

tion causes no surprise. Republicans who always support the railway machine saw no reason to vote for Judge Hastings, and republicans hostile to railway rule and to free-pass corruption were convinced that Judge Letton was sincere in his declared opposition to these evils.

The republican candidates for regents of the state university ran behind their ticket. Two years ago the republican candidates for regents ran far ahead of their ticket. The moral is so plain that it seems almost unnecessary to say that Rockefellerism has been rebuked. Rockefellerism remains an issue in spite of republican prophesy. It is to be regretted that the state university must continue to bear the taint of trust servitude, but the fight is no ended yet. The wave of reform will sweep over the entire land in the next few years and that wave will not be calmed by a few barrels of Standard Oil tossed overboard by a pirate captain of industry.



Future of the Old Parties Hanging in the Balance

By a close vote the Iroquois club of Chicago, a democratic organization, indorsed the plan of placing life insurance under federal control. This is a notable departure from democratic ideals and emphasizes the existence of two well-defined factions in the democratic party. One faction has little fear of centralized government; the other still insists on the importance of state rights. Undoubtedly the latter faction is the dominant influence in the party, although somewhat favorable to government ownership of railways and municipal ownership of public utilities.

The democrats of the nation are still wedded to free competition. They demand the withdrawal of special privileges and are beginning to believe that the government should own those natural monopolies which affect the welfare of the people as a whole. It is evident that they are trenching on populist grounds and that they are a trifle uncertain in their radicalism. How to harmonize state rights with this form of centralization presents some difficulties to the democrat who favors the widest measure of individualism under an industrial system of free competition. Your true democrat insists, and his contention cannot be refuted, that free competition has never existed in this country. Special privileges such as the tariff, preferential rates for freights and a system of taxation which presses more heavily on the poor than on the rich, have tended to concentrate wealth in the hands of monopolists. Remove these special privileges and you will destroy the trusts, says this kind of a democrat. Restore free competition and you will not need socialism, for individualism will then flourish.

So far the democratic argument is promising, but there are sceptics who think the democratic party cannot cling to state rights and a non-centralized scheme of government and yet obtain those reforms which are demanded by the conditions of today. If the government could stop at the ownership of the railways and telegraphs and at the control of corporations all would go well with the democratic theory. But there are those in the democratic party who now say, or will soon say, that the government must go into the life insurance business, must own the anthracite coal mines, must establish postal savings banks and a parcels post, must take over the oil fields, the gold, silver, iron and copper mines, etc., if the people are to be saved from the rapacity of the trusts. These do not believe that the withdrawal of special privileges will restore a condition of industrial peace. Mr. Bryan, the leader of the democratic party, is making a trip around the world and will enlighten his party as to the results obtained by state socialism in New Zealand and other Australian countries.

It is not difficult to see that the democrats must strike a balance somewhere between free competition and state socialism. The republican party, which clings to the idea that the trust is a natural evolution, is drifting unconsciously into that kind of socialism which will develop out of the trust system if the trust system is not destroyed.

The radical democracy is sure to give offense to those conservatives who do not favor public ownership, and yet the conservative democrats of the Iroquois club are hastening the day when the government will reach out for the ownership not only of insurance, but of the railways and many other utilities more or less public.

These are some of the latest tendencies in the two old parties. In each there is a conflict. What the result will be not the shrewdest political prophet can predict. The democratic party will strive to preserve its ideal of individualism, and will stop at some point in

its drift toward paternalism. The republican party will fight off paternalism for a time, but will finally discover that the trusts are becoming too big for the government and that the government would better own the trusts than permit the trusts to own the government. Then will come the parting of the ways. The republican party, if it continues in the course mapped out for it by the trust faction, will be forced to decide between state socialism and trust control of government.

The future holds out an interesting play of political forces, and this may bring about the entire extinction of one or the other of the old parties. It may mean the building up of a great new party or it may mean the realignment of the old parties. Whatever is to be the result it is certain that the next decade will present many curious political developments.



RAILWAYS AND REVOLUTIONS

There is a distinctive phase of the Russian revolution that seems to have escaped notice outside of Russia. More has been accomplished by a railway strike than by all the riots and massacres. Russia lost in the war with Japan because of inadequate railway service and her autocratic form of government was destroyed by a strike of railway workmen. The importance of the railway appears to be as great in revolution as in war. Rapid transit has made absolutism impossible. As soon as the Russian workmen discovered this secret they liberated an enslaved people. It is true that the time was ripe for the revolution, but it is no less true that a revolution could not have succeeded had the government been permitted to transport troops and munitions of war without hindrance.

In our day a revolution can shatter an empire into a thousand pieces by means of a complete and successful strike of railway employes. Vast empires like Russia are made possible by rapid transit and can be destroyed by the blocking of transit. The czar could not recruit an army large enough to put down insurrections in a hundred rebellious provinces unless the railway employes remained faithful to the government. The power of confederated railway workmen carrying on a revolution is terrifying to contemplate. They could, if they were so disposed, starve the people in any section of the empire, or they could feed the people and starve the soldiery. The army could not operate the railways and even if it tried to accomplish such a colossal task the revolutionists could tear up the tracks and blow up the bridges at strategic points.

Had the railway and shipping strike continued Poland and Finland might have been free. With the cessation of the strike the czar can pour troops and military supplies into these discontented districts. The Russian people are eager to secure their own freedom, but they are not at all interested in liberating either Poland or Finland from Russian rule. As soon, therefore, as the czar yielded by sacrificing the autocratic power and pledging himself to establish a liberal government, the Russian railway employes called off the strike. This as a serious blow to the rising revolt in Poland and Finland. In these provinces revolution, to be successful, must be guaranteed against the constant interference of the central government. In both Poland and Finland large armies are maintained at all times, but the operations of these armies would be greatly hampered by the blocking of transportation and the consequent stoppage of supplies. As for the local railways the revolutionists could use them against the troops.

It is too early to say that the revolution has ended. If the czar does not keep his promises faithfully; if he fails to introduce the proposed reforms promptly and fully, the railway men will again go on a strike. But it is not likely that Nicholas will tempt the people to further revolt. Now that they understand their power they would be quick to smite and slow to make terms. A second revolution might easily result in the complete downfall of the Romanoff dynasty.



LIFE TERMS ARE HAZARDOUS

President Stickney of the Great Western, who speaks sanely on railway affairs as a general rule, has made a dangerous suggestion with regard to the administrative body which will have charge of railway regulation if the Esch-Townsend bill is passed. In his opinion members of this body should be appointed for life. "If appointments of that sort could be guaranteed," said Mr. Stickney, "I believe that the manager of every important railway in the country would endorse the measure."

Life appointments under a free government are always hazardous. The peril lies in the power of special interests to control such