

we should not imply either criminality or idiocy; we could plead that there is nothing necessarily criminal in the one word, nor of the fool foolish in the other. Anybody who does things by indirection is "crooked," in the slang of the time, without being necessarily a rascal. Diplomats are apt to be "crooked." And who may not be a "chump" on occasion? Only those persons that are too superhumanly wise ever to have anything "put over" on them. Some time we hope to write a lay sermon on "crooks" and "chumps," from the text about the wisdom of serpents and the harmlessness of doves. It may possibly have some value for honest persons of both classes. But not now.

* *

Presidential Possibilities.

John T. Fort, a predecessor of Governor Wilson in the gubernatorial chair of New Jersey, has recently returned from abroad across the Western States. He reports the outlook for Democratic nominations next year as Wilson and Harmon or Harmon and Wilson, with a shade of difference in favor of the former. Mr. Fort must be cross-eyed politically or he wouldn't get these two men mixed. Maybe, as a partisan Republican, he would like to see Harmon strapped on to Wilson; or possibly he got his news in Japan.

* *

A "Progressive" Ticket.

For President and Vice-President in 1912: Taft and Hearst! Why Not?

* *

"Progressive" Combinations.

The latest "get-together" program of the reactionary Progressive Republicans of Illinois, according to the Chicago Tribune of the 28th, is a "combination of the forces of Gov. Deneen and the 'Federal crowd' led by United States Senator Shelby M. Cullom." If now the Cullom-Deneen forces could get United States Senator William Lorimer also into their leadership, what a fine combination of "progressive" forces it would make! And would it be such a very incongruous crowd?

* *

The Fitness of Things.

"The Lincoln Protective League" is the name the Lorimer Republicans of Illinois have adopted. In itself a good name, it is peculiarly appropriate for the purpose—appropriate, that is, as a white horse is an appropriate match for a black one when you want a cross-match. And then this Lorimer-

ized "Lincoln League" denounces the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, which is as it should be, precisely.

*

If Governor Deneen is to lead "progressive" Republicanism in Illinois—and that's the way it looked to some wise men until Senator Jones came into the gubernatorial field—Republican progressives, and progressive Democrats, too, might do worse than wait for something to turn up. They certainly couldn't do worse by falling in behind the Hearst-Harrison aggregation, nor much worse by making Sunday-school terms with Roger Sullivan, et al.

* *

Big Booze and Big Business.

It is entertaining to find the New York Times applauding Dahlman of Omaha, the man who, when he thought he had been elected Governor of Nebraska, publicly declared that he would kick out of the Governor's office every member of the W. C. T. U. who might approach him on the "booze" question. Mayor Dahlman's declaration was well enough for him, for on the "booze" question he has the advantage of the W. C. T. U., he being an expert; but when the New York Times, spokesman for Big Business, glories in Dahlman, it is to laugh. The Times told a few days ago of "the severe denunciation of Bryan and his political methods in his own State," expressing its hope that the effect would be "wholesome in other States." It thought, or pretended to think, that it was talking about the Nebraska convention. In fact, it was talking about Dahlman's Omaha (Douglas county) convention, which stood for Big Business, Big Booze and Harmon of Ohio. But the State convention strode over Dahlman, so dear to the editorial heart of the New York Times and its Wall Street clientele, and while naming no names, ignoring Harmon's, the only name that had been proposed, it adopted a Bryanistic platform. We commend our readers to D. L. K.'s fine letter on the subject in this week's Public.

* *

John Z. White in New Jersey.

The speech of John Z. White at Passaic, N. J., reported stenographically and in full by the Passaic Daily News of July 24, ranks high among the convincing elementary presentations of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall as safety devices for representative government. It was delivered on the 22d in advocacy of the New Jersey commission form of city government, which was adopted by the people of Passaic at

the referendum election on the 25th. We reproduce parts of this impressive speech, regretting that we cannot produce it all; and we venture the hope that after the editing which is always necessary to correct crudities of extemporaneous speaking, but which would be slight in this case, it may be reproduced in pamphlet form and widely circulated. As a Congressional document it would make a most useful companion-piece to Senator Bourne's famous speech on People's Power in Oregon, and to Senator Owen's exposition of the general subject.

+ +

A Distinction With Some Difference.

No, sir; nothing of the kind. We do not say that everybody who is against the Initiative, Referendum and Recall is a plute. A good many are only ignorant, and some of these are stubborn. What we do say is that every plute is against those reforms—penniless plutes and all. There is some difference. And yet men really must be judged, by and large, by the company they like to keep.

+ +

For an Intelligent Suffrage.

Educational tests for the suffrage have been popular with suffrage restrictionists these many years, but they have always contemplated restraints by one set of persons upon another set. The proposed tests have ranged, explicitly or in effect, from reading and writing to a college education, according to the educational equipment of the restrainer, who has usually aimed to draw the line of exclusion just below himself. But now that the best kind of educational test is coming in vogue, an automatic test—behold! the very classes that would limit the suffrage by arbitrary tests are in opposition and on the express ground that the unintelligent don't vote. At the Trenton election, for example, at which the commission form of government was adopted, it seems that only two-thirds of the voters who had voted for Governor, voted on the Commission form plan, and that, as the New York Sun expresses it, "something like 33 1/3 per cent of the normal voting population determined this important issue for the whole city." But that was because the *unintelligent* voting population were disfranchised—by themselves, as incompetent. If only two-thirds voted on the question, then only two-thirds were sufficiently educated on the subject to take enough interest in it to vote. This is the way the argument runs, at any rate, when suffrage restrictionists give reasons for disfranchising women. Now, isn't it better to

let citizens disfranchise themselves by the truly civic educational test that was applied in Trenton, than to have disfranchised them arbitrarily? And if only two-thirds did vote, upon what theory can any person object that a minority determines an important issue for the rest, if that very person advocates the alternative method of electing a few "representatives" to determine it for all? Is it democratic to compel all to delegate power to a few, but undemocratic to allow all to participate or not as they please, if it so happens that some decide for themselves that they don't know and don't care how to vote on the question at issue?

+ +

Hot Weather Dress for Men.

C. W. Andrews, librarian of the Crerar library in Chicago, has explained a question of masculine dress in response to a criticism of library rules, which is broader in its application than to reading-room etiquette. A reader in shirt sleeves and suspenders, claimed that he had been required by the rules to put on his coat, whereas other readers were undisturbed though they also were in shirt sleeves but without suspenders. Mr. Andrews very sensibly and conclusively replied that the difference is one "between dress and undress." That phrase presents the whole case. It needs no elaboration and there is no answer to it. But the important point is that as to shirt-sleeve "dress" (in contradistinction to shirt-sleeve "undress"), no effort is made to popularize it. If suspenders remain out of vogue as a part of external dress, why not some sort of shirt-blouse or "jumper" that could be worn over them conveniently and usually, in warm weather? This would solve more questions than those of decency in reading rooms. There are decent persons and many who cannot afford, with reference to time as well as money, to wear two kinds of clothing on the same day, one kind from which they may remove the coat and still be dressed and another from which they cannot remove the coat without being undressed. A warm-season style of dress for men, to be worn with or without a coat at pleasure, would put them on an equality with women in a respect in which they are now pathetically and often aggravatingly inferior.

+ +

Aviation.

It is but barely probable that aviation can come into very general use, no matter how efficient the mechanism of flight, until two supplementary inventions are made. One of these is a life preserver—something to give the operators and pas-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY