

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