

The Page Letters

A man by the name of Hendricks—Burton J.—is editing the letters of the late Ambassador Walter H. Page and printing the edited letters in the *World's Work*. Either he or Mr. Page is responsible for several flings at Mr. Bryan. The first was a complaint that Mr. Bryan, when Secretary of State, gave a letter to a friend addressed directly to a British official instead of sending the friend to Mr. Page. Mr. Bryan knew that Mr. Page was not friendly—had never been—but even if he had been friendly, why was it necessary to send a friend to Mr. Page with a request for a letter to the official of another land? Mr. Bryan knew many foreign officials personally. No slight was intended and no friendly American official would have made it a part of his memoirs.

The second item that has been paraded before the public is Mr. Page's protest to Mr. House against Mr. Bryan's speaking on the subject of peace in Europe. Mr. Bryan never planned any trip to Europe while Secretary of State. Mr. Page's alarm was therefore unnecessary. But facts are immaterial when one wants to find fault.

The third reference is still more important. Mr. Hendricks calls attention to the fact that the Kaiser notified Mr. House that Germany would not enter into the Treaty Plan embodied in Thirty Treaties with three-quarters of the world. Mr. Hendricks, so the Boston Traveler says, congratulates the country on the Kaiser's action and breathlessly announces that if the treaty had been negotiated "William II might now be sitting on the throne of a victorious Germany with Europe for a footstool." Has Mr. Hendricks forgotten that President Wilson was back of all the Bryan treaties? While Mr. Bryan proposed the plan and negotiated the treaties, he spoke as the representative of President Wilson and, as President Wilson's representative, offered the treaty plan to Germany as well as to the other countries. It seems to have been to the President's special representative that the Kaiser presented his refusal. Mr. Wilson was so committed to the Treaty Plan that he secured its inclusion in the covenant of the League of Nations. Does Mr. Hendricks mean to criticize President Wilson for having been willing to make a treaty with Germany in June, 1914? Or is Mr. Wilson to have the credit when things go well and Mr. Bryan to bear the blame when they go wrong?

Dealers in the goods that farmers ordinarily buy are complaining that they insist on measuring all prices in bushels of corn, and then refusing to buy. Corn is down to thirty cents a bushel, below prewar prices, and is the one medium of exchange that the farmer possesses in abundance at the present time. Until those who consume the corn directly or indirectly refuse to reduce the exchange value of what they have to sell, the farmer is justified in refusing to trade. If his example were followed by all others whose income has shrunk faster than prices, the top heavy price structure would speedily tumble.

The truth about the movement among western grain growers to organize a corporation through which to market its grain without the aid or consent of the Chicago board of trade has at last come out. It is a socialistic enterprise. The national grain dealers' association has so declared it. A socialistic enterprise, it should be understood, is one where the producers seek to absorb the profits of marketing their own grain. If the profits are absorbed by the national grain dealers' association it is not a socialistic organization. Thus we see what a great boon it is to have somebody to make our definitions for us.

It is perhaps worth noting that right after the Chicago chief of police had delivered himself of the declaration that "prohibition is not a fact but a fallacy," the state's attorney came out with the charge that he had evidence to show half of the policemen in Chicago were in a conspiracy to sell confiscated liquor, that they had stored some of it in a station house and delivered part of it in a patrol wagon. No wonder it is a fallacy where such things can go on under a chief's nose.

A peculiar divorce case is reported from Chicago. The wife of a millionaire there has begun suit for divorce and seeks a large sum for alimony. The queer part of it is that she declares absolutely that there is no other woman in the case. That makes one millionaire who has overlooked the privileges of his class.

UNTERMYER TELLS TENANTS NOT TO PAY UNJUST INCREASES

With the renting population of this city and the moving van men facing an October 1, which promises to be the most confusing moving day in history, due to re-renting by landlords of apartments whose tenants are unwilling or unable to move, the Lockwood legislative committee decided yesterday on fresh measures of relief.

They will be embraced in an application to the Appellate Division for a definition of practically all the disputed points of the rent laws. Action was taken after an opinion from Samuel Untermyer, chief counsel for the committee, condemning in severest terms and pronouncing "fundamentally wrong" the recent decision of Justices Cropsey, Lazansky and Kelby, in the Appellate Term in Brooklyn, that landlords are entitled to a 10 per cent return on the market value of their properties.

A case is to be brought speedily to the higher court, in which not only this but many other conclusions, in which Mr. Untermyer set forth that the Brooklyn justices had erred, will be determined in such a manner as to provide for the first time a uniform rent law construction for New York City. Meanwhile Mr. Untermyer advises tenants from whom increases are demanded, which will give landlords a return of greater than 10 per cent on their equities (subject to qualifications which are later explained), to withhold payment of the increases until the appeals have been decided.

In his opinion, which was rendered at a meeting of the committee in his offices, Mr. Untermyer advised against an appeal of the specific Brooklyn case of Hirsch vs. Wiener, on the ground that the judgment of affirmance was proper, inasmuch as the landlord had been allowed only 7 per cent, return by the lower court. He declares, however, that in its decision the court interjected opinions which, "if permitted to go unchallenged, will establish a vicious and unsound precedent which the statute did not contemplate."

Mr. Untermyer points out that the landlord who won the Brooklyn case has already notified his tenants of further increases from 10 to 25 per cent, in accordance with the rule the court laid down. On Mr. Untermyer's advice, the tenants are refusing to meet the demand.

Mr. Untermyer holds that the "only reasonable basis of rental value" is the value of the investment at the time the rental was fixed. He says a 10 per cent return on actual investment is not unreasonable, but a 25 per cent return on the total value of property, regardless of investment, is "an unreasonable and indefensible allowance."—New York World.

A New York banker has discovered who is responsible for the forced liquidation that everybody has been blaming on the federal reserve banks. He says that it was the depositors in the member banks. They spent too large a portion of their cash, deposits went down and the banks had to call in loans. The theory is a pretty one but overlooks the established fact that no one noticed anything was wrong until the federal reserve banks adopted the sliding discount rate, with the slide tilted upward.

The Senate committee on privileges and elections has recommended that Newberry of Michigan be given his seat on the theory that in order to beat Henry Ford it was necessary to spend \$176,000, and that anyway Newberry's friends paid the money without his connivance. The fact that the Republicans cannot even excuse this on the ground that they need another Republican in the Senate did not deter the committee from such stultification.

Senator Cummins has become convinced that the Esch-Cummins law governing the railroads has proved a failure, and that a new way of controlling them must be devised. This fact was discovered some time ago by the general public, which is likely to suggest that the new job be let to somebody else than the original authors.

It may not be that the modern maiden was born to blush unseen, but unless a little preliminary blasting is done it is certainly difficult to discover whether she is blushing.

"OTHERS"

A Commoner reader writes that the poem entitled "Others," reproduced in our August issue with the notation "Author Unknown," was written by Charles D. Meigs of the Meigs Publishing Co., Indianapolis, Ind., who died recently. Mr. Meigs was during his life a great friend of the Sunday School.

Why Such Bitterness?

Why do the Darwinites and the evolutionists fly into a passion when anyone questions the soundness of the guess that links man in blood relation to the apes and the monkeys? Can it be that brute ancestry is so aristocratic that they are proud of it? If the human race could be divided into two groups and the members of each group could be allowed to choose their own ancestry, the believers in Moses would gladly allow the believers in Darwin to go to the jungle for their forefathers, but as all must come from the same source those who prefer to be made in the image of God ought not to be so bitterly assailed for rejecting the brute ancestry hypothesis.

I supposed that those who feel that they are forced by reason to be evolutionists would be grateful to anybody who could convince them of the truth of the Bible account of man's creation, but I have never been more bitterly assailed even in politics than I have by those who take offense at my defense of the Bible account of creation. One man even refused to lunch where I was the guest of honor because he did not agree with me on this subject of evolution. Just think of that! If I can afford to eat with a man who imagines he has brute blood in his veins, why should he object?

Anger is not a fair substitute for argument. Whether man's ancestors once lived in trees, as the evolutionists are in the habit of saying, or were made by the Almighty by separate act and for a purpose, is a very important question. It cannot be settled by a look of surprise or an expression of contempt. The question lies at the very foundation of man's character and vitally affects the basis of ethics. Evolutionists will have to "come down out of the trees," abandon "tooth and claw" methods, and present such facts as they that cast suspicion on man's family history.

A large majority of the Christians of the United States and the world believe the Bible; those who desire to substitute Darwin's "Descent of Man" for the Book of Books may as well cool off and prepare their side of the case. Even the preachers who have been joy-riding with the evolutionists will have to meet the facts. "A tree is known by its fruits," and evolution has been bearing fruit long enough for us to tell the character of the tree. A doctrine that carries more than half of the prominent scientists and nearly half the male graduates of our colleges away from the Bible and the Bible's God cannot be defended as an AID TO CHRISTIANITY. The evolutionists tell us that they can worship a God who created a germ of life and endowed it with power to develop, as reverently as they could worship the God of Moses; but the question is not whether they CAN, but whether they DO. The facts show that evolution is leading men away from belief in a personal God and a personal immortality and that, too, without a single fact in the universe to support the doctrine of evolution as Darwin applied it to man. The evolutionists lay great stress upon REASON—why not apply reason to evolution? That an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-loving God should create man in His image as Moses declares He did is much more REASONABLE than evolution or any other substitute ever offered for the Bible plan. W. J. BRYAN.

The women of Nebraska are supporting the referendum on the anti-primary bill which the last legislature attempted to make into a law. The significant fact that just as soon as the women became voters the machine politicians began maneuvering to get back to the old convention system, under which the average voter counted for nothing, has not been lost upon the new addition to the electorate.

Judging by the numerous arrests of booze runners who use motor cars the old proverb will have to be rewritten to read that a fool and his auto are soon parted.

A PROVISION FOR STATE CONSTITUTIONS

(Suggested by Hon. J. E. Babb.)

Section 4. Persons having business with public bodies, boards or committees thereof, shall not interview or solicit or communicate with the said public functionaries or the members thereof otherwise than in open meetings thereof, at which a quorum is present, to the end that the public and competitors of the applicants, may be represented and know what is going on, and the legislature is required to make necessary provisions to that end obligatory upon officers as well as persons having business with them.