

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-