

sidered on its merits, apart from the accident of its principal nominee. They are right. There is, to be sure, the obtrusive fact that in every practical aspect, and in the view of Roosevelt and his personal supporters as well as in the estimation of the general public of all party shades, Roosevelt is the Progressive Party. Yet it is true that in theory the party should be considered without reference to its candidate and simply upon its own claims as a political organization.



### The Progressive Party.

Considered apart from its principal candidate's characteristics and career, the Progressive Party's appeal is attractive to the progressive spirit. But its demands, unless they can be secured without a new party can hardly be secured at all. If they are too weak in public opinion to win against hostile influences in existing parties, they are probably too weak in public opinion to serve in the manufacture of a new party. The progressive spirit, however, is a spirit of impatience. Unless it were it might not be progressive. And in this country its impatience turns to the manufacture of new parties instinctively.



Let an American get a new political thought, and, presto! he turns it into a new political party right before your eyes—if he can. It may not be helped, but it is a great waste. The energy spent in organizing new parties in the United States since the Civil War—parties that were futile except for agitation, and uneconomical for that, both in energy and time—could long ago have given progressivism complete control of one of the established parties and driven plutocracy into the other. May it not be this impatience of the progressive mind, rather than its progressivism, to which the Progressive Party's appeal is so alluring just now?



Here is a new party, let us say, which goes farther in favor of one's favorite ideals of progress than either of the established parties, and why shouldn't one go to it? The answer might be that the test of a political party is not alone what it declares for, but also what it can do. Appropriate efficiency, no less than good words and good intent, is as necessary a quality of political parties, *as such*, as it is of individual men and women in their several occupations. So the question of going over into the Progressive Party—considered apart from the characteristics and career of its spectacular candidate—necessarily involves consideration of its probable voting

strength; not in August, either, but in November. To "vote right" regardless of how others vote is not enough. No one votes right, if at a critical election and because the procession hasn't yet caught up to him, he "flocks alone." If overdone, this kind of voting may help to side-track the procession so that it may never catch up.



Such considerations, however, are at this time of less moment to progressive Republicans than to progressive Democrats. As the former are only beginning to break party ties, the Progressive Party is to them, and rightly, an inviting refuge. But progressive Democrats are differently situated. There is no "bolt" in their party, nor any present occasion for one. After struggling devotedly for sixteen years to democratize the Democratic party, they find it now almost everywhere committed to almost everything of progressive value that the Progressive Party declares for, and without the Progressive Party's paternalistic flavoring. Is this a fit time, then, for progressive Democrats to abandon the Democratic party to its plutocratic remnants? Shall democratic Democrats, at this turn of the tide, help re-elect Taft, or help throw the election into the House, by taking from Wilson a counterpoise for the votes that Roosevelt takes from Taft? Or shall they restrain the impatience of their progressivism until they can see whether, on the one hand, they really are in control of the Democratic party, and this party of the country; or, on the other hand, if disappointed in either respect, whether the Progressive Party is politically capable and permanent and essentially democratic, or only a temporary "bolt" from the Republican Party?



### Commercialized Police Powers.

Attempts to make Mayor Gaynor responsible for the recent police-graft murder in New York must seem queer to the man who remembers his "little old New York." The argument runs like this: Mayor Gaynor forbade arrests on sight by the police for illegal liquor selling; the police said to themselves, "We get you," and then began commercializing prostitution, gambling, etc., as well as liquor selling. "Then began!" Bless the innocents who say so. Gambling and prostitution have been commercialized by the police of New York since time whereof the memory of policemen runneth not to the contrary.



### Darrow's Acquittal.

The acquittal of Clarence S. Darrow at Los Angeles is an event to be glad of, quite apart from