

The Sun

THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail. Postpaid. DAILY, Per Month, \$3.00; Per Year, \$36.00. SUNDAY, Per Year, \$10.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$46.00. DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$3.83. Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Latta, 170 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Bartlett, 23 Nassau street.

Paris Office: 23 Rue de la Grève. The daily and Sunday papers are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel; Kiosque 77, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opera; and Kiosque 18, Boulevard des Ternes, corner Rue de la Grève.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Sanity in Respect of the Currency.

We observe that the measure introduced by Senator ALDRICH in respect of a special currency reserve has met with general approval and is assured of an early passage. There is, of course, no one factional opposition, but it is not likely to prevail or even to cause material delay.

Senator ALDRICH's bill is a very simple one and does not aim at anything like currency reform. It provides that the Treasury may issue currency up to the amount of \$250,000,000, secured by the same class of obligations as present recognized as lawful in the case of savings banks; said issue to be taxable at 6 per cent. The prudential stipulations and restrictions are adequate and the whole measure impresses us as wisely conceived and ably planned.

If we might be permitted to offer a criticism, and we do so with the utmost diffidence, it would be that the tax of 6 per cent. does not adequately differentiate this reserve from ordinary current money on which the legal rate conventionally stands at the same figure. The rate, we venture to think, ought to be 7 or 8 per cent. At the latter figure the possibility of inflation is negligible.

The great probability is that, assuming that the Aldrich bill becomes a law, this generation will not witness a recourse to it. The very existence of the law and the permanent availability of the sum it provides will operate very much as the rate of the Bank of England operates in London. A money panic will be impossible, except indeed in case of an overwhelming national calamity, such as has led in England on occasion to the suspension of the bank act—a euphemism for the same thing that we do here under another name.

We have plenty of money in the country, ample for all its needs, and there is no dollar of our currency which cannot be exchanged at the holder's option for a dollar in gold. The statement implies that our currency is ideal; and in all practical senses that is the truth. With leisure and security we can be trusted to make it a little more scientific and technically orthodox, but for the present it is the part of wisdom to let it alone.

Given this special currency reserve of \$250,000,000, we think we shall get along very smoothly and perform all our monetary functions in peace. We do not believe that we shall call upon the Treasury for any of it, even in the annual crop moving. There is ample money for that purpose, especially since the wealth of the country is so much better distributed and is held in such material volume in the vicinity of productive areas. The proposition to draw money out at 7 or 8 per cent. to move crops does not particularly appeal to our intelligence.

Will Senator ALDRICH tolerate one brief interrogation? It is, Why should not Government deposits in the banks draw at least a nominal rate of interest? The Treasurer of the United States has had for some time upon \$200,000,000 on deposit in national banks. Why should he not be empowered to receive, say, 2 per cent. on such balances? We have the idea that it is unwise to challenge public opinion respecting the discrepancy between public and private depositors, particularly at a time when the ruling rate for money is persistently high, and, indeed, out of the reach of the class that is best entitled to its use, to wit: the mercantile community. We are quite aware that the Government has been deprived of interest upon its balances heretofore by the influence of the banks themselves, but the present is a time for sweet reasonableness, unless it be that we are incapable of learning the lesson which our Rooseveltian policy should teach even the most incorrigible.

The Commission is Pleased With Itself. The Interstate Commerce Commission's annual report is an expression of its conviction that it has made good, that it has justified the act of those who gave it power and authority to render railway managers more righteous than they are naturally disposed to be. In its satisfaction with itself it is generous enough to admit that there has been a notable readiness on the part of railway managers to accept the new law in good faith. It goes even so far as to admit that these erstwhile offenders, supposed to be lawbreakers by nature as well as by habit, have exhibited "for the most part a sincere and earnest disposition to conform their methods" to the laws of the land.

But the commission feels that there are still powers which it does not hold and which it feels would exercise, perhaps, again, if the facts are not as stated, and in any event they are without present significance.

Finally, the President is in a great state of mind over the preservation of "neutrality" in the case of hospital ships. We wonder whether he knows what the Hague conference ruled in that particular case. But it was almost scrupulously to suppose that he does know.

hearing, declare the rate excessive if it is so fixed, and set it back to the point of reasonableness, but he is without power to forestall the outrage. The report says:

"Under the operation of the Interstate Commerce act the right to initiate rate increases rests entirely with the railway, which may, by giving thirty days notice, put into effect any rate or any regulation or practice affecting a rate which it sees fit. The commission is not required to approve these rates and has no authority whatever to condemn them. It can only act upon a rate so established by the railway in case a formal complaint is filed attacking that rate and after a full hearing. This is the express provision of the statute."

There is an obvious wrong to the community in leaving in the hands of railway managers, despite their present obedience and seeming humility, any shred of right or power to fix rates, and they should be promptly stripped of what still remains to them. If all power over revenue and expenditure could be taken from railway officials and be placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission a serious danger which is noted in this report might be averted. This danger is thus described:

"It may conservatively be stated that the inadequacy of transportation facilities is little less than alarming; that its continuation may place an arbitrary limit upon the future productivity of the land, and that the solution of the difficult financial and physical problems involved is worthy of the most earnest thought and effort of all who believe in the full development of our country and the largest opportunity for its people."

This seems to be a matter of far more serious public concern than any question of extending the scope of the authority of this commission, and of much more importance than the physical valuation of the roads urged in this report. With an ever impending danger that their revenues may be reduced by order of a political commission, the railways are likely to find an increasing difficulty in obtaining the money imperatively needed for the improvement of their facilities. This country has never faced a more serious economic problem than that which appears in the handling of the merchandise which must be moved during the coming years.

It has not yet been shown that railway rates are oppressive or that the profits of railways are unreasonable. Reduction of rates and of profits does not seem to be the proper direction from which to approach the problem of increased facilities.

Let Congress Ascertain the Facts.

It begins to appear that in dealing with the Brownson case the President has exceeded all previous achievements in mismanaging—deliberately perverting—the facts of history. His second letter, of January 4, is a triumph of juggling and only a remarkable as an effectual extinguisher of all truth really bearing on the controversy.

Let us pass over with as little nausea as may be possible the plain intimation that Admiral BROWNSON has been contumacious, actually insubordinate. His letter of resignation, "inadvertently" withheld until the President's fulminations could reach and saturate the public mind, discloses no faintest hint of revolt or disrespect. Finding himself a discordant note in the Roosevelt-Rixey symphony, an obstacle to the harmonious process of naval exaltation, a discovered delinquent who had forfeited the confidence of his chief, he tendered his resignation as the only expedient of deference within his reach.

To accuse him of "disobedience of orders" is extravagantly absurd. What order, we should like to know, could the President or the Secretary issue in the case unless it were an order to the effect that BROWNSON should change his private opinions formed on the basis of more than forty years of faithful service? It was within the President's power to nullify his resignation. He had exercised the same power within a week or two under much more questionable circumstances. BROWNSON could have remained in charge of the Bureau of Navigation without incurring the smallest provocation to a clash. He would not have been called upon to issue orders and thereby lend his countenance to the proposed absurdity. The law requires the Secretary of the Navy to assume responsibility in such matters. BROWNSON might easily have held on, enjoyed his comfortable extra pay, and not once have had to compromise with conscience. He tendered his resignation, therefore, in a spirit of the most obvious respect and courtesy.

As for the President's "arguments" in support of his most mischievous and unfortunate action, they are hardly worthy of serious notice. As we have already shown, his statement that "the hospital ship of the Mississippi [during the civil war] was under command of a fleet surgeon," is utterly inaccurate. His reference to "hospital transports and hospital boats" not only in 1865, but in 1868, goes wide of the mark since those were matters of the army and not the navy. He quotes: "At present two pay officers are serving in naval hospitals under the command of medical officers of the navy," but he does not tell us where those hospitals are or explain the circumstances under which—supposing the story to be true—such conditions have obtained.

Another reference is still more chimerical: "On yet another occasion, but for the vigilance of the medical officer aboard her, the Solace would have carried armed men from New York to Cuba. Her senior medical officer reported the violation of neutrality to the Navy Department and the ship was recalled after passing through the Narrows and the armed men removed."

The line officer commanding the Solace was simply obeying orders from Washington—doing exactly what Mr. ROOSEVELT so unapologetically approves. The armed men were landed by the same authority. Perhaps that vigilant medical officer was unduly exercised. Perhaps, again, the facts are not as stated, and in any event they are without present significance.

Finally, the President is in a great state of mind over the preservation of "neutrality" in the case of hospital ships. We wonder whether he knows what the Hague conference ruled in that particular case. But it was almost scrupulously to suppose that he does know.

honest ignorance is sometimes the most respectful hypothesis.

The really serious question, however, relates to the practical execution of the President's or Dr. RIXEY's order. The hospital ship, now in San Francisco harbor, is to sail under command of Dr. STOKES—so goes the present programme. But how? According to the law, a small thing maybe under the present dispensation, the ship in question must sail, if in command of Dr. STOKES, with a civilian navigator, a civilian crew and no taint of real naval authority anywhere. Where is the financial backing for this enterprise? The rumor from Washington is that there is no money left for experiment, however attractive. Every fund at the disposal of the Government has been looted to the point of last attention. There is a widespread demand for Congressional investigation. The opportunity is here.

Mr. IVINS at the Head of His Profession.

The appointment several days ago of WILLIAM A. SUTHERLAND of Rochester to be counsel to the up-State Public Service Commission at a salary of \$10,000 a year impels the inquiry, "Does the Inquisition business pay; and, if so, whom?" The first glimpse the people of the State had of Mr. SUTHERLAND was in 1891 as the candidate for Attorney-General on the Republican ticket headed by JACOB SLOAT FASSETT of Elmira. SIMON W. ROSENDALE of Albany, Mr. SUTHERLAND's Democratic opponent, won handily by a plurality of 44,980, and ROSWELL P. FLOWER beat Mr. FASSETT for Governor by 47,937. This was the campaign which immediately followed the work of the Fassetts Inquisition Committee, of which WILLIAM M. IVINS, now counsel for the New York City Public Service Commission, was chief counsel. The Fassetts Inquisition of 1890 was expected to furnish the Republicans with ammunition in the shape of Tammany corruption for the State campaign of 1891. The smashing defeat of FASSETT and SUTHERLAND and the entire Republican ticket proved the futility of the experiment.

Mr. W. M. IVINS, however, suffered no pecuniary loss, although perhaps his dove-like gentleness and patience were tried for a time by hope deferred. He made out his bill neatly and in detail in the name of the firm of which he was then a member for services as counsel to the Fassetts committee. The bill was for \$22,882.72, but while the services for which it called for payment were performed in 1890 it was not paid until June 13, 1898. The explanation for the delay in presenting the bill is that Mr. IVINS was too experienced a claimant to ask a Democratic Legislature at Albany to pass upon a bill for services performed in attacking a Democratic community like New York City. On June 12, 1898, Mr. FASSETT, as chairman of the committee of five years before, approved Schedule B, for disbursements, for \$22,882.72. It was in the name of IVINS & BOARDMAN, and enumerated the incidental disbursements. Here are some of the items which made that total of \$22,882.72:

- Carfare to Twenty-third street, 10 cents. Carfare to Houston street, 10 cents. Two copies City Record, 10 cents. Copies City Record, 10 cents. Carfare Ludlow Street Jail, 20 cents. Carfare to Ludlow Street Jail, 10 cents. Newspapers, 15 cents. Carfare, Franklin street, 5 cents. Carfare, 10 cents. Carfare, 25 cents. Carfare to Clinton place and Mayor GRANT'S, 30 cents. Newspapers and postage, 30 cents. Carfare, 14 cents. Carfare, 20 cents. Messenger to Court House, 25 cents. Messenger to Ninth street, 45 cents. Daily newspapers, 35 cents. Two papers, 5 cents. Four copies Herald, 12 cents. Newspapers, daily and evening, 42 cents. Carfare, 10 cents. Messenger to Mayor GRANT, 30 cents. Expressage, 25 cents. Expressage to Albany, 25 cents. Expressage, 35 cents. Expenses office, evening work, 30 cents. Expressage, 30 cents. Stenographer, letter, 25 cents. Expenses, investigation of Excise Board and licensed places, \$100. Carfare, Police Headquarters, 30 cents. Carfare, Police Headquarters, 10 cents. Carfare, Twenty-second street station, 10 cents. Carfare, Court House, 10 cents. Carfare, Police Headquarters, 30 cents. Carfare to Board of Excise, 10 cents. Copies Herald and Excise, 30 cents. Stenographer, letter to J. CHAPIN, 30 cents. Stenographer, letter and memo., 15 cents. Copies World, Tribune, Post, 33 cents. Carfare, 30 cents. Carfare, 10 cents. Carfare, 10 cents. Carfare, 10 cents. Telegram to Mayor of Jamestown, 25 cents. Time, 25 cents. Telegram to Mr. SHER, 25 cents.

But why continue to wade through scores on scores of these personal disbursements, petty in detail, portentous in the aggregate? The record of Mr. IVINS's negotiations, to insist that the plan he has fallen in pleasant places, yet even at fifty odd thousand a year he doesn't put the dollar above the man. His job pays better and is less confining than the one which he has sought so long. Why is he off and on the country in better off. Nobody can grudge Mr. BRYAN that fat property which his devotion to calamity has earned.

A citizen of Washington called the other day upon Representative WILLIAM GREENE of Massachusetts, who is one of the most obliging men in Congress, and asked him to put a stop to the crowing early in the morning, because it murdered sleep. Mr. GREENE asked his visitor if there was any law upon the subject. There was, said the sleepless one, but the courts had declared it unconstitutional. Mr. GREENE saw his opportunity and seized it.

"I replied that he had come to the wrong man who he came to me. I never entered into competition with the courts. When they decide that a thing is unconstitutional, I never try to prove to them that it is not so. I also said that I was of the committee of the District of Columbia, which might try to discover a way to beat around the Constitution a little, and so could not help him much."

Meantime, in 1894, Mr. SUTHERLAND was appointed counsel to the Lexow Inquisition, but retired to second place as associate counsel, JOHN W. GOFF becoming Grand Inquisitor. Was it the honey-

comb of the Democracy by the revelations of the contested election cases in 1891-92, supplemented by the nomination in 1893 of ISAAC H. MAYNARD for the Court of Appeals, one of the chief actors in the contested election litigation, which led to the overwhelming defeat of the Democratic State ticket in 1894 and the election of WILLIAM L. STRONG as Mayor of New York City? Were the more potent factors in producing those results, the aforesaid furor over the contested election cases or the Lexowing of the city by Mr. GOFF immaterially aided by Mr. SUTHERLAND? Mr. GOFF was elected Recorder of the city as his personal reward, and when the Recordership was abolished Mr. GOFF was elected to the bench of the Supreme Court in New York county.

Mr. IVINS remained in comparative retirement as a professional Inquisitor until 1905, when the Republicans of the city, being in the last ditch for a candidate for Mayor, easily persuaded him to accept what thirty-one fellow Republicans of his had peremptorily refused. Mr. IVINS was one of the worst beaten candidates for Mayor of the city in the annals of the Republican party. As its official capital, therefore, of what value were Mr. IVINS's legal services to the Fassetts committee and to the Brooklyn strike Assembly committee?

On April 2, 1906, Mr. IVINS was selected as counsel to the special committee of the Board of Aldermen appointed to investigate the Street Cleaning Department, of which Major WOODBURY was the honored and efficient chief. Three names were considered at a meeting held by the committee at the City Hall. Mr. IVINS was put forward as a Republican, PETER R. GARTINS as a Municipal Ownership Leaguer and JAMES W. OSBORNE as a Democrat.

Ultimately the appointment of Mr. IVINS was decided on unanimously. One of the members of the committee said that Mr. IVINS had promised to serve without pay if the Corporation Counsel should refuse to designate him. Indeed, according to Alderman IVINS, Mr. IVINS promised to pay the whole expense of the inquiry out of his own pocket should the Board of Estimate refuse to make the appropriation. When JOHN J. DELANEY, then Corporation Counsel, was notified of the selection of Mr. IVINS he immediately designated him as special counsel to the committee.

In December, 1906, the Aldermen had a spat over a resolution which the Republican members sought to put through allowing to Mr. IVINS a fee of \$12,500 as counsel to the committee which "investigated" Major WOODBURY in the preceding April. The "investigation" was a fiasco, and Little TIM SULLIVAN, chairman of the board, said at the time that he didn't see where the value of Mr. IVINS's services came in. Alderman DOWLING, who was a member of the investigating committee, put it more strongly when he declared:

"The bill is too high. We sat for twenty days listening to a lot of rubbish, but that was about all. The bills and grays are exceedingly grateful to the eye. Note the lace with old gold tones in the gown of the Madame Hanako, the Japanese actress, in the key of old Japan. It is very decorative. More conventional, though the performance of a virtuoso, is the rendering of a scene in the portrait of 'Madame C.' The still life must have pleased the painter's master. Its color scheme is warmer than the generality of the canvases. Ullman evidently prefers sombre tones."

The matter was finally made a special order for the next meeting of the board. Outside the \$12,500 for Mr. IVINS the investigation cost \$16,000. Finally, on February 19, 1907, the Aldermen authorized an issue of \$12,500 special revenue bonds to pay Mr. IVINS for acting as counsel to the committee of the board which made the "investigation" of the Street Cleaning Department. Several members objected to the size of the fee, saying that the investigation had amounted to nothing.

Now, with Mr. IVINS as a \$15,000 a year counsel to the New York City Public Service Commission, and after six months of scandal mongering not a practical step taken to benefit the millions of transit patrons, and with Mr. SUTHERLAND as the \$10,000 a year counsel for the up-State Commission, does the business of profession of Inquisition seem likely to pay anybody but the professional Inquisitors themselves?

The members of that famous literary body the Gridiron Club of Washington have the keen sense of the vituperative volage of a quart of sauterne into which a quart of champagne is strenuously precipitated.

Mr. BRYAN made this admission at Omaha: "I know that some people are giving much thought to the matter, but that is not worrying me much. The people of this country have made it possible for me to acquire an independent income for all time to come, so I have no worry on that score."

What worries Mr. BRYAN is that some men are richer than he and have got their money out of some other business than lecturing, although even this profitable profession is exploited by selfish "syndicates." And Mr. BRYAN's best friend for the "common people" is that, in the people who haven't an independent income, his eyes have fallen in pleasant places, yet even at fifty odd thousand a year he doesn't put the dollar above the man. His job pays better and is less confining than the one which he has sought so long. Why is he off and on the country in better off. Nobody can grudge Mr. BRYAN that fat property which his devotion to calamity has earned.

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The following quotation from the "Memoirs" of Napoleon is in the opinion of that great military leader:

"Any General in chief who consents to carry out a plan which he believes to be bad and injurious is criminal. He ought to make himself a martyr, to insist that the plan be changed, as a last resort to resign rather than be the instrument of harm to those under his charge."—READER.

Not to Be Dropped. To the EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Admiral Brownson's conduct being stigmatized as "childish, unseemly and improper," it is now officially announced that "the Administration does not see any necessity for pursuing the subject further."

But perhaps the country will. It is to be hoped so. K. T. W. NEW YORK, January 8.

The Threatened Addition. New terms will soon be added. To crossing the ocean blue. A liner is planned to carry. A sailor and modiste love. Imagine a husband's feelings. When told by his spouse so fair. Just two hours out on the voyage. She has a rag to wear. Imagine the fit of trousers. When the ship rolls and pitches. And appetite says you nay. With never a place to lodge in. Just fancy the greatest ill. Alone on the vasty ocean. Alike with a tailor's bill. McCLANDERSON WILCOX.

AROUND THE GALLERIES.

Max Weyl, a well known artist from Washington, D. C., is showing thirty-three of his landscapes at the Bauer-Folsom Galleries, 302 Fifth avenue, opposite Tiffany's. This painter is a veteran of seventy years, whose "Indian Summer Day" was recently presented to the National Gallery by a group of art lovers in the capital. He is a Wurtemburger by birth, in vigorous health, who has resided in America since 1858. A sympathetic portrayal of American landscape is the chief feature of his mood. There is delicacy in his brush work. He is fond of autumnal tints, woods, vast lonely moorlands and the edge of pools. His "Indian Summer" hangs in the Bauer-Folsom Gallery—a well lighted room—and deserves the praise it has won. The "Narrow Observatory Ground" is a canvas which reveals a deep feeling for tonalities and its neighbor across the wall has some of the silvery quality in its sky not unlike a Casini. It depicts some marshes near the Potomac. "October Days," "Forest in the Sapphoro Country, North Carolina," and "Forest in Cape Cod, Gloucester, Mass.," are well worth looking at. Mr. Weyl is a Schwedermack, though never morbid; a man given to poetic reveries and the charm of fading days and moonlit nights. The exhibition lasts until January 25.

At the Lotus Club there is an exhibition of the artist members of the club. Paul Dougherty, Carroll Beckwith, John Dessar, Art Leamer, Snell, Charles M. Dewey, Henry W. Ranger, Carleton Wiggins, William H. Howe, Louis Leob, Bruce Crane, Irving R. Wiles, Van Boskerck, Leonard Ochman, Charles Warren Eaton, Clifford Seal, W. Gedney Bunch, G. H. Bogert and others are to be seen at their best. Henry Wolf, the wood engraver, has on view several of his beautiful proofs: "Miss Alexander," after Whistler, and half a dozen others.

There is a joint exhibition of paintings, statuettes and medallions at the galleries of Finkel and Schwartz, 312 Fifth avenue, between Thirty-first and Thirty-second streets, which is to last until January 18. The pictures, among them several portraits, are by Eugene Paul Ullman, the bronzes by Dr. R. Tait McKenzie. Mr. Ullman studied under William R. Chase. He is a member of the Chautauque League, perceptible in his work is but to pay him a compliment. But he is also Ullman, the portrait of Mr. Chase by Mr. Ullman, acquired by the French Government some time ago, is a happy confluence of a sympathetic interpreter and a capital subject. We are sorry that this virtuous presentment of a virile artist is not in the hands of a more splash to attract attention to himself. How better could he do it than to about for Roosevelt? He shouted:

The favor of the mob is proverbially fickle. The mutable many can be easily swayed. The psychology of popularity no one knows, but the witness with which the crowd swings from the pole of like to that of dislike is as old as time. The American people are a volatile people, and their heroes of the morning have not infrequently been their villains of the night. Not one, but many things combined to give Mr. Roosevelt popularity. The belief that he was fishing for the nomination was perhaps the greatest, but there were others. When the first time the great public refused to give him a "thumbs up" he did it the second time it was questioned; when he did it the third time the judicious grieved; when he did it for the fourth time the people wished the President would exercise greater restraint. When he first began his crusade against "the criminal ring" the virtuous poor and the honest middle class were strengthened, and they were filled with hope. The people were with him because they believed some good would result; but nothing came but disturbance and distress. The difference between a rebel and a patriot is merely the difference between failure and success—the hangman or the founder of a dynasty. Mr. Roosevelt's policy was to establish order, but it was necessary for his own fame that he should triumph. He has not. That assertion cannot be denied. The great wave of moral reform, the great wave of the public and flung itself on the breakwaters of capitalistic greed, which it left untended. It spent itself in wrecking some of the great monuments of the past, which its fury was directed were unharmed.

There is no need to question Mr. Roosevelt's motives; to him may be attributed motives magnificent in their idealism. Put the world care more for the practical than for the ideal. His idealism has produced nothing; he is one of the unsuccessful rebels of history. Nor would it be fair to attribute to him the responsibility of the present state of affairs. But with a result as disastrous as this, he had carefully planned it, his crusade shook confidence and made capital timid. Foreign investors became frightened. Long ago pointed out the danger that the President was inviting, and warned the readers of the Morning Post to be prepared for what has happened. It was folly for Englishmen to put their money into a country that might be ruined overnight by a monstrous line. When the President of the United States proclaimed the dishonour of the managers of great enterprises, it was only a matter of time before Europe would believe him and hasten to bid itself of its American investments.

With the unthinking the President was still extremely popular, with the thinking class he was regarded as a man of straw. His office would not be inimical to the best interests of the country. A week ago the Republican national committee met here, and among the speakers was some one who was managing men of the party were opposed to Mr. Roosevelt. This fact clearly established, two courses were open to him: he could appeal from the platform to the people—once more he could raise the standard of revolt, or he could admit defeat and abandon the contest. Public opinion here was in favor of the latter course. A year ago he might successfully have gone to the people, but that time is not now. Seeing the futility of fighting when victory was impossible, he has chosen the latter course, last night, eliminating himself as a future Presidential possibility.

But now comes a more interesting question. Does the cause of "reform" thus ingloriously abandoned? A little more than a year hence Mr. Roosevelt will leave the White House, a private citizen. Will his successor be a reformer or a reactionary? As the President terms those who are in opposition to his policy "reactionaries," it is not surprising that there be nothing to show for seven years of much bitterness and excitement and many thousand spoken and written words? Will reform be a by-word, or will something come of it, although Mr. Roosevelt no longer is its high priest? It would be absurd to pose as a prophet and anticipate the future, because the future has such a malignantly inconvenient way of knocking the prophets down when they found their prophecies, especially when they attempt to solve the riddle of American politics, but it is not presumptuous to draw conclusions from past events. It is reasonably plain that the pendulum of popular opinion that swung very far in one direction during the last few years is now slowly swinging back to its normal position, and that equilibrium. That law no force can oppose. The people have followed Mr. Roosevelt very far, always hoping to reach the beyond, but as a leader he has not been able to give them the morsels of discontent and uncertainty.

Mr. Roosevelt is a man of action, but not of achievement. That is his misfortune. He has been extremely active; strenuous, the word he has delighted in, expressing his character admirably; but the strenuous man, the man who delights in doing things with a great noise so that all the world shall know what he is doing, does not always accomplish. In fact he is the man who usually accomplishes least. No living man can be correctly judged by his contemporaries, and it is only

A BROKEN IDOL.

Fish Truths About Mr. Roosevelt Told by a Friendly Observer. From the London Morning Post. WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—It may come as a shock to a great many of Mr. Roosevelt's admirers in England to be told that for a year past there has been a well founded belief that he regretted extremely his somewhat hasty declaration on the night of election that he would not remain a candidate, and that he has been willing to accept the nomination if it should be offered to him. It will perhaps be a greater shock to them to be told that many people were fully convinced that Mr. Roosevelt was endeavoring to manipulate public sentiment so as to force his nomination. In a word, the sincerity of Mr. Roosevelt's motives was questioned, and it is that which robbed him of much of his influence. I do not impugn Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity. I do not question his motives, nor do I know whether public opinion does him an injustice, because it is not possible for any man to look into another man's heart. I merely state a very widespread belief.

Mr. Roosevelt, then, was in that position where he had solemnly and in the most explicit language declared that he could not under any circumstances again be a candidate, and yet he was believed to be anxious to be a candidate, and that he was in fact a man whose support and weakened his influence it still left him in a commanding position with Lincoln's "common people," who believed in him, who were not only not opposed to Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had the courage openly to oppose Mr. Roosevelt's strength with the people is not to be underestimated: until a few months ago I believe it would be quite correct to say that no American would so completely hold the affections of the people as Mr. Roosevelt. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the clamor, much of the adulation, a large part of the ever swelling chorus of praise with which the newspapers have been filled for the last few years came not from the common people but from the politicians, the men who disliked Mr. Roosevelt, but burning with impatience, again to follow him. The "common people" were, the politicians were not, although few of them had