

both been fishing for votes with bait that died before millions of these voters were born. Let us frankly chuck out the lath swords, paste-board shields, moth-eaten banners and all the rest of the theatrical paraphernalia of our sham battle. In this world of death-throes and birth-throes, if we cannot find anything more vital to American life than our program of merely criticizing the technic of each other's games, let us candidly announce that our respective parties are utterly bankrupt in mind and spirit and ought to disband \* \* \*"

This makes rather pretty reading but it does not rhyme with the facts. Suppose Mr. Hays should so write to Mr. McCormick and the two national chairmen after due deliberation should decide to make such a confession, what then? Mr. Lorimer does not tell us, and therein lies the absurdity of his suggestion. We fear that the able editor, sensible as he seems in many respects, is at heart pretty much of a Socialist. Thus only can one account for the beautiful pictures he paints from time to time, and his noticeable sacrifice of sound sense for sentiment.

Surely our contemporary must realize that, aside from the Socialistic menace, the gravest danger that could possibly arise in this country would be the loss of an effective minority political party. The security of the Republic itself is largely reposed in such an organization, regardless of what its name or accepted principles. So it would seem that the Republican chairman has a definite duty to perform—to win the fall elections, if possible; if not, then to entrench his party as strongly as possible in the high councils of the nation. As to the lack of vital political ideas: it is true that most of the time-honored policies of both parties have gone into the discard. But this likewise is true: the present turmoil of national and international affairs is producing new political ideas of striking significance. That sooner or later these ideas will be adopted by one party or the other and espoused as political principles, goes without question. This admitted, is it reasonable to assume that one of the two great parties will acquire a monopoly of all the new ideas, or that the principles to be adduced will not permit of a spirited difference of opinion? To say so is but to show an inexcusable ignorance of the American mind.

There will come a day, no doubt, when we will see a realignment of political parties along radical and conservative lines. New names will in all probability be adopted to distinguish the new parties from the old, but the change will be one of shape rather than of substance. However, it is idle to contemplate a dismemberment of the two great parties while the war rages. Too much is at issue to undertake a readjustment of this sort at this time. Moreover, there still remains too much life in both of them to permit of any such peaceful interment as has been proposed. The conduct of the war, as viewed from the standpoint of efficiency and economy, will furnish the two old parties plenty of grounds for difference for this year at least, as will the prohibition and woman suffrage amendments in certain sections. Then too, the control of capital, the protection of industry, the adjustment of the demands of labor and the question of taxation, all present issues that are bound to assume vital importance in the approaching political line-up. We will see.

#### THE CAMPAIGN IN WISCONSIN.

THANKS to President Wilson himself, political affairs have taken a sorry turn in the senatorial contest in Wisconsin. Partisan prejudice is at the boiling point and there is grave danger of the Socialist candidate winning over the two old line party candidates. The paramount issue is supposed to be unadulterated Americanism, an issue that was hotly contested by the Lafollette machine and the loyal element for the Republican nomination. Lenroot's victory over the Lafollette candidate should have settled the issue, but apparently the Democrats, aided and abetted by the President, will not have it so.

Hardly had the primaries ended when the President took it upon himself to challenge the Republican candidate's Americanism, in a letter extending his congratulations to the Democratic candidate. Nor was this all. He immediately dispatched J. Ham Lewis to Wisconsin to stump the state and shortly afterwards Vice President Marshall and other Democratic spellbinders, at the President's instance, hastened to join the administration chorus in a whirlwind cam-

paigned to defeat the Republican candidate. All of which does not set well with thousands of Wisconsin citizens who, although they have no political axes to grind themselves, are desirous of seeing fair play. Such as these are indignant that President Wilson should dare to stoop to such means for political advantage. Were there the shadow of a doubt as to Lenroot's loyalty, the disposition would be to give the President the benefit of the doubt, but there is none. Lenroot's Americanism had never been questioned until he became a candidate; his record rings clear as a bell, and in comparison with that of the President himself on all the issues that have arisen since the great war broke out, it does not suffer a particle.

Whatever may be the President's motives, it is apparent that his over-anxiety to assist the Democratic candidate has stirred up bad blood. Under the circumstances, it would seem that the least he could have done would have been to keep hands off altogether. One can readily understand how desirous he is of having his policies sustained, and it is to be expected that he will seek to make straightforward Americanism the issue in every congressional election, but he seems to be going a bit too far to assume that whoever the Democrats may happen to name as their candidate thereby acquires a monopoly in this respect. If he persists in pursuing this policy he is bound to lose favor throughout the country. In this, of all campaigns, the President should be above petty politics. And even after the elections next fall, the chances are that he will still stand in need of the loyal support that the Republicans have so cheerfully accorded him thus far, so why run the risk of antagonizing them without reason?

\* \* \* \*

#### WHAT NEXT?

IT is a personal characteristic of George Creel, we suppose, to attempt to arrogate unto himself power and more power. Also, he wouldn't be a good Democrat if he did not show this disposition. What with the censoring of war dispatches and the dissemination of information in various forms—information which properly comes under the category of stale news and promptly finds its way into the editorial waste basket,—one would think that he could find plenty to do in his present capacity. But Mr. Creel is an industrious young man and a veritable glutton for work. So, when he now seeks to have all historical and magazine articles and books dealing with any phase of the war submitted to his bureau for examination before publication, we suppose that we ought not be surprised.

It is no secret that the director of the "Bureau of Public Information" has long had a strangle hold on the daily press. Due to his relentless methods, the great America dailies been obliged to sacrifice their independence and individuality, and insofar as they have yielded in this respect, just so far have they suffered in the estimation of the rank and file of their readers. In contradistinction to the daily papers, the great national periodicals and magazines—and may we say the local weeklies, as well?—have gained in popular favor. The reason for this is quite clear: because of their very nature, they are not dependent upon the censorship for the news matters that fills their columns. Thus have they been able to edit and publish their matter in keeping with the true spirit of American journalism. True, the discriminatory postage rates have done much to discourage them by imposing on their operations a severe and unfair financial burden, but in one way or another they have all managed to pull through and perform their plain duty to the American people.

Now Mr. Creel proposes to cripple them beyond repair by robbing them of their very birthright—that of independent utterance. For once it becomes known that he is the editor-in-chief of all publications, their doom is sealed. We wonder just how far the American people will really let him go.

\* \* \* \*

"Nothing is deadlier than a machine gun."—New York World. Nothing, except the lack of a machine gun.—Philadelphia North American.

\* \* \* \*

The Bolsheviki didn't ask much: They merely requested the Kaiser to make the world safe for democracy. Like asking Old Nick to deliver a cake of ice.—St. Louis Star.