

zens, on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of one year after the date of notification to the government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the government of Russia.

Now, why were the President and Senators opposed to that resolution? Was it the democracy of it? Did they see that it would include Negro citizens, for instance, and might become embarrassing as a precedent? They didn't say so. What they said was that the Russian government had protested against that form, and that therefore its adoption would be an affront to a friendly Power. But Russia had in fact not protested. An error of the Associated Press, widely published, indeed gave an appearance of truth to this plea of a Russian protest; but the Associated Press correction, not widely published, was ignored. Here is the proof, over the signature of the General Manager of the Associated Press, Mr. Stone, in a letter to Congressman Sulzer:

It is quite true that in a dispatch dated Washington, December 16th, The Associated Press was led to say that the Russian Government had protested against the House resolution through Ambassador Bakhmeteff. But on December 18 we carried and transmitted to the American newspapers a rather lengthy dispatch from St. Petersburg in which the Russian Foreign Office denied explicitly that any such protest had been made. Also, on the same date we carried a dispatch from Washington quoting Secretary Knox as saying that Russia had not protested either "against the abrogation of the treaty or against the language of the Sulzer resolution." So that it seems to me we have already clarified the situation as well as it is possible for us to do.

Evidently the pigeon-holing of the Sulzer resolution was not to oblige Russia. Nor was it lightly done. There was a purpose, and now this purpose seems obvious. For the Senate solemnly to declare the equality of citizenship rights under treaties, regardless of race, might make much trouble in the future for gentlemen of Senatorial and Presidential size who never cross race lines except when angling for race votes.



### La Follette and New Political Parties.

It is doubtful if the philosophy of new political parties has anywhere or by any one been more exactly and briefly stated than by Senator La Follette in his autobiography in the American

Magazine for February. "New parties," he writes, "are brought forth from time to time, and groups of men have come forward as their heralds, and have been called to leadership and command. But the leaders did not create the party. *It was the ripe issue of events.* It came out of the womb of time, and no man could hinder or hasten the event. No one can foretell the coming of the hour. It may be near at hand. It may be otherwise."



### Singletax Progress.

Sad indeed is the fate of that Singletaxer who in these days sits upon his back-porch and mourns because the Singletax does not progress. Were he to shift positions to his front-porch, and wipe away his blinding tears, he could see the Singletax procession moving forward on the main highway. Many a Singletaxer can remember—it isn't very long ago—when he would have given his right hand to be assured that by this time the Singletax would be half as far ahead as it actually is. But back-porch mourners are so lost in sorrow that they forget to help make the procession move. Because it isn't yet moving exactly in the way or in the place they hoped for, they leave the work and the responsibility to others. The English movement is across the seas, alas; and alack, the Canadian movement is over the border; while Seattle is only a town, and Oregon and Missouri are in the far-away woods! Yet in Seattle and Oregon and Missouri the Singletax fight is on. Whether it wins or not in any of them is a secondary consideration. The merits of the question will be talked about and written about and thought about in those places—yes, and elsewhere—until the vote is cast, and afterwards too, no matter how the vote goes—with a keenness and vigor that only such campaigns as these can provoke. For propaganda purposes alone, these opportunities are magnificent compared with ordinary ones, and for home purposes everywhere these campaigns will be beneficial, and if successful where they are waged will be triumphs everywhere.



But who is doing it all? *You*, if you are helping. But before you are the men and women of Seattle and Oregon and Missouri, without whose activity and devotion not even the chance for a fight would be at hand. They can't make the fight what it ought to be, though, if they are unaided; and there is your opportunity, public spirited reader! If you have done something and are will-

ing to do more, or have done nothing but want to do something—there is your opportunity, whether you live in those places or elsewhere, and whether you reckon your income in thousands of dollars or in dimes. Every dime will help. If you can't give a thousand dollars, give a nickel, or something not so extreme as either; but give.



Give through the Joseph Fels Fund, unless you object to that channel. What you give will be distributed better and count for more if given that way. It will be distributed better, for the Joseph Fels Fund Commissioners know the relative need of different places, and have financed the work to its present stage; it will count for more, because to that fund Joseph Fels will add a dime to your dime, a dollar to your dollar, a hundred or a thousand or ten thousand dollars to yours. If you object to this channel—for any reason, good, bad or indifferent—don't allow your objection to serve as your excuse for not helping. For Missouri you can send direct to Dr. William P. Hill of St. Louis; for Oregon you can send to William S. U'Ren of Oregon City; for Seattle you can send to Thorwald Siegfried. And don't wait. They vote on the question in Seattle the 5th of March, and in Missouri and Oregon next November, and the campaign in all those places has already begun. Whether you send direct to those men or to the Joseph Fels Fund, send! Send now. Send enough to convince *yourself* that you really want your cause to win and are no dawdler. Don't wait until the fight is over. If you do, and the fight is lost, it will not be for you to criticize, nor if it is won for you to cheer. The fight you have prayed for is on. Whereabouts are *you*?



## THREADED OBSERVATIONS.

In a New York speech, and again in Washington, Governor Wilson of New Jersey made an observation that shows that he knows how to string his observations on the right thread.

In his New York speech he said: "As a politician I'll agree not to trouble this country's business if this country's business men will agree not to trouble politics. The trouble is that the business men of the country won't agree to this. The purpose of one political party now is to take the tariff out of politics and settle it for the good of the whole country. But as long as the schedules of the tariff are settled by special interests there is going to be trouble. . . . Suppose we ask the

*business men of this country to stop meddling with the tariff."*

This is the talk of plain common sense, something heard too rarely in speeches by our public men.

The majority of them, and the great mass of conservatives generally, in private conversation or in public utterances from the platform, in newspapers and magazines, have a great deal to say about the way in which the country is surely going to the dogs unless politics will stop interfering with business. But now we have a public man who reminds us that the interference of business with politics came prior to, and is the direct cause of and reason for, the present concern of politics with business.



An editorial in one of the big New York dailies recently showed the same popular misunderstanding of cause and effect, the same lack of proportion.

In giving some kindly paternal advice to organized Labor apropos of the Los Angeles troubles, that paper asserted that "ninety millions of people cannot endure that two millions should subvert the common welfare from any motives whatever, good or bad."

This sort of argument is always used to organized Labor in connection with any manifestation, violent or otherwise, on its part. But, apropos of Governor Wilson's suggestion, how about the less than two millions of representatives of Big Business who for some decades now have been subverting the common welfare of ninety millions of people for their own advancement?



A constant perusal of the daily press is a great delight to a person with a sense of humor.

Another editorial writer, in dealing with the epidemic of poisoning cases in the Berlin Municipal Lodging House, remarked that the case was astonishing in that it revealed an incredible depth of poverty in that prosperous city. It seemed to this writer that but few people here or in Germany realize that even in a well-governed city like Berlin there is such a tremendous sum of actual want and misery.

Possibly if he would think the matter over, he might understand that in the so suddenly revealed depth of misery lay the explanation for the remarkable gains in the Socialist vote at the German elections. But when the papers report Socialist gains, public opinion here is surprised,