

his class. They were so sacred, in his estimation, that no contractor should be obliged to waste his time discussing them with walking delegates. This is a high note. But it is a false note. Those who sing it do not sing it true. They appeal to the doctrine of natural rights when walking delegates bother them; but they forget all about the doctrine of rights at other times. Then they descend from their high note of natural rights all the way down the scale to "vested rights," and finally to no rights at all but to mere might. Natural rights is their plea against trade unions; but "the greatest good to the greatest number" is their favorite doctrine when the "greatest good" is coming their way and they can masquerade as "the greatest number." It is concededly fair to hold trade unions to the rule of natural right; but it is not fair to hold them to that rule without applying it universally. If the law of rights may be pleaded acceptably against the aggressions of trade unions, it must be accepted against all other aggressions. But if the law of might is allowable in justification of wars of conquest, of public utility franchises, of land monopoly, then it must be allowed to trade unions. The law of right is either universal or it is non-existent.

One of the startling dispatches of the week came from Kansas on the 12th and related to Washburn college. Let us read it again:

The faculty of Washburn college today ordered the socialist club of the college to discontinue its meetings. The order is said to be the result of letters from Eastern financial supporters of the college saying they would withdraw aid unless the club was suppressed.

Since these "socialists" are described as followers of the Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, who has asked some pointed questions relative to what Christ might do in various matters if he were among us in the flesh to-day, it is not likely that they were socialistic enough to more than hurt the self esteem of some puffy pharisee or other. But what of it if they were Simon-pure

socialists? Are our colleges endowed for the purpose of forbidding sociological study, or of holding it within plutocratic bounds? Is this one of the strings that educational philanthropists attach to their gifts? If so, well and good. They are within their rights. If Washburn college allows its students to study and discuss subjects which are offensive to Mr. Eastern Moneybags, then it is quite within Mr. E. M.'s right to give to Washburn college no more money. But if, on the other hand, Washburn college taboos studies and discussions to which Mr. E. M. objects, in order to get his money, then the status of Washburn college is defined. It is not a college at all, whatever else it may be.

Under the monarchy of Spain the people of Porto Rico were represented in the Spanish parliament at Madrid by 16 deputies in the lower house and 4 senators in the upper. But under the republic of the United States, Porto Rico has no representation at all. The humiliation to which the Porto Ricans are subjected in consequence of their shifted allegiance from a European monarchy to a Rooseveltian republic is indicated by the insular committee of the lower House of Congress, whose chairman informs the House in support of a bill recommended by the committee providing for one Porto Rican delegate, that—

Under the existing law the resident commissioner from Porto Rico is not permitted to speak on the floor of the House, but if he desires to communicate to the members information of importance to the people he represents he must see them at their apartments or in their committee rooms.

Even one delegate, with the right to speak in Congress but not to vote, is a "come-down" for a country of 1,000,000 inhabitants, which boasted 16 deputies and 4 senators in the Spanish parliament, all with full representative powers equal to those of the Spanish members themselves. But when the Porto Ricans realize that they were citizens of Spain and could be naturalized in the United States

or any other country to which they might migrate, whereas they are now citizens of no nation whatever and cannot be naturalized anywhere at all, they must be curious about the blessings of republicanism.

The widely published reports that Wall street interests oppose President Roosevelt's renomination are not believed by everybody. DeWitt C. Wing, of Chicago, voicing the opinion of those who regard these reports as cunningly deceptive, remarks that—students of Roosevelt's acts and declarations need not be reminded that he is as friendly to the unholy financial interests as any president could be without making himself liable to impeachment. Newspaper reports to the contrary are designed to inveigle an unsophisticated public into the flimsy belief that inasmuch as Roosevelt is unpopular with the trust operators and protected custodians of corporate interests he is entitled to the support, moral and active, of that very large class of voters to whom these unconscionable "captains of industry" are repugnant. Probably the game will work in a limited way, but there is small chance to deceive in this ingenious way those who lay any claim to knowledge of political events.

It is true that Roosevelt is a flighty, self-willed "wild-and-woolly-west" type of man, and inclined because of these characteristics to travel roughshod, in performance of his political duties, over the counsel and opinions of saner men in his circle of advisers; but no one who clearly perceives the intimate reciprocal relations between the present Administration and the security-digesting interests which are reported to regard Roosevelt as "unsafe," can be persuaded for a moment to doubt his contract loyalty to those interests. If nominated next June, as he doubtless will be, Roosevelt will be supported with renewed aggressiveness by the same interests which, looking askance at "Bryan's revolutionary and anarchial programme," left no stone unturned that would aid his successful though nominal opponent.

It is enough to consider that trusts have prospered most under the administration of the chief executive who, for his own political weal, affects "strenuous" opposition to their operations.

Let no one be deceived by the shrewd tricks of the plutocratic press nor the unfortunate errors into which a few opposition organs have been led.

We are not so sure as Mr. Wing evidently is that the reports re-