

not yet been declared. It is possible that it may not be. What can those who yet see, do to open the eyes of those who are blinded by passion? President Wilson stands for peace, and for the justice that can come only through peace. He may have made mistakes in his treatment of the Mexican problem, and his policies may not have been the best, but there can be no question that he has kept ever in mind the fact that Mexicans are our brother men, and that we can do more for each other as friends than we can as enemies. Nor is there any doubt that he still holds to this high ideal. But he has ventured upon a policy fraught with the gravest dangers. Powerful interests are more eager than ever to force his hand; and a war-mad people, backed by an echoing press, clamors to enter the shambles. It is the duty of every man and woman who has at heart, not alone the immediate victims of war, but those infinitely larger numbers who suffer in after days from the blight of war, to throw every ounce of weight into the scales for peace. s. c.



Etiquette and War.

A Chinaman of the old school sees an insurmountable objection to a railroad in the fact that building of it will disturb the grave of some ancestor. Some Americans who see the absurdity of that position adhere to a similar absurdity. They hold the refusal of a Mexican official to salute the American flag to be an insurmountable objection to peace. They can no more comprehend how such a refusal may "with honor" be ignored than the Chinaman can understand of what little importance is his ancestor's grave. Because of the obsession which so greatly magnifies the importance of a rule of naval etiquette, the nation has been driven to the position of threatening or of actually beginning war on Mexico. Never again let us treat with contempt the most ridiculous superstitious rite of the most ignorant savage tribe.



It may be asked, "What should have been done?" We were insulted and defied. The apology actually tendered was insufficient. Moreover it was not the first time such disrespect has been shown us." Well, a sensible man will bear in mind the words of the poet Cowper: "No gentleman will insult me. No other can." It is true that Cowper's wisdom is still too deep for most so-called statesmen of this and other countries to grasp. But we should not wait for these to realize the absurdity of some customs of the dark ages in order to adhere to a policy of peace. We should

not be influenced by unintelligent foreign jibes and sneers. If back-number statesmen and publicists of other countries consider self restraint a sign of weakness, then the reflection is on them, not on us. So the incident at Tampico should have been treated by the nation as a sensible individual would treat an insult that had not really injured him. It should have accepted the apology offered, while the Admiral misled by a back-number education into insisting on a certain ceremony, should have been instructed to give common-sense the preference over mediaeval tradition. Surely a question of etiquette may no longer be considered justification for an aggressive war. s. d.



No Time to Pass Army Bills.

A period of war excitement is always taken advantage of by selfish seekers to gain some sinister object. The feeling concerning Mexico is now being used to push to adoption the Hay bill, the object of which is to practically increase the standing army. Those back of the measure clearly feel that calm discussion of the bill, when the war fever will have subsided, will show it to be unfit for adoption. So it has been kept in committee for months waiting a favorable opportunity when any attempt to check it can be howled down. Evidently the present is considered just such a time. That is the very reason why it should not be passed now. If the bill has merit it can stand being subjected to discussion when there is no war spirit abounding. If it can not stand such discussion, it should not be passed at all. In either case action on it should be delayed. To force it to passage now is to confess that it will not bear calm inspection. s. d.



Geographical Politics.

Of all the absurd possibilities of the protective spirit it is doubtful if any surpass its application to political representation. Avowedly for the benefit of the voters—as the tariff is for the protection of labor—it is in reality maintained in the interests of machine politics, and those businesses that make use of machine politics. Aldermen must be elected from arbitrarily prescribed wards, and Congressmen must represent districts laid out every ten years by the party that happens to be in control of the Federal government after the taking of the census. The scandal attaching to these gerrymanders is the least objection to the system. An absolutely honest apportionment, that is, one that allotted to each district the proportion of voters in each party that the party bore to the total

vote of the state, would throw the whole congressional delegation into the hands of the party that had a majority in the State. Under such a system Missouri and Kentucky would have no Republican Congressmen, while Massachusetts and Pennsylvania would have no Democrats.



Arbitrarily formed wards and districts make for small politics. Should several men exceptionally qualified for public service happen to live in the same ward, but one—or at most, two—can be used. Should a congressional district have no man of proper qualifications in a certain party, though that party had the very best of men in another district, they would be unavailable. This produces an effect on politics similar to that of a protective tariff on manufacturing. By preventing the voters from choosing as their representative whomever they please, no matter what his place of residence, the minority parties are rendered helpless, and the majority party, being practically certain of the election, quickly falls a prey to the machinations of the political machine. All the voters fall into a state of indifference, those in the minority because it is useless to contest, and those of the majority because it is unnecessary.



So ingrown is this geographical notion that men seek to apply the idea even where the law has failed to prescribe it. A good illustration is found in the Illinois Senatorial contest, where the cry is raised by some of the aspirants, that we must have a "down state" candidate. The hold-over Senator is from Chicago; and Mr. Sullivan who seeks the honor of misrepresenting the State also lives in Chicago. Hence, the "down state" anti-Sullivan candidates are making much of this feature. Not that they would go too far "down state," but just far enough to take in whatever candidate is raising the issue. But it so happens that the strongest and ablest of the candidates opposed to Mr. Sullivan, John Z. White, also lives in Chicago; and it may be suspected that a part at least of the "down state" cry has been raised for the purpose of inducing the voters to choose their Senator on geographical, instead of political grounds.



Why will men be so utterly irrational? In no other calling is such an idea applied. If one has need of the services of a physician, an engineer, an artists, or expert service in any line, the question of residence is not raised. The best available

is sought. But in politics an exception is made. No matter what a man's qualifications, he is unavailable unless he lies in a certain prescribed district. He may tower above local men as a giant above pigmies, but the law restrains the choice to the pigmies. And where the law has not yet laid down the geographical limitations, men are seeking to apply an unwritten law. Congressmen and Senators are supposed to legislate for the nation, and not for a specified number of square miles of territory; and they should stand for ideas and policies, not for postoffices and Federal marshalships. One of the reasons why the office-hunting disease has so little hold in English politics is that few members of Parliament reside in the district that elects them. It may be impracticable at present to disregard State lines in choosing Representatives, but there is no reason at all why Representatives should not be elected from the state at large, by means of proportional representation; while the Senators should be chosen from among the ablest men, regardless of their place of residence.



The objection to Roger C. Sullivan is not that he happens to live in Chicago, but that he represents machine politics and special privileged business. He would be just as objectionable from a democratic point of view if he resided in Cairo, or at any point between the northern and southern limits of the State. And the fact that John Z. White lives in Chicago is no objection to him. No man in this country, search it as you will, is better qualified to serve in the United States Senate. He is unsurpassed in intellectual power, his understanding and grasp of the new economy is complete, and he has the force and character that carry weight in a public assembly. Illinois has been humiliated as few States have; let us have one Senator of whom we are not ashamed. s. c.



True Democratic Doctrine.

Senator Gore in obtaining the views of delegates to the last Democratic national convention concerning toll exemptions received a true democratic response from Robert F. Devine of Erie, Pa., national Democratic committeeman from that district. Mr. Devine quotes the golden rule as the principle to which all platforms must conform to be considered democratic and then says:

If there be planks in the platform of the Baltimore convention that do not belong there, that do not bear inspection under the light of pure democracy, draw the spikes and pull them out, even though in doing so you make an ugly noise. Put in a plank, or better still, close the gap by shortening the plat-