

the Senator Spencer fluke in Missouri and the Representative Blanton fluke in Texas. Each and every one of them sentenced to political death by Samuel Gompers and each and every one of them maintained in political life with renewed and unprecedented vigor after beating each and every Gompersian opponent out of his boots! It is incredible! It is impossible! But, alas, it is fact!

And there is another sad little memorial in this Gompers private graveyard. It is the one over the political remains of Representative Thetus W. Sims, of Tennessee. This was the most unkindest cut of all. For Sims was the idol of all the A. F. of L. hosts. Yet lies Sims there smashed to political smithereens by the deadly side swipe of Gompersian approach!

Sims had introduced the Bill embodying the sacred Plumb Plan. On the floor of Congress he had advocated Government ownership of about everything in the heavens above, the earth and the waters under the earth. Samuel had not merely urged that Sims be re-elected to Congress. He had commanded it. And yet, notwithstanding the fact that without the Gompers endorsement and militant support Judge Sims had always triumphantly carried the Eighth Tennessee District, with that endorsement and militant support he went down to disastrous defeat— butchered to make another victim in the Gompers graveyard!

Pending the erection of the imposing mausoleum, over the last resting place of the Gompers Coxian edict, by all odds the most impressive monument in the Gompers cemetery is on the spot where lie such remnants of the Gompersian forces as could be swept up after their head-on collision with Governor Henry J. Allen, of Kansas. How deeply Henry had offended Samuel we all do know? The dire vengeance Samuel called down on him we also know.

Yet what happened in the final show-down? The Gompers forces wiped off the Kansas map! Every Kansas county save just one swept clean of them! And the sum total of Henry's expenses, the derisory sum of eighty cents!

Now with Gompersian support firmly wished on him, what ever on earth will become of Coxe?

Recognition of Mexico

THAT is a most unfortunate intimation which has got abroad, immediately following the Mexican election, that the United States not merely demands the repeal of certain Mexican laws relating to oil lands which are regarded as unjust and oppressive to American interests, but also intends to make such repeal a prerequisite condition of American recognition of the administration of President Obregon. The report must, of course, be a gross exaggeration if not an entire fabrication. It is quite inconceivable that even the most purblind and infatuated partisan of the "watchful waiting" policy of the last seven years could be guilty of such mingled injustice and folly.

The administration of President Obregon will be entitled to prompt and ungrudging recognition on the most convincing grounds. The first is its unimpeachable authority. True, it is an administration established by virtue of a revolution. So is that of President Wilson. At the very beginning of our Constitutional life as a nation the United States recog-

nized the right of revolution and the legitimacy of governments thus founded, provided that they gave satisfactory evidence of representing the will of the people and of ability and disposition to perform the essential functions of government. There seems to be no question whatever that the administration of Señor Obregon can meet such tests.

Another ground of recognition, not essential but highly gratifying, is found in the intrinsic merits of Señor Obregon and those who presumably will be associated with him in the government. Although he has been a highly successful soldier, he prefers to be regarded as a civilian, and will aim at a civil rather than a military administration. Of his intellectual competence there is no question, and of his character the highest estimates are given. Of all men of his time he appears to be one of the very best fitted to conduct Mexico into the era of peace and prosperity which she so greatly needs after the troubles of the last eight years.

A third reason for recognition, also not essential but of peculiar interest to this country, is Señor Obregon's friendly disposition toward the United States. This has been remarked from the beginning of his conspicuous career. It was one of the prime causes of his estrangement from President Carranza, and of the revolt which he led against that anti-American autocrat. There is every reason to believe that he is sincerely desirous of cultivating close and mutually advantageous relations with this country, and of assuring safety and doing justice to Americans settled in Mexico or interested in Mexican industries.

For these reasons, especially of course the first, recognition would seem to be imperatively required. It would indeed be if only the first of the three existed without the others. If Mexico had elected a man whom we considered intellectually unfit to be President, that would be none of our business. So long as he was the choice of the Mexican people we should be bound to recognize him. Even if he were known to be unfriendly in his feelings toward us, it would still be incumbent upon us to recognize him as President. Republics elect their presidents to suit themselves, not other nations.

Indeed, in this latter case there would be a specially practical reason for recognition, on elemental grounds of practicality. If Mexican laws were unjust to us, and the Mexican Government unsympathetic, it would be expedient for us to recognize it as a government in order that we might remonstrate with it and enter into negotiations for an abatement of our grievances and for a betterment of relations. To refuse to do so would be to create a hopeless *impasse*. Happily, of course, the present case is not so bad as that. If Mexican laws do bear hardly upon some of our interests, the Mexican Government is inclined to listen to our complaints and to seek ways and means of satisfying our just demands. Such a disposition is auspicious of good, and should be met at least half way, in a frank, friendly and practical manner; and a practical manner involves recognition, so that we can do business with the government.

Coxey says that witnesses before the Senate Committee have been committing perjury. Perhaps that is why he avoids going before the committee, so that he won't commit perjury, too.



Murphy

Brennan

Taggart

Nugent

THEIR CANDIDATE

“A deal of skimble-skamble stuff”—King Henry IV

The Week

WASHINGTON, September 14, 1920.

SENATOR HARDING'S visit to Minneapolis was perhaps the most impressive incident thus far in the whole campaign. It would have been noteworthy standing entirely alone, because of the immensity of the multitudes which gathered to see and to try to hear the candidate for the Presidency, and because of the thoughtful constructive statesmanship of his chief address. It was the more noteworthy and instructive taken in contrast to the hippodroming performances of Governor Cox. The one is received with respect and serious regard, as a man of parts and weight, whose utterances are worthy of serious consideration, and who is addressing himself to the most vital interests of the nation. The other is looked upon as a show, to be regarded with curiosity to see what new mental flip-flops he will turn and what new railings and vituperations he will invent; like Artemus Ward's kangaroo, "an amoosin' little cuss."

How tedious and distasteful the antics of Governor Cox have become was strikingly indicated by one of the most important of all his journalistic supporters, the *New York Times*, when it editorially discussed them under the caption "Wearying the Country"; quoted with approval, as probably expressing the feelings of a majority of the voters of both parties, the declaration of another Democratic paper, the *Jacksonville, Fla., Times-Union*, that "nobody will gain by it and the people will be embittered and disgusted"; and declared that "the whole matter strikes most people as insincere." The *Times* was ostensibly referring to both parties in the campaign, but its severe animadversions were evidently applicable alone to Governor Cox and his aides in mudslinging, since they started it, they alone are engaging in it, and they are—or Governor Cox himself is—threatening to keep it up until November 2—"a good enough Morgan until after election."

Senator Harding's address at the Minnesota State Fair, on the agricultural interests of the nation, was a worthy companion-piece to the two which recently preceded it, on our foreign relations and the League of Nations and on the interests of labor. Never has there been a more just or a more profitable conception of the place of agriculture in the national economy than his, that it is not merely an adjunct or a feeder to the manufacturing and commercial interests which are usually so much more exploited than it, but is in fact essentially fundamental to them all. From that statesmanship conception there naturally arises his pregnant question, whether we shall continue to exploit our agricultural resources for the benefit of these other industries, saying "After us the deluge," or shall so conserve, develop and cultivate those resources as to make and permanently to keep this a self-sustaining nation. Himself unhesitatingly answering it in the latter direction, he presented a definite, explicit and practical scheme of constructive statesmanship for securing that end, such as seldom if ever has hitherto been put forward. It was an address which should be read and pondered by every intelligent and progressive farmer in the land.

"Wherever," said Governor Cox in Montana, "you show me a radical movement I will show you a government that has been unjust and oppressive." We don't suppose he could make that promise good, or would try to do so, any more than he did or could his promise to prove that "sinister interests" had "contributed millions" to a slush fund for buying the Presidency. But we really did not expect him, at this stage of his game, so openly to repudiate and so scathingly to condemn that administration of President Wilson which he has pledged himself to continue if the country gives him a chance. For it is quite certain that this country is to-day the scene of the most radical movement in its history. Indeed, Governor Cox in making that speech was addressing men who were very largely extreme radicals and who had been engaged in a "radical movement" of the 'extremest kind. That was why he spoke as he did. But it is also certain that the country which is the scene of this radical movement has been for seven and a half years under the administration of Woodrow Wilson and for most of that time also under a Democratic Congress. The unescapable purport of Governor Cox's declaration is, therefore, that the Government of the United States during the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson "has been unjust and oppressive." And that, as a staff correspondent of the *New York World* reports, "is the doctrine that Governor Cox has been hammering home to the radical labor groups of the Northwest." Apparently he aspires to be known as an incendiary as well as a mudslinger.

That is an exceedingly interesting and important announcement, that there are now 8,000,000 unnaturalized aliens in this country, of whom more than half are eager to become citizens but are debarred by "illiteracy and technical obstacles," and that the Department of Labor is going to ask the States to pass legislation which will "let down the bars" and admit them to citizenship. We must regard it as unfortunate that so many immigrants have remained unnaturalized, and as desirable that such conditions shall be abated as expeditiously as possible. At the same time it would be most undesirable and indeed pernicious to lower or in any way to impair the standard of American citizenship. There are many who doubt the propriety of admitting illiterates to citizenship wholesale, and who would greatly like to know what "technical obstacles" existing laws present which have kept millions of worthy candidates out of citizenship. There seems to be occasion for a searching scrutiny and perhaps for some radical revision of our immigration and naturalization systems.

Amid all the scandalous performances which have marked Sir Josephus's maladministration of the Navy Department, from the deliberate refusal to make reasonable preparations for war until after war was actually begun, down to the crazy scheme of honoring with decorations men who lost their ships rather than those who saved them, where did the distinguished young Assistant Secretary of the Navy stand? Was he "consenting unto" those things? We do not recall hearing any protest against them from his lips, pen or typewriter.