

trying to manufacture side-parties? When political conditions are ripe for a side-party, it will spring up and quickly crowd one of the two principal parties out of the political arena. But until then, side-parties, though they may be useful as political schools, or entertaining as political toys, will be useless or worse than useless as political factors.

There has been in the newspapers a good deal of callow criticism of Bryan's proposition for State ownership of railroads. Youthful publicists have pointed out with playful pen the absurdity of changing cars at every State line. This may be excellent Greek-letter-society fooling, but unfortunately it has fooled some who are beyond the horse-play age. Mr. Bryan's proposition neither contemplates nor involves a change of cars at State lines. Cars would cross from State to State without bumping up against the boundaries, just as they do now. The proposition has no such practical disadvantages as are thoughtlessly urged against it, and it has at least one tactical and one political advantage. Its political advantage is that it would tend to prevent a centralization of control at Washington. Its tactical advantage—and this is most important at present—is that the public ownership of railroads could begin as soon as one State favored it. There would be no necessity for converting the whole nation. Bryan's proposition offers, also, at least one more advantage. It would open the way for the adoption of better methods of public ownership, if better methods there are. Whether our aim be State ownership and operation, or national ownership and operation, or rail highways (both national and State) open to competitive operation—which seems to us the ideal method,—the line of least political resistance to the accomplishment of the object is the State ownership plan which Mr. Bryan proposes.

Washington dispatches report

that the treasury looters who have been at work for years trying to get ship subsidies are to be rewarded at last. Congress and the President contemplate giving them from \$1.50 to \$5.00 a ton on the capacity of every American ship doing foreign trade. They have been obliged to compromise, however; for they are to get this, say the dispatches, not as a "subsidy," but only as a "subvention." Ah, ha!

On the question of local self-government President Roosevelt is in alignment with George Wyndham, British chief secretary for Ireland, rather than Redmond, the Irish leader. Mr. Wyndham says that the British parliament has done for Ireland all that an Irish parliament could have done. This is what Mr. Roosevelt says of Congress with reference to the Philippines. Now consider Mr. Redmond's pointed reply:

Even if it were true, Ireland would still demand its own parliament and would prefer to be badly governed by its own people than to be well governed by aliens.

In that reply Mr. Redmond strikes the keynote not only of just government but of good government. No matter how good your superimposed government, a proud people will rebel against it and the character of a tractable people will wither under it. It is as true of a people as of an individual, that they must make their own character or they will have none. Bad home government is better than good alien government, because it alone gives the common experience that makes for common wisdom.

President Eliot criticises trades unions for attempting to restrict the output—to limit production. He characterizes this as one of the chief defects of trades unionism. And so it is. But why attack trades unionism for adopting a prevailing economic philosophy, and trying to protect workmen from the oppressive conditions which, according to that philosophy, result from not restricting output? Did President Eliot

never hear of "overproduction"? This is not a labor fad. On the contrary, for a hundred years the working poor have been taught by "their betters" that "overproduction" is the natural cause of poverty—the more you produce from nature the less nature gives you. What so reasonable, then, as that labor unions should try to limit output so as to avoid "overproduction" and escape its somewhat illogical penalty of poverty? Why blame the unions? Why not blame the college professors, and preachers, and editors, and Congressmen, and manufacturers, and merchants, who teach this doctrine of "overproduction," and practice restrictions for their own protection? Why not blame the Republican party, whose policy is one of restricting output—the output of our importers and exporters? Why not blame land monopolists, who raise the value of land by keeping it out of market, thereby restricting output and preventing "overproduction"? Why is it that labor unions must bear the brunt of all criticism for doing for the protection of labor only what is ignored, if not approved, by men of President Eliot's class when done by "business" men for the protection of monopolists? Has President Eliot called trust mongers to task for restricting output, quite as bitterly as he criticises labor leaders for that offense?

A San Francisco employers' paper, bitterly hostile to labor unions, carries this motto at its head: "The right of man to live, the right of man to work." That is an excellent motto. Let its principle be applied impartially, and not against labor unions alone, and there will be no longer a labor question in our country. It is because our laws deny "the right of man to work," and therefore deny "the right of man to live," that there is so much undeserved poverty and so much unearned wealth in the land. Out of its own mouth is this anti-labor paper condemned.

"He would have the poor meet the rich, and for an afternoon at