

ministers was the problem, now it is the intentions of the allied powers.

To the astonishment of the world, Russia has proposed withdrawing from China. So ostentatiously gracious a proposition from such a source naturally excites suspicion; and the fact that Russia has been waging a successful little war all by herself in the Manchurian provinces of China seems to account for her willingness to join the other powers in withdrawing from the more southerly regions of the empire. With Manchuria secured, Russia might find it to her advantage to delay further encroachments until she could do so without confederates. Yet the fact must not be ignored that there are two Russias, just as there are two Englands, two Germanys, two Americas, and so on; that is, that in Russia as in other countries the imperialists do not have it all their own way. Though Russia is not so far advanced in democracy as other countries, democratic influences are at work there as well as elsewhere, and they reach far up. They have certainly affected the royal family in some respects more than once, and the present tsar most assuredly has no love for war. His instincts are for peace. It may be, then, that the proffer of Russia to withdraw from China is a genuine expression of democratic influences in that imperial country. And there is some indication of this in the assurances she makes of her willingness to withdraw not only from all China, but also from Manchuria.

Russia's proposition has been approved by the United States, under the influence doubtless of the anti-imperial sentiment which is manifesting itself so strongly as the presidential election approaches. In harmony with the Philippine policy, American arms should stay in China, whether Russia wishes to withdraw or not, until a stable government is established there with no more autonomy than we think the Chinese capable of appreciating. But the election approaches, and that operates as a check upon new ventures in imperialism.

There is, however, no indication of an actual movement to withdraw from China. The ministers are safe. It is now known that they need never have been in danger. But the flags have gone up, and some of the allies have no hesitation in asserting the imperial principle that when their flag goes up it must not be hauled down. No one can predict the outcome. The most probable guess would be a world war. Meanwhile, reports of the most atrocious acts of barbaric cruelty perpetrated upon Chinese peasants by the civilizing forces that have invaded the empire, begin to leak through the censor's sieve.

In reporting, at page 314, the action of the International Typographical union upon the resolution offered by Robert Bandlow, of Cleveland, and described in the report as a socialist resolution, we copied so much of the resolution as we used from the news report in the Chicago Record. We are now authoritatively advised that the one actually presented and acted upon was entirely different from that which we fell into the error of using. It was in these words:

Resolved, That the International Typographical union emphasizes that it is distinctly a class organization, embracing in its membership all workers following the kindred crafts in the printing industry, who upon the industrial field are antagonized by their employes on every occasion, which fact should impress the members of this organization that to subserve their interests as wage-workers it is essential that they act as a unit upon the political field from whence capitalism derives its power to oppress, and we declare it consistent with the ethics of unionism and the sacred duty of every honorable member of this union to sever his or her affiliation with all political parties of the exploiting class which are constantly encroaching upon the liberties of the working people.

The Record reporter, instead of forwarding to his paper a true copy of the resolution offered at the convention in Milwaukee, had forwarded one which had been offered by Mr. Bandlow last year at the convention in Detroit. The essential difference is that the resolution of last year called upon

the members of the union to ally themselves with the socialist labor party, whereas the one this year called upon them to sever their connection with parties of the "exploiting class." Both resolutions were designed to strengthen socialism in American politics.

Clarence S. Darrow, the well-known Chicago lawyer, increased his fame more than he could have guessed, when, at the celebration in Chicago of Henry George's sixty-first birthday, he expressed his preference for prize fighters to college professors and college graduates for "genuine sympathy and warm heartedness." "Dead right, and that's no dream of a burlesque star," was the verdict of the prize fighters whom one of the local papers interviewed. But the professors whom it also interviewed were evidently annoyed at the comparison. It may be conceded that Mr. Darrow's view of the matter was expressed in extreme terms. But that is frequently excused and sometimes required by the necessity for emphasis in a world in which vital truths stated in commonplace form pass without notice. The thought which Mr. Darrow doubtless had was that the college education has a tendency to harden the heart as it hardens the mind. This is true. It is especially true in those departments of college study that have to do with economic problems. The professor or student who, for instance, allows his mind to become saturated with the merciless principles of Malthusianism, certainly is in a fair way to lose all "genuine sympathy and warm-heartedness." Though his affections may be strong for parent and child, wife and friend, they will be like the love of the beast for its mate and brood. Love for the race cannot long abide in the heart after belief in the social necessity of war, pestilence and famine as checks upon population takes possession of the mind.

A writer in a recent number of the Westminster Review has very opportunely been discussing the logical position of those superior jingoes who

seek to justify national greed and rapacity by claiming for it the scientific sanction of evolution. "Evolution" is a much abused word, and the climax of its absurdity is reached when its authority is invoked in the case of such international calamities as the overthrow of the two South African republics by Great Britain. The writer in the Westminster has no difficulty in showing that acts of war on the part of civilized nations derive no support from the teachings of evolutionist philosophers, and he quotes largely from the writings of Herbert Spencer in support of his position. Although Mr. Spencer has not been on all questions a perfect model of consistency, it is satisfactory to find that his teachings as contained in his works dealing with social evolution, touching the question of wars in general, and his latest specific utterances on the question of the Boer war in particular, are in complete accord. Yet there are many fireside philosophers and pothouse jingoes in Great Britain and America, of the retail order, who pervert the elastic phraseology of Spencer and Darwin so as to cover all sorts of moral failings, individual and national. For example: A big nation makes war upon two little nations, all professing the same religion and on nearly the same plane of civilization. The big one, with an army and resources ten times as great as the small ones, ultimately destroys them after a gallant struggle and a great deal of slaughter. The verdict of these self-approving philosophers is something like this: "All very well, you know, this national independence idea, but it must go; it can't be helped; nature's law must take its course—survival of the fittest." Or again: A thief robs a safe. A policeman attempts to arrest him. The thief shoots the policeman and escapes. Verdict: Survival of the fittest. The astonished philosopher may well exclaim: "To what vile uses may we not return" on seeing how his doctrine has come to be applied.

Now, evolution is either a physical

law, like gravitation, or it is nothing. If it is a physical law it cannot be, at the same time, a criterion of ethics. Evolution teaches that there is a constant struggle for life going on throughout all nature, mankind included. It does not say by what means the struggle shall be carried on; all it stipulates is that there shall be a struggle. Evolution, when it comes to deal with man, finds barriers which limit its severity and determine its course. These barriers are supplied by the moral law. Every "thou shalt not" of the decalogue is an interference with the severity of the evolutionary struggle; it is not a stoppage of the stream, but merely an alteration of its direction. Evolution under moral law takes the shape of competition in right-doing. Under the physical law it takes the shape of brute force. The extent to which a nation obeys the moral law in preference to the physical law is the measure of its civilization. What then is a war between two civilized nations? It is an appeal from the moral law to brute force; it is a temporary retracement of the steps by which it ascended the ladder of civilization. In the one case as in the other it is the fittest that survives, but the meaning of the word "fittest" undergoes an alteration. Under the moral law it means the most righteous, but under the physical law it means the strongest. The meaning of the word alters with the conditions under which the struggle is carried on. To attach a fixed meaning to the word so as to make it conformable to one's policy is to bring bad logic to the rescue of bad morality.

The weekly country newspaper has not as a rule much improved in its editorial department upon the country newspaper of half a century ago. In wealth of personal gossip, known as local news, there has been a notable advance. Few things happen now within the field of a country weekly's circulation, from the mirroring of a farmer's heifer in a slough to the marriage of his daughter and

the birth of his grandchild, without being reported by the indefatigable village correspondent. But most country editors are hopelessly weak when it comes to editorials. This is not because they cannot write. It is because they dare not think. We recall an exception in a country paper recently published at Waukegan by James H. Malcolm. Mr. Malcolm's disposition to think was equal to his ability to write, and he made a paper worth reading. As the paper did not last, however, country editors might reason that thinking does not pay in country journalism. Possibly they are right. But it is also true that thinking, if it happen to be unpopular, does not pay anywhere. What must be borne in mind is that vigorous thinking, even if unpopular, does pay in the long run. It is to be hoped that this idea will be cherished by the editor of the Sumner Herald, of Pierce county, Washington. For with the single exception of Mr. Malcolm's paper, it has never been our fortune to come across a country paper so strong in its editorial department. There is everywhere a field for local papers of the high order of the Sumner Herald. Though their merits may not be at once recognized, country weeklies that treat their subscribers as thoughtful men and women, instead of mere gossips, are certain in time to make themselves genuine organs of local opinion.

An Oregon reader asks "what relation the national bank circulation bears to the government in its bond security; and whether the bonds are secured by a pledge of money held, or are dependent upon the government's credit." He further asks "in what way this security of the bonds is superior to that which could be placed behind greenbacks of full legal tender," and "why such greenbacks cannot be made to take the place of bank notes and save the people bond interest?" The first of these questions may be answered by reference to the