

one meaning to observers for ten years or so of American politics. It does not mean that Mr. Hearst is putting Mr. Clark forward for the Democratic nomination. What it means is that Mr. Clark has been picked, doubtless without his own knowledge, to be a candidate from whose shadow Mr. Hearst may emerge as a "dark horse" at the psychological moment.

* *

A Correction.

An error in the newspaper from which we quoted at page 1187 with reference to a certain eyewater, "Murine," made us say that this concoction, which costs 5 cents a gallon for its simple and familiar materials, is sold as a proprietary medicine for \$1.28 per gallon. We are assured that the moral of our editorial "might have had still more point" if we had known, what the fact is, that this stuff is sold for \$128 per gallon. The percentage—but hold, this profit is out of the realm of percentages.

* *

Highways.

Judge Knapp of the United States Court of Commerce is quoted as amending Henry George's observation that the man who owns the land owns the people, by saying that "the person who owns the highways owns both the land and the people." Pray what does Judge Knapp think highways are, since he thinks they are not land?

* *

A Timely Contrast.

Susan Look Avery is responsible for reviving R. R. Bowker's epigram at a time when it is better calculated, than at its first utterance, to probe the piety of those good people of whom Lincoln Steffens says that they "believe in Jesus but not in his teachings." As Mrs. Avery quoted the Bowker epigram at the Singletax Conference dinner in Chicago, this is the way it runs: "It is bad for the ignorant and the vicious to do ill, but it is worse for the educated and the honest to do nothing."

* *

Death of Our "Uncle Sam."

In the death of Charles Humphrey Roberts, The Public loses one of its old and valued contributors. "Uncle Sam's Letters to John Bull," of which Mr. Roberts was the always unrevealed author, will be recalled with agreeable memories by our readers of the earlier days. So will his "grindin' on his poetry machine." And, long ago as it is since most of those letters came out, they may yet be read with interest and profit for their

wholesome Quaker democracy and their quaint, old-fashioned New England style. Mr. Roberts was a native of Ohio, a flouring-miller, an engineer, a school teacher, an inventor, a graduate of the law school of the University of Michigan, and a patent lawyer. He contributed incidentally to periodicals for the love of it, and he was the author of a novel of Quaker life named "Down the O-hi-o." Although a resident of Evanston, one of the suburbs of Chicago, his health necessitated a long sojourn in Arkansas and southern Illinois, whence he had come to Bloomington (Illinois) where he died on Thanksgiving day. His last letter from "Uncle Sam" to "John Bull" appeared in The Public hardly more than a year ago.* It pictured most humanly a State fair in Arkansas, and at its close "Uncle Sam" recalled the delirium of conquest about which he had written much in earlier letters. "I don't seem to have any use for warships nowadays," he wrote; "I don't think I am feelin' my best." They prove to have been his goodby words to The Public.

* * *

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

For a conservative race our British cousins are certainly addicted to paradox. Imbued as they have been for generations past with the spirit of *laissez faire*, it would seem as if the very last thing which would have appealed to them would have been Lloyd George's scheme for old age pensions; and yet, if the newspaper reports are true, this is the one measure put forth by the present radical Ministry which has commanded enthusiastic support from the upper and middle classes. How much of this is due to the general trend toward paternalism and how much to a shrewd recognition by the upper classes of the fact that it means self-insurance by the working classes, is hard to determine; although the latter supposition would seem to be supported by the fact that such opposition as has developed appears to have been among those whom the scheme has been designed to benefit.

With such opposition in sight it is seriously to be doubted whether any plan of the kind can be made to work smoothly; and even if it were not proposed to derive the pension fund in part from wages it is quite clear that there is an instinctive distrust among wage earners—which is by no means ill-founded—that the contribution by the employers would in effect come out of wages indirectly. There really does not seem to be any logical reason why, if the principle of a pension

*See Public of October 21, 1910, page 1002.

for protection against the emergencies of old age is accepted at all, either employers or wage earners should be required to contribute except through their relation to the state as members of the body politic. From certain extreme socialistic points of view, a government is warranted, of course, in regulating the individual actions of its citizens in any direction that it may consider for their best interests; but the idea of pensions for old age, or for that matter for disability before old age, does not by any means rest necessarily on any such foundation.

+

The *laissez faire* idea has always been that every one should lie upon his or her own bed, according as the individual effort had made it; that the dread of privation in itself is the most wholesome incentive to thrift; and that the semi-socialistic departure from this conception, which recognizes that under modern conditions with their intensified struggle for bare existence it is almost impossible for the very poor to carry out such an ideal, does not involve any essential contradiction of the ideal in itself.

Whether that ideal is a true one, however, is quite another matter. There is another phase that the most cold-blooded economists have always admitted. Nearly all workers do quite unavoidably contribute more to the world's wealth than they enjoy of it, and if the extent of this could only be determined there would come a time when they would be entitled to a refund. Even if more just conditions could be established than we have ever yet been able to attain, there would still remain probably a surplus of this character, such for instance as is represented in the sacrifice of parents in bringing up children to aid in the world's work, who, whether through undutifulness or otherwise, do not make adequate return to the parents for such sacrifice. It may be said, it is true, that the contribution which the state is supposed to give under a plan such as that of Lloyd George, would reasonably cover the community's share of the benefit derived from such sacrifice; but when this is coupled with a compulsory insurance by the beneficiary it imposes an additional burden that may well prove to be intolerable. It is easy to say that the penny or two a week which it is proposed to exact, the equivalent perhaps of a nickel or a dime for corresponding classes in our own country, means only the sacrifice of a glass of beer now and then or some similar possibly useless luxury; but this is much as if those of us who enjoy somewhat easier circumstances were to sternly deny ourselves the occasional theater visit, the subscription to a mag-

azine, the comfort-giving cigar, for the sake of guarantee against penury late in life that after all we may never live to enjoy. It is a case of giving up for an uncertainty those little things for which after all life is most worth living.

+

There is another factor. Is it for the best interest of the community to stimulate what we call habits of thrift?

Paradoxical as it may seem at first glance, it is impossible for us all to save. The abstention by any one person from consuming all of what that person produces, since we all produce chiefly to exchange for the products of others, means simply that some one else must have the opportunity of enjoying less, because the some one else will have a diminished market for what he or she produces. We cannot create products and lay them by for future use. Nature forbids that. Most things created by man begin to deteriorate or decay from the moment of their creation; some with greater rapidity than others, but all in some degree. And so it is that when one person saves, that person merely acquires a mortgage on the future labor of others for which sooner or later a refund will be demanded without an equivalent being then rendered in return; while in the meantime the sum total of good things for the enjoyment of all is correspondingly diminished.

+

Not altogether a fallacy, is the conception which welcomes the destruction of wealth by war or even great fires or similar disasters because it stimulates the demand for labor; although such truth as lies in this is chiefly due to the constant restriction of current production, due in turn to the deliberate holding out of use of opportunities to produce under existing conditions. But it is nevertheless true that the ideal conditions would be those under which everyone able to labor is producing to the utmost of his or her capacity, and to do this it is essential that everyone must consume to the maximum of each individual need.

There comes a time, however, when each of us who lives long enough can no longer effectively produce. If we have not fulfilled our complete social function by consuming to the extent we have produced, if in other words we have not denied to others the full market of their product so as to gain for ourselves a legal title to the fruits of the future labor of others, we must then depend for our support on the generations which have followed us, and to which, if we have

at all lived useful lives, we have bequeathed a legacy that gives us some title to such support.

+

Shall we recognize this to be the real question of old age or disability pensions? If we have labored and sustained our children thus far, we are entitled to support from them when we can labor no longer even though they may not recognize it or we may not wish to exact it. If we have labored for the community we are in like measure entitled to it, not as an insurance to which we have ourselves contributed but as a matter of justice. The drones might benefit with the workers, it is true, but after all the drones are most apt to fall back on charity in any event. With universal pensions, on the other hand, there would be no stigma of charity and the community as a whole would gain by the better work which is done when the future is secure.

E. J. SHRIVER.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE CALIFORNIA AMENDMENTS.

Los Angeles, Calif., Nov. 25.

Respecting the recent adoption of Constitutional amendments, the official vote on the three main amendments was as follows:

No. on Ballot.	Subject.	For.	Against.	Majority for.	Total vote.
4.	Equal Suffrage.....	125,037	121,450	3,587	246,487
7.	Initiative and Referendum	168,744	52,093	116,651	220,837
8.	Recall	178,115	53,755	124,360	231,870

At the session of the legislature at which the resolutions proposing amendments were adopted a considerable number were introduced in each House, and were numbered in the order of their introduction: Senate Constitutional Amendment, No. 1, 2, 3, etc.; Assembly Constitutional Amendment, No. 1, 2, 3, etc. Only 23 of the proposed amendments passed both Houses. The Suffrage Amendment was "Senate Amendment No. 8"; the Initiative and Referendum, "Senate Amendment No. 22"; and the Recall, "Senate Amendment No. 23."

Supposing that the amendments would appear on the ballot under the numbers as adopted by the legislature, advocates of woman suffrage all over the State proceeded to boom "Amendment No. 8." They were therefore taken aback when, a few weeks before election day, they were informed that although the Secretary of State would place the Amendments on the ballot in the order of their introduction, the Senate amendments first and the Assembly amendments next, they would be numbered from 1 to 23, the Suffrage amendment thus becoming No. 4 on the ballot, the Initiative No. 7 and the Recall No. 8. The attention of voters was called to the change, and those for woman suffrage were asked to vote for No. 4; but many of the country papers supporting woman suffrage continued to

print up to the day of election: "Be sure to vote for Senate Amendment No. 8." On the ballot, in small type, No. 4 was described as Senate Amendment No. 8, but that was easily overlooked. As the vote that came from the country counties saved the amendment, notwithstanding the large adverse majorities in San Francisco and Oakland, it seems probable that many voters may have stamped "yes" after No. 8 on the ballot, supposing they were voting for woman suffrage.

This view is borne out by other facts.

For several reasons, and among them the pronounced opposition of President Taft, the Recall at first was not as popular with the voters as the Initiative and Referendum. Knowing this, advocates of the Recall who stumped the State in its favor, notably Governor Johnson and Mr. Heney, said little in their speeches about the Initiative but devoted the bulk of their talk to the Recall. Mr. Heney, in his speech in Los Angeles, barely mentioned the Initiative, but spoke for more than an hour on the history of the adoption of the provisions of the United States Constitution relative to the judiciary, the encroachments of the United States Supreme Court upon the rights of the people, and the necessity for the application of the Recall to judges as well as to other officials. Mr. Heney said little about equal suffrage. Governor Johnson refused to say anything about it, which led many women to be vexed with him, declaring that a word from him would have influenced many votes in its favor. His apologists explained that he feared that his advocacy of woman suffrage might lead some of its opponents to vote against the Recall.

An analysis sustains the inference noted above. Many voted for or against the Woman Suffrage amendment and neglected to vote on any of the others. If 10,000 votes were taken from the Recall it would leave the vote on the Initiative and the Recall about equal; and if this 10,000 were added to the total for woman suffrage it would show that about 35,000 more voted on that amendment than on any other, and that it should have carried by more than 13,000.

DAVID WHITE.

+

POLITICAL RUMBLINGS IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Pittsburgh, Nov. 27

The results of the recent election in Pennsylvania, from a Democratic and independent viewpoint, afford little comfort to the one time irresistible Penrose machine. Philadelphia elected a Democratic-Keystone Mayor, thereby overcoming a 100,000 Republican majority. Penrose personally conducted the machine campaign and although he used a very "respectable" business man (Geo. E. Earle) as his candidate for Mayor, the people ignored him and elected Rudolf Blankenburg.

In Allegheny County the Republican ticket was elected, with the exception of Judge of Common Pleas Court No. 3. For this office A. B. Reid was elected on the Democratic and Keystone tickets, and several other county candidates ran close to their Republican opponents. The Socialists made a wonderful showing in Allegheny County, polling nearly 20,000 votes.