

we beg to give is that, from present appearances, the abrogation of that rule may not improbably result in Hearst's election on the first ballot, or at any rate before his line breaks in favor of a worthier candidate.

The Cleveland "patriots" alone have made Hearst possible and are now augmenting his strength. Why do they not meet the Hearst movement with a democratic opposition instead of a Grover Cleveland opposition, if party harmony and not personal plunder is what they want? It is not for lack of men. There is Gen. Miles, of the District of Columbia. Is his reputation too exclusively military? Then there is John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. Is the party afraid to go into the contest with a Southern Democrat? Then let it come farther North, on the border line, and take up Joseph W. Folk, of Missouri. Must we have a New Yorker in order to get the large electoral vote of that State? Then why ignore Edward M. Shepard. Is Shepard's professional connection with corporations as a practicing lawyer an element of weakness? Then why not Lucius F. C. Garvin. This is not all the list of men who may or may not be first favorites with democratic Democrats, yet whose nomination would not arouse their hostility. These are men upon whom compromise might be made, if that is what the "conservatives" want; and any one of them would be stronger, except in and about the offices of Hill, Harriman, Morgan, et al—than Grover Cleveland himself would be. But compromise is not what the Grover Cleveland contingent wants. What they want is Cleveland and the rich perquisites for plutocrats that would go with another Cleveland administration.

When we remarked that the Democratic party might go farther and fare worse in its search for a Presidential candidate than to Gen. Miles (p. 673), we were criticised by peace-loving friends for recommending a military can-

didate. This kind of criticism strikes us as taking more thought of clothes than of men. From the fact that Gen. Miles has worn a uniform and been all his mature life a military officer, it does not follow that he would be a military candidate. There is more repugnant militarism in one breath of a Roosevelt than in a whole lifetime of a Miles. Mr. Gamaliel Bradford, of Boston, is not famous for love of militarism, yet he advocates Miles. He does so on the express ground that the only great issue before the country to-day is the principle of peace versus the principle of war, and that Miles is our most distinguished representative of the peace principle. For ourselves there are other possible candidates that we prefer to Gen. Miles, but we prefer him infinitely to the two who are just at present in the lead. Aside from our preferences, however, we see no good ground for objecting to any military man who, although he recognizes the possibility of war and its necessity in defense of liberty, believes and declares as Gen. Miles does, that nevertheless "the spirit of peace should be cultivated rather than the demon of carnage."

The Progressives were again overwhelmingly victorious at the County Council election held in London on March 5th. Their representatives number 83 in the new council, as against 84 in the old, while the Moderates and Independents now have a combined vote of 35 as against 34 before. As the only loss of strength which the Progressives suffered was in the defeat of George Bernard Shaw, the brilliant author and opportunist socialist, and as his defeat was evidently due to his championing of Balfour's state church educational bill, the Progressives are virtually in the same position as before the election. The chief significance of this election is its indication that the bitter "patriotism" engendered by the Boer war, which was in progress at the time of the previous election, in 1901, could have had little effect. Lon-

doners appear to have progressed much farther than Americans in divorcing municipal questions from national party policies.

The recent election insures, of course, a continuation of the municipal policies that have made the Progressives strong ever since the creation of the London County Council some twelve years ago. Not only has the city acquired and successfully operated most of the street-car lines, and set about acquiring the London Water Company, but it is grappling, as no city in this country pretends to be doing, with the question of "overcrowding." Millions of dollars are being expended in taking over large tracts of land in the suburbs and erecting small dwellings thereon in such number as practically to found colonies. The Progressive programme calls for a great extension of electric street-car lines on the conduit system, operated by the Council itself; the acquirement of the entire water system; the acquirement of further large municipal estates for municipal cottages; reduction of the number of saloons; refusal of licenses to new music-halls; direct employment of labor; enforcement of trades-union wages with a "moral minimum"; and a persistent pressure on Parliament for the taxation of land-values to meet the cost of these reforms. When this London program is compared with the municipal policy of either of the great parties in any of our large cities except Cleveland, and it is remembered that these things are not merely talked about but are being done, how senseless appears our boast that Americans are the most progressive people in the world.

One of the best suggestions recently made by public school authorities is that of Edwin G. Cooley, superintendent of the public schools of Chicago, for organizing the pupils as citizens of a republic similar to that of the United States and thereby training them in the functions and principles of