

effectively fight reactionaries there must be a leader who is not compelled to get his ideas of democracy from a party platform. While a perfunctory democrat is to be preferred to a reactionary, that is not the kind of democracy which usually gains victories. Sullivan's nomination was assured the moment it became known that there was no better hope for the opposition than concentration on Stringer's candidacy. However, since there was no vigorous democrat to take the nomination it is well that the final contest will be between an avowed reactionary and so advanced a democrat as Raymond Robins. Had Stringer been nominated, some democrats would have felt bound to support him, and the democratic vote would have been divided. There is no need to feel such an obligation now. Robins is clearly entitled to the vote and energetic support of every democrat in Illinois.

S. D.



### WHEN THE PRIMARIES FAIL.

Getting the right men elected depends on two things. There must be enough people to want these men and they must want it hard enough to busy themselves about it.

When nobody cares very much, the professional politicians will nominate the men they prefer and the public can either vote for them or stay home and let them be elected by default. That situation developed so many objectionable results that the people went to work in many States and had primary election laws passed.

In nearly as many cases they have been disappointed. The same men who were busy under the old system busied themselves at the primaries. The discontented public found itself confronted by the choice of accepting the candidates offered by the politicians, voting for self-seekers whom nobody wanted, or staying home and letting it go by default.

As an attempt to eliminate the politician, the primary is a failure. The politician is the man who attends to political duties. He cannot be retired by men who do not attend to political duties. The machine is an agency for collecting the available strength of any political group. It can be overcome only by opposing it with an organization equally effective or by a force of numbers vastly superior. Upheavals sometimes come which carry everything before them, but ordinarily the only way to get action in politics is by political action. The non-political brand of politics never has been a success and never will be for any length of time.

Under any system the people can get anything they want any time they want it bad enough.

Under the primary system, it is easier to get what the people want, or rather it is harder to thwart the well-defined will of the public. But the primary is no automatic device for registering the unconscious desires of the public.

The best engine in the world won't run till the steam is turned on. Primaries or any other popular machinery won't work unless the people supply the necessary energy.

Unceasing effort is the price of political progress.

JOHN S. PARDEE.



### MAKING HISTORY.

Of all stock phrases used as conversational currency by the majority of mankind, the above is the most pernicious, and the most mendacious. We are hearing it constantly just now. Whenever there are wars and rumors of war, and the daily papers bristle with scareheads that fairly drip gore, the good citizen takes another hearty drink of his morning coffee, leans back in his chair and remarks unctuously—as if he really enjoyed it—“Ah, we are making history now—in great chunks.”

Were this point of view not so pernicious, one could laugh at it because it is so ridiculous. It's true, the average good citizen, belonging to the great mass of those who think in phrases they have heard, has an excuse for it. In his youth, he was probably, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, taught history only by dates of battles and names of kings. The different periods of civilization's development were marked for him by wholesale slaughter on some battlefield, or by the life story of some swash-buckling King Tiger, or some mildly innocuous King Log. Small wonder then, that this average citizen does not understand that he and the hundreds of thousands like him do a great deal more to “make history” than do the sanguinary encounters or the pompous coronations or funerals he so much admires in the movies. We do not make history by killing men but by making it possible for them to live more human lives. History, any dictionary tells us, is a record of the development of the human race. Development implies constructive effort, and so does the verb to make. It means to construct, to build up. Wars and battles, and very frequently the monarchical principle and its representatives, are the destructive forces of society. Civilization has developed in spite of them, not because of them. Destruction can never mean development, it is always the force which interferes with development. Therefore a record of the destructive moments in civilization's course cannot be making