

Take, for instance, two events of the past week which are in highly significant juxtaposition: the idle girl of New York with her golden stockings, and the hungry women of London driving their wretchedly-paid bread winners back with spurs of affection into yielding to privileged greed. What have you to say, you good folks who love pious ceremonials, and you other good folks who despise them—what have you to say of all such wanton waste by idlers in the midst of this dreadful want among workers? Not about the girl; that Miss Kilmansegg's stockings are none of your business. Nor about anybody else's personal expenditures of which hers may be typical. But about the laws and institutions which make such unfair, unrighteous and unjust contrasts possible in a society that takes its life in part from you. What have you to say about perpetuating those laws and institutions?



The Bluster for Battleships.

In no other respect has the majority of the Democratic caucus in the lower house of Congress served the country better than by calling a halt upon the insane notion that this nation must produce battleships as a hen must lay eggs—so many so often. This battleship craze, so far as it really has any place in public opinion anywhere, is prompted and promoted by battleship builders. Take away contractors' profits and the profits of financiers in connection with the annual output of battleships, and there would soon be little demand for them, either in this country or any other.



The American Electoral College.

When Archbishop Platon of the Russian church in North America was reported from Russia as explaining politics in the United States, an American newspaper correspondent at St. Petersburg got him nearer right as matter of actual practice than he had probably spoken with reference to Constitutional theory. "In America," said the Russian prelate, as reported, "the nation does not elect the President; that is done for it by the vast business interests which have important affairs at stake."



Panama Pettifogging.

The latest international lawyers to pettifog for the giving of another valuable privilege to the owners of American railway terminals by exempting American ships from Panama Canal tolls, raises the point that when the United States ac-

quired sovereign rights in the Canal Zone the Canal-treaty became voidable. If this point depended entirely upon general principles of international law, the shameless proposal would be bad enough. But the Chicago Record Herald reduces it to the level of police court tactics by quoting from the treaty an explicit clause to the effect that no change of territorial sovereignty or of international relations of the country or countries traversed by the canal shall affect the obligation of the high contracting parties under the treaty.



La Follette on Roosevelt.

It would be wise for Mr. Roosevelt's followers to reflect upon Senator La Follette's warning. No one can doubt La Follette's genuineness; no one can dispute it without reflecting on his own. If La Follette be personally ambitious, he at any rate keeps his personal ambition under control, or else most expertly concealed. Roosevelt does neither with his. Roosevelt is doubtless the greater Nimrod, but this is not the time for Nimrods in American politics. The men whose patriotic impulses he is stalking now would do well for their cause, which is not Roosevelt's but is La Follette's, to listen attentively to this much at least of what La Follette has to say about the object of their curious idolatry and the thrilling dime-novel adventure he is inviting them into:

While special interests have been increasing their hold upon the administrative side of the government at Washington, progressive Republicans in many stanch Republican States have wrested the control of government from these interests and have enacted statutes restoring representative government to the people of those States. . . . The contest in many of these States was severe and protracted. Defeat was encountered again and again. While Roosevelt was President he offered no encouragement to the progressive Republicans who were struggling with the old machine bosses to enact direct primaries and other progressive statutes. His influence was openly on the side of the reactionaries. His appointees were the most active agents of the opposition. In Wisconsin Federal officeholders were lobby agents for the corporations and spent their time almost wholly at the State capital during legislative sessions. I am somewhat acquainted with the conditions which prevailed in northern and western States, where I spoke year after year in support of the effort to establish progressive Republican government, and I know that the same opposition was encountered in most of those States. Until little more than one year ago Roosevelt had not even expressed himself as friendly to what had become—while he was in Africa—so widely known as the progressive Republican movement. Not until about five months ago did he make his so-called declaration of principles. Shortly thereafter he abandoned any attempt to discuss his

"principles." Ignoring issues, he lured the President into a campaign so bitterly personal that by the time of the Chicago convention the frenzy and passion aroused subordinated everything to a fierce scramble to seat delegates and secure the nomination. And upon this mad squabble for office between two men under whose administrations the Republican party had made the trust, tariff and special interest records for which it is most severely criticised, it is proposed to destroy a sound and vital progressive movement, which had already gone far to nationalize itself within a great and powerful organization. . . . A political party is not made to order. It is the slow development of powerful forces working in our social life. Sound ideas seize upon the human mind. Opinions ripen into fixed convictions. Masses of men are drawn together by common belief and organized about clearly defined principles. . . . But what abject folly to seek upon such a basis to destroy a great political party 7,000,000 strong, with a clear progressive majority in its ranks, within which there has been bullded up a progressive movement that promises to make the Republican party the instrument through which government shall be completely restored to the people. I would in no degree disparage the good work of the progressive Democrats. Encouraged by Bryan's support of progressive principles, many Democrats in Wisconsin and other States abandoned their party on State issues and supported the Republican progressive programme. And it was Bryan's superb leadership and courage at Baltimore which nominated a candidate for the Presidency who has made a progressive record as Governor of New Jersey. I repeat—and in no partisan spirit—that the progressive movement began within the Republican party. It rapidly advanced its control, shaping policies of State administrations and stamping its impress upon national legislation as a distinctly progressive Republican movement. And upon this fact in recent political history I appeal to progressive Republicans everywhere to maintain their organization within the Republican party. To maintain such organization blind allegiance to every party nomination and to every party declaration is not essential. . . . It seems to me that the highest obligation of real progressive Republicans in every State is to maintain their organization and continue to fight within the lines of the Republican party for progressive principles, policies and candidates. No aid or encouragement should be given to a third party plan to divide the progressive vote and destroy the progressive Republican movement. No break should be permitted in the progressive ranks which will endanger the election of any true progressive Republican anywhere. Every effort should be put forth to increase the number of thoroughgoing progressive Republicans in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Progressive Republicans never had a higher call to greater service.



British Labor Leaders in Politics.

The comments of Labor Party leaders in Great Britain upon the issue sustained at the Hanley by-election by Mr. Outhwaite, which Mr. Garrison

quotes in our Editorial Correspondence this week, are on a par with some Labor Party policies at by-elections of seeking to obstruct progressiveness in the Liberal party. It is regrettable that Labor Party leaders like Macdonald and Hardie are as blinded by partisanship as they appear to be from their language as Mr. Garrison quotes them, and from their speeches as reported in local papers. To Mr. Macdonald the taxation of land values does not seem to touch what he calls unearned increment derived from capital; to Mr. Hardie it is a red herring across the trail. If the taxation of land values really means no more to those Labor leaders, explanation would be futile so far as they are concerned, and men like Mr. Outhwaite may have found it so. But it can hardly be that all the Labor leaders of Great Britain are as oblivious to the fact that when you strike down land monopoly you dislodge capital monopoly. On the point that the Liberals invaded a Labor constituency at the Hanley election, the poll tells the story better than any assertions or arguments from partisan leaders on either side. The radical Liberal candidate at Hanley, whom Labor leaders opposed with vigorous unreason as a Singletaxer, and who carried the constituency at the election by a majority of 654 over the Tory, polled in all 6,647 votes, whereas the Labor Party candidate polled only 1,694. To call that a Labor Party constituency is to trifle with figures if not with words.



THE PARCEL POST.

Now that the parcel post has been brought to an issue by the bill introduced by Senator Bourne, with the endorsement of Postmaster General Hitchcock, one can but wonder at the vast amount of effort required to secure such a needed utility. We have as a nation become very conservative. It is no longer a question of America leading the world, but of limping along at the tail end of the procession. Spain alone of the European countries has kept us company. And of late months it has been a matter of speculation as to whether or not the youngest republic in Asia would not have a parcel post before the oldest republic in America.

In seeking the cause of our tardiness in establishing this postal service, one is again impressed with the truth that it is not the tyrant that oppresses the people, but the ignorance and cupidity of the people themselves. Though the express companies have opposed this reform, and for years have maintained a lobby in Washington, the effective sum and substance of their opposition has