them. An interesting Presidential campaign on economic questions along radical lines looms up in consequence in the political sky.

✣ ✣

A Lesson of the British Labor Strike.

In this country great labor strikes evoke hysterical demands for the military; and it is customary in that connection to insist upon mercilessly "shooting down the mob." If one tries to argue that these "mobs" may have just grievances, a heartless reply comes sharply back. In effect it is that the time for considering grievances is past, the only consideration now being "law and order." To persons who have argued in this way, the time they speak of as past had never come. They were wholly indifferent to grievances until aroused by fears of violence, and then they thought of nothing but slaughter. Americans are not alone in this hellish attitude of mind toward "the lower classes." Precisely the same spirit animated British Tories when the recent strike broke out in Great Britain. Some military shooting was indeed done; but one death-dealing volley in Wales aroused the indignation of all humane Britain. Had Tories been in power, the slaughter might have gone on in spite of public opinion, but Tories were not in power. The Ministry, supported by the Liberal-Labor-Irish coalition, cast aside all that "upper class" nonsense, criminal nonsense, about "law and order first and grievances afterwards," and sanely considered that grievances which cause lawlessness and disorder are the primary consideration for a government trying to re-establish law and order. Consequently—and note that it is *con*sequently—a gigantic labor struggle has been averted with peace and in honor. A man like Grover Cleveland wouldn't have believed it possible, and wouldn't have tried it; men like Asquith and Lloyd George did believe it possible, and trying it in good faith have proved it.

✣ ✣

The British Federation.

A brief news item that went through the American newspapers last week, is prophetic of the future of Great Britain. It was to the effect that a Scottish member of the British Parliament had, on the 16th of August, introduced a bill in the House of Commons providing for a local legislature for Scotland. This is a natural sequence of the abolition of the absolute veto heretofore held by the House of Lords. The purpose of the Scottish bill will doubtless follow, if indeed it does not accompany, the granting of home rule to Ireland. As long as the House of Lords controlled legislation by its veto, home rule for any of the amalgamated nations within the British empire was impossible. But abolition of the Lords' veto was a preliminary condition to home rule for Ireland; and home rule for Ireland means inevitably home rule for Scotland also, and for Wales and for England.

✣

None of those countries has a local legislature. There are city councils and county councils, but no sub-Imperial autonomy. Parliament governs all. On the other hand, nearly two score British dependencies scattered over the world and having local self governments, such as Canada and Australia, have no representation in the British parliament, as have Ireland, England, Wales and Scotland. All this is to be changed. The abolition of the Lords' veto absolute, makes it possible. With Ireland in the lead, local legislatures will be established in Scotland, Wales and England as well as in Ireland; and all four, together with the world-scattered autonomous dependencies of Great Britain, will be represented in the Imperial parliament. The whole Empire will be as in Canada with her Provinces, and in Australia with her States, or as in our own country with its State legislatures and its Federal Congress. Here, then, is in the making the greatest federated empire of history—and a democratic empire at that, albeit the shadow of a throne and the ghost of an hereditary legislature may for a time remain. It is no new thought. Richard McGhee, an ex-member of Parliament from Ireland, and now a member of Parliament again, told the City Club of Chicago about it two years ago. Mr. McGhee saw then what was coming; it is easier to see it now.

✣ ✣

President Taft's Statehood Veto.

To appreciate the significance of President Taft's veto of the Statehood bill, three things are necessary to be understood. In the first place, Mr. Taft's legal education was got at a time and under circumstances which bias him in favor of the sacrosanctity of the judiciary. A bunch of wigs and gowns, with corporation lawyers concealed within them, is to Mr. Taft what crowns and scepters are to imperial flunkies. In the second place, his political, business and social connections have a tendency to make Mr. Taft see the patriotic importance of morganistic government. In the third place, New Mexico is absolutely under the thumb of morganistic combines through their control of its natural resources, whereas Arizona is as yet above the control of those powers. Gladly would Mr. Taft have admitted New Mexico with its prac-

tically unamendable and plutocratic Constitution. He himself says it. But there was only one bill before him, and in this the two applicants for Statehood were coupled. He could not admit New *Mexico* without admitting Arizona. Put those *three considerations* together and you have "a line on" Mr. Taft's veto. His amiably patriotic desire to serve his great and good friends of the class to whom he has done his utmost to give Alaska, fell nicely in with his distrust of popular government and his worship of judicial wigs and gowns. Run your eye over the argument of the veto message.

♣

If the people of Arizona should adopt the Recall for judges "the rights of the individual" would be subject "to the possible tyranny of a popular majority." Granted. But even if it occurred why would that be worse—why as bad as the *actual* judicial tyranny over both individual and popular rights which has so long been inspired by corporate greed? And what governmental device is there by which "possible tyranny" over individual rights can be prevented? Absolutely none; except it be the will of the people themselves, they being armed with power to enforce their will. "The unbridled expression of the majority of a community converted hastily into law or action would sometimes make a government tyrannical and cruel;" wherefore we must have, not only Constitutional checks (depending upon the people for their just observance, which the masses of the people are always inclined to, as experience shows), but, so thinks President Taft, we must also have judges so "independent" as to be depended upon by greedy interests to twist those checks into weapons for killing popular legislation. "Judges are not popular representatives," says Mr. Taft. True enough. But Mr. Taft would have it understood that they represent even handed justice, and this is not true outside of the old text books and Bar-society oratory. In the very nature of things, judges who are "independent" enough of public opinion to deny it or to defy it, tend to become representatives of class interests at the best, and of corrupt interests at the worst. Jefferson prophesied this, and experience proves it. The "independence" of judges is secured by "a fixed term and fixed and irreducible salary," Mr. Taft goes on to say. This is the old and essentially sordid if not corrupt theory of property rights in public office. Cases are infrequent in which the judgment of a judge may be "affected by his political, economic or social views." So writes President Taft, as soothingly as a morganistic lawyer might purr it to a friend on the bench with a perpetual franchise at stake. Mr. Taft must have been among the exceptions when, as a judge, he departed from what in his message he describes as the "clear principles of law," to introduce government by injunction in the interest of plutocracy. If these exceptions are in cases in which judges come under "the people's influence," as his message asserts, then in his own case the "people" consisted of his own class and not of a majority of all the people. But if influence is to count, why not count it by means of formal regularity? If judges "are not removed from the people's influence," and this is part of President Taft's argument, why not provide for popular expressions of that influence, instead of depending upon plutocratic clubs and newspapers subsidized by Big Business? This is the meaning of the judicial Recall, except as it applies to corrupt judges —those that impeachment is intended for but has never reached.

♣

A man of President Taft's instincts, training, associations and extreme simplicity of mind, might have been expected to give away his whole case against judicial recalls; and he does so when in his message he approvingly says, alluding to the judiciary, that "we are dealing with a human institution that likens itself to a divine institution because it seeks and preserves justice." Precisely what used to be said, with precisely the same meaning, in precisely the same spirit, and for precisely the same object, in behalf of the pernicious doctrine of "divine right of kings." The Emperor of Germany and his flunkies say it yet. Might they not shake hands with Mr. Taft across the bounding billows, or cable him to "have one on" them?

♣

Congress has doubtless adopted the wise course regarding Arizona, in amending the Statehood bill so as to conform to the President's demands. By withdrawing the judicial Recall, Arizona may secure her Statehood; and after her admission Mr. Taft's prejudices will have no more weight in the matter than in any other State. At least one of the others already has the judicial Recall, and more will have it soon.

♣ ♣

Crooked "Parallels."

Not long ago plutocratic newspapers were testing the Initiative and Referendum by the action of "the people of Jerusalem" in demanding the crucifixion of Christ; all unmindful, these papers, that those demands were not by the people but by plutocratic pharisees and their slumgullion hang-