

pendence to the Philippines would be to hand the islands over to disorder and anarchy, to destruction and to chaos.

It therefore prays for annexation with the privilege of admission into the Union as a state as the only peaceable solution of the Philippine question. That the assertion that disorder will attend upon any attempt to make a colony of the Philippines is true, needs no labored argument. An all-sufficient argument is found in the bloody history of the past three years and the continued resistance of the people to foreign subjugation. But what assurance is there that independence would produce similar results. The bare statement of the memorial would carry great weight, if it had been made in entire freedom. But inasmuch as the memorialists were bound by the conquerors to refrain from advocating independence, their opposition to independence in those circumstances carries no weight at all. Their memorial does excite a suspicion, however, that they were really advocating independence in the only way open to them. Nominally they opposed it. That was necessary in order to keep out of jail. But as the course they suggested as the only one that could pacify the islands—statehood—is one which they must have known would not be adopted by the United States, they have thrown this country back upon the alternative of turning the islands into a colony or granting independence, either of which, they say, would be followed by disorder. This leaves the United States to decide, unless it offers statehood, whether to produce disorder by violating its own traditional policy or by conforming to that policy, which makes a pretty problem. There may have been more shrewd politics in that Filipino memorial than the confiding Gov. Taft was aware of.

Once more the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate a resolution for submission to the states, which would amend the constitution so as to require the choice of

United States senators to be made by popular vote. It has been the custom of the Senate to pigeon-hole these resolutions; and probably the House, following its custom under the autocratic rules which now govern it of turning out undigested measures indiscriminately for the Senate to legislate upon, has trusted to such a disposal of the last one. That might be good politics. Members of the lower house could thereby make capital with the people, upon whom they are dependent for reelection, while senators, not depending upon the people for reelection, could with impunity "turn down" the amendment. Thus the majority party in the popular body could get credit for a democratic action, without producing a democratic result. But if any such motive did control them, there is this time a possibility that it may be disappointed. All senators are not millionaires, nor the flunkies of millionaires, two classes of senators who could have no hope of reelection were the question left to popular vote; and it is believed that there are enough of the other kind to carry this important amendment. In some states already public sentiment has forced senatorial candidates to stand before the people, through party pledges in advance of legislative elections. In other states this inadequate device for making the Senate responsible directly to the people is gaining in popularity. But an amendment changing the mode of election would settle the matter. Under the present method the Senate is an American house of lords, and that was the original intention. It is time to abolish their lordships. Though the House has recently become more autocratic than the Senate, that is only a passing phase. It is no argument for the election of senators by legislative lobbies. The people can abolish autocracy in the House as soon as they want to. But the Senate may be autocratic or not as it pleases; and so long as its members are not directly responsible to their constituents the people are powerless to control it. The principle is wrong. It is undem-

ocratic and un-American, and being so it should be changed.

In Texas the People's party organization has decided to take a different course from that which it is to be hoped the party in Kansas will adopt at its state conference this week. Instead of cooperating with the Democratic Democrats to line up the Democratic party to its democratic principles, the Texans have decided to continue flocking by themselves in a futile side party movement. Their argument is the old one of the hopeless badness of both the old parties. In their address they say:

No man who has studied the political acts of the Democratic and Republican parties for the last 30 years and whose soul is not completely warped and twisted by political prejudices, can fail to see that there is absolutely no hope for relief to the great common people of this country from either of the old parties.

That notion rests either upon the assumption that the great common people—for it is these that compose the old parties—are corrupt, or upon the concession that self-seeking politicians in secret partnership with plutocratic combines cannot be displaced from party control. If the assumption is just, that the members of the old parties are corrupt, then where is an honest side party to go for honest support. If the concession is true, that corrupt leaders cannot be displaced, then why is it true? These are questions for side party enthusiasts to consider. Of course, it is not just to charge corruption to the masses of either of the old parties. So that consideration may be passed over. Is it true, then, that corrupt leadership, say of the Democratic party, cannot be displaced? It is true only on one condition, and that is that whenever a member of either of the old parties becomes alive with democratic principles, he shall go off somewhere and flock with himself and a few congenial spirits instead of staying in the Democratic party if he already belongs there, or going into it if he has been a Republican, and using his influence to make the Dem-

ocratic policy true to democratic principle and the Democratic organization loyal to its democratic policy.

If political parties could be made and unmade easier than they can be directed, something might be said for the policy of making side parties to order when new and more radical issues begin to demand consideration and action. So, also, if established parties were only partnerships of corrupt politicians. But neither suggestion applies. The great imponderable force in established parties is their traditional vote—the vote which thoughtless or superficial men in vast numbers give to one party or the other from habit. It is only in times of great crises, stirring men to the depths, that the ordinary voter breaks away from his traditional party moorings. This is the potent fact in politics which side party enthusiasts neglect, but to which corrupt politicians and more corrupt plutocrats give supreme attention. They secure control of the machinery of established parties, not because there is any peculiar power in the machinery itself, but because with the machinery goes the thoughtless vote, which is overwhelming. That is the explanation of the un-democratic behavior of the Democratic party. Because the plutocrats seek to control the machinery of the Democratic party, instead of forming side parties, and so many democratic Democrats form side parties instead of suppressing their pride of opinion long enough to secure control of the machinery of the Democratic party, the plutocrats hold the party in check and often turn it against its own principles. With only a fraction of the energy necessary to put political breath into the weak body of a side party, when there is no tidal wave demand for it, a party which can at best never be more than a political plaything, complete control of the Democratic organization, with the thoughtless but dominating popular vote that clings to it from force of tradition and habit, could be secured. Within that party, every

thoughtful voter would count as a host against the political trader and the plutocratic adventurer. He could influence the masses that give power to the party. But outside he counts for nothing with the great thoughtless horde of traditional voters. It is to be regretted, therefore, that the Texas People's party has decided, good as its intentions doubtless are, to remain outside the real field of the fight between democracy and plutocracy.

For one thing, however, the Texas People's party conference is to be strongly commended. It recognizes the importance of promoting the Winnetka system of direct legislation, a description and explanation of which will be found at page 340, and in its address it approves that system in these terms:

We believe in the doctrine of the pure democracy, and the way out of the fog and difficulties that now surround us is to clothe the people with power to pass upon all general legislation and the right to initiate and enforce the enactment of laws that will benefit all the people. By this means we will be able to overthrow the political power now exercised by the cliques, rings and machine bosses that now dominate both the old parties in every state where they are now in power. To this end we invite your attention to a system by which we can secure the adoption of the initiative and referendum without constitutional amendment, and we earnestly invite the cooperation of men of all parties in our state so that we this year may secure the adoption of majority rule. We advise the voters of Texas and of all other states as well that they demand of every candidate for legislative honors that he sign a written agreement to vote to submit to the people the right to pass upon all general laws affecting the whole people at the ballot box before it goes into effect, and if he fails to do so to see that he is defeated and a man elected who will agree to such action. By this course we will free our legislative bodies from what is known as the third house (the lobby), overthrow the bosses and political machines and restore to us a government of, for and by the people.

Direct legislation would make the mass of voters think, whether they are inclined to or not; or in default of their thinking it would automatically disfranchise them. It cannot come

toosoon in any form, and the Winnetka system seems to offer an opening to bring it into practical use without waiting for the aid or consent of any political organization.

The catlike tenacity to life of a well-groomed lie is illustrated by the following irrelevant comment in the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune of the 14th upon ex-Gov. Altgeld's speech at the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln banquet in Columbus. Saying that Altgeld devoted his time to corporations, the Commercial-Tribune proceeds:

Yet the sale of his stock in the Chicago corporation which requires its tenants to pay their rent in gold was not announced—at least not loud enough to allow anybody to hear it.

This is an allusion to an old campaign charge, that although Altgeld was a free silver man he obligated his tenants of the Unity building, in which he was a controlling stockholder, to pay their rent in gold. The truth is that the "gold bug" mortgagees of that building inserted a clause in the mortgage requiring principal and interest to be paid in gold, and that this made it necessary to pass along the same obligation to the tenants. The further truth is that Mr. Altgeld was long since frozen out of his interest in the building, his labor of management and his investment of capital being entirely lost. That would not have happened if while governor he had been as friendly to monopoly interest in Chicago as the Republican legislature was.

ROYAL AMENITIES.

The speech of Representative Wheeler, in the lower house of Congress last week, in which he denounced the American flunkysism now in evidence in connection with the approaching visit of Prince Henry of Germany, has furnished a text for whole yacht-loads of editorial comment, much of which unintentionally goes far to justify Mr. Wheeler's bitter criticism.

In this connection it is to be observed that the journalistic comments refer only to some of the sensational and hardly excusable things that Mr.