

would be called the second as distinguished from a third party.

In his article on "Political Germany," in the Review of Reviews for April last, Dr. Barth, the liberal parliamentary leader, said: "The greater number of voters for the social democratic candidates, do not trouble themselves about the socialistic program, but they wish to express their feeling of political discontent with things as they exist, by voting for the most violent opposition." This opinion of Dr. Barth's has recently been confirmed by the socialists themselves. At the socialist convention held last month at Stuttgart, the opportunists exhibited such overwhelming strength that the old leaders, Liebnicht and Bebel, expressed their fears that socialism in Germany would get away from its original revolutionary plan. It has in fact long since done so. This convention only made it evident that the masses of the Socialist party in Germany have themselves come to realize what has for years been apparent to observers, that the party, instead of being a slowly developed third party with an affirmative program, is the popular party in opposition. Like the Republican party of the United States, it leaped almost at a bound into the place of an influential factor in practical politics.

Not only does experience testify against the possibility of slowly building up a third party and finally raising it to power in politics, but all the probabilities are against such a thing. Any third party must, in the nature of things, soon become the second or first party, or drop out of politics. There can never be for long more than two great parties. The simple reason is that broadly speaking there are two and only two kinds of political thought. Every live man is instinctively in his political thought either aristocratic or democratic. Hence political activity naturally generates two parties, the tendency of one being away from popular government and that of the other toward popular government. "Hamiltonism" and "Jeffersonism" are terms that describe a conflict which is inseparable from political growth. Consequently a third party, to live, must speedily be-

come the exponent of one of these two political tendencies. That is, it must speedily pass from the position of a third party to that of the first or the second party.

Yet it is clear that the two leading parties of a country often fail to represent between them the two great conflicting tendencies in political sentiment. They fall under the control of machines and bosses who use them as instruments for selfish ends. And how shall this evil be remedied, if third parties are to be condemned? We have not said, let it be noted, that third parties are to be condemned. What we insist upon is not that they cannot be successful but that they cannot be slowly coaxed up to success. When that one of the two leading parties which stands for democracy, becomes a mere echo of the other party, when its vitality is gone and it is indeed but the tool or plaything of bosses and rings, then there may be an opportunity for a third party. And in those circumstances, if the third party strikes the right breezes in public sentiment it will sail into power.

That was the case in 1856. The Whig party had fallen as completely under the dominion of the slave power as had the so-called Democratic party. It was a dead party. The democratic sentiment of the time had no exponent in politics. Then the Republican party rose up. It embodied the leading principle of the declaration of independence in its platform—the equality of men—and resting upon that principle denied the constitutional power of congress to give legal existence to slavery in any territory. That struck the keynote, and at the very first election which this new third party contested, the moribund Whig party fell to the rear. The new third party became the second, and the old devitalized second became the third.

We have now reached another period when the devitalized condition of the party upon which democratic sentiment depends may have opened the way for a third party. The Republican party has so completely changed that, no longer the exponent of democracy, it has become to plu-

cracy what in 1856 the then Democratic party had become to the slave power. It now represents opposition to popular government and equality. And the democratic side, now as then, is represented unsatisfactorily.

Here may possibly be an opportunity for a third party to spring into the place of the Democratic party as did the republicans into that of the whigs in 1856. Such an opportunity there doubtless would have been two years ago had the plutocratic leaders not lost their grip. Such an opportunity there doubtless will be two years hence if they recover their grip. But should the Democratic party turn upon plutocracy in 1900, as it did in 1896, the lesson of history is that there will be no opportunity for a successful third party.

In that event, and even in expectation of that event, the effective thing to do is not to waste effort in third party politics, but to take a hint from the radicals of England, and organize a party within the Democratic party, to keep the face of the latter turned constantly toward the shining sun of democracy.

NEWS

The turmoil in France has subsided. At our last report it had reached a state which had forced the radical cabinet of M. Brisson to resign. This crisis was precipitated by the resignation of the minister of war, and the refusal of the president to make a new appointment at once, which gave the opposition an advantage that expressed itself promptly in a vote of want of confidence. The cabinet resigned on the 25th, and on the 27th the president asked M. Charles Dupuy to form a new cabinet. M. Dupuy was premier in 1894, when Dreyfus was degraded and transported, and President Faure was then associated with him in the cabinet as minister of marine. The selection of Dupuy, therefore, created a popular impression that it had been made in hostility to Dreyfus. M. Dupuy acceded to the president's request, and on the 31st succeeded in forming the following cabinet: M. Lebreton, Minister of Justice; M. Dupuy, Premier and Minister of the Interior; M. de Freycinet, Minister of War; M. Lockroy, Minister of Marine; M. Delcasse, Minister of Foreign Affairs; M. Peytral, Minister of Finance;

M. Leygus, Minister of Public Instruction; M. Deioncle, Minister of Commerce; M. Guillaime, Minister of the Colonies; M. Vigier, Minister of Agriculture; and M. Krantz, Minister of Public Works. The cabinet so composed was duly constituted on the 1st by presidential decree.

The new French cabinet has not yet revealed its policy as to the Dreyfus case, but a decision has been made by the Court of Cassation, which may lead to a final and satisfactory disposition of the matter. As reported in these columns on the 1st of October, the old cabinet had decided on the 20th of the preceding month in favor of opening the Dreyfus case, and to that end had ordered the minister of justice to submit the petition of Mme. Dreyfus for a rehearing, to the Court of Cassation. Formal proceedings were accordingly instituted, and on the 27th of October an application for a rehearing for Drefus was made in open court. A crowd of people filled the courtroom. The history of the case was orally reported to the court with an explanation that the petition rested upon the theory that Maj. Esterhazy had forged the document which was relied upon to convict Dreyfus. On the second day of the hearing, Oct. 28, the public prosecutor addressed the court, urging that the sentence against Dreyfus must not be annulled without a retrial. "You must fix the responsibility," he said; "if Dreyfus is innocent, the culprit must not go unpunished." To reach the culprit the secret record in the Dreyfus case, called the secret "dosier," which is in the custody of the war department, would have to be produced, a consummation that army interests have been opposing with all their might, apparently because an examination of that record would not only acquit Dreyfus but expose corruption in high places. But the production of this record now seems inevitable. For though the court, which made a decision on the 29th, did not annul the Dreyfus sentence nor order a retrial, it did order the institution of a supplementary inquiry. News dispatches from Paris describe the decision as one giving to the Court of Cassation absolute control over the Dreyfus case, and enabling it to examine any witness and demand any document bearing upon the matter. It can also order the production of Dreyfus in person. On the whole, the

decision appears to be more favorable to Dreyfus than if it had annulled his conviction and ordered a new trial before a court martial.

Counselors were appointed by the Court of Cassation, on the 31st, to proceed with the supplementary inquiry. On the same day the Dreyfus lawyer applied to the war department for an inspection of the secret documents; but the acting minister (M. Freycinet not having yet taken the office) raised difficulties and allowed the lawyer to inspect some of the documents only.

With the change of ministry and the opening of the Dreyfus case, which have had an unexpectedly quieting effect upon public opinion in Paris, the French appear also to have abandoned their quarrel with England over the possession of Fashoda. Maj. Marchand, commanding the French detachment at Fashoda, came down the Nile to Khartoum on the 28th, with the apparent intention of proceeding to Cairo; but Capt. Baratier, his subordinate who recently arrived in Paris with dispatches from him, was sent back with instructions to Marchand to return to Fashoda and evacuate it. The dispatch containing this information says that the French are disposed to recognize that the capture of Omdurman changes the situation as it existed when Maj. Marchand was instructed to proceed to the Nile. It appears that the French had expected to take possession of Fashoda while the mahdi's empire lay between that point and the Egyptian frontier, intending thereby to establish a claim; but the defeat and destruction of the mahdists at Khartoum changed the situation by extending the Egyptian frontier to the southern limits of the mahdi's empire. It is probable that the French would not have advanced to the Nile at all, had they known of the advance of the Anglo-Egyptian army upon Khartoum. Later dispatches reported that Marchand, accompanied by Capt. Fitton, of the Egyptian army, was due at Cairo on the 3d.

Although the French difficulty with Great Britain is evidently at an end, Great Britain has in no wise relaxed her warlike preparations. Quite the contrary. It is now suspected that the enemy for whom she has been preparing is not France but Russia, the Fashoda incident having been used as a pretext. From Weihaiwei,

China, on the 2d, it was reported that the British naval force there had cleared for action, and that a large Russian fleet had assembled at Port Arthur, across the gulf. Russia appears to have taken virtual possession of the entire province of Manchuria. A Russian regiment entered New Chwang on the 20th, the Chinese troops withdrawing without resistance, and it is regarded as significant that the intense activity on the part of the British began on the following day. All the news from this quarter, however, is vague. Only one fact is both significant and definite, and that is that the British squadron at Weihaiwei has cleared for action and is ready for sea at an hour's notice.

The Spanish-American commissioners now in session at Paris, have reached the question of the disposition of the Philippines. At the last joint meeting we reported, that of Oct. 25, the commissioners were still considering the question of responsibility for the Spanish-Cuban debt, the Spanish commissioners urging that the United States assume it, and the American commissioners firmly declining. Meetings were held on the 26th and 27th. At the former the Spanish acceded to the requirement of the United States, that Spain relinquish sovereignty over Cuba unconditionally; and at the latter the details as to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Guam, of the Carolines, were arranged. So it is reported. But all the meetings are secret, and reports must be taken with some allowance for error.

The next joint meeting of the peace commissioners took place on the 31st, when the Philippine question was for the first time considered. The American commissioners demanded the cession of the whole archipelago, the United States to assume only such portion of the Spanish-Philippine debt as has been incurred for useful purposes in the islands. This proposition was not put forward as an ultimatum, though it is regarded in Paris as virtually one. At the request of the Spanish commissioners an adjournment was taken until the 4th to enable them to prepare their reply.

For the final surrender of Cuba, the American commissioners have proposed the 1st of January. The Spanish authorities at Havana protest that this date would not give them time to