

forms can be secured within old parties and that they are the best instruments of government."

In other words, practical politicians will not leave the old parties. They will influence their own party when suf-

ficiently pressed. But otherwise they are like the man who, whenever he heard a thing which particularly expressed his ideas, always rushed to his wife in order to irritate her with it. Divorce was the last thing he wanted.

Backstage in Washington

WASHINGTON, D. C.

WITH ALL DEFERENCE to President Hoover's political counselors, who think that early discussion and dynamiting of any third-party movement is all to the merry for them, we feel that plain speaking on that subject by the Progressives may have unanticipated effects in 1932 and thereafter. Those wise old political owls—Senators Norris and Borah—are not, to our mind, merely giving vent to grievances in their current criticism of the conservative wing of the party. Both of them, safely ensconced in their Senate seats for six more years, feel that now is the moment to further inculcate in the electorate the spirit of independence and insurgency which they have exhibited on the Senate floor for so many years.

When Mr. Borah predicts that the political situation two years hence will be "chaos," he is expressing a hope as well as what may be reality. Both men are exulting at the disruption of party lines that marked the recent election, even in such conservative commonwealths as Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Colorado. They pray that the smashing of Republican and Democratic solidarity will continue, and, though both gentlemen deeply dislike President Hoover, in their own sour and silent way they are grateful that he, who once forswore all organized political activity, has hastened the day of a bloodless revolution at the ballot box.

Despite their idealism, both these elderly statesmen are, first of all, political realists, as any review of their career reveals. Mr. Borah, though he served as Theodore Roosevelt's advocate in the delegation contests at Chicago in 1912, scurried back to Boise once the convention closed, and said nary a word on behalf of his distinguished and rebellious

associate. Likewise in 1924, when "Old Bob" La Follette tried to torpedo the Republican ship of state, the Senator from Idaho remained aboard the party craft as a stilly and sulky seaman. We have frequently accused Mr. Borah of trimming in those trying times—and maybe he was—but it seems clear now

and thought to this question, and to them it transcends the purely partisan and political quarrel over that vague thing known as "regularity." They see, for instance, the prospect of a break between the nationally and internationally minded groups in the Republican party and in the Democratic party—between the let's-love-Europe group represented by that eminent volunteer statesman, Otto H. Kahn, and the made-in-America coterie captained by Joseph R. Grundy of Pennsylvania; between Democratic factions led, respectively, by Owen D. Young and, meaning no disparagement of Mr. Young, Cotton Tom Heflin. They also look for—and, as the greatest obstacle in their outlook, dread

—a serious split between the wets and the dries in both parties. Above and beyond these issues and personalities they can see millions of the younger generation emerging from the schools and the colleges to search in vain for a true leader. He may not arise for many years to come—neither Senator considers himself properly fitted for the rôle, if only by reason of his age—but each has a firm faith that some political Messiah will rise to deliver the children of America from the bondage of traditional and meaningless partisanship.

Meanwhile, they will undoubtedly continue to cherish and nourish their grudges against Mr. Hoover and against those who are aligned with the Administration inside and outside the Senate chamber. They will be aligned against him, silently but, we have reason to think, effectively, in 1932. Indeed, we

venture to predict that only a few Senators will be prepared to furnish active assistance to the President two years hence. As "Jim" Couzens remarked to "young Bob" La Follette, who had expressed curiosity concerning the identity of those Senators who were accused by the President of "playing politics at the expense of human misery"—"I think he meant almost all of us." And, after all, that is certainly no way for Republican Senators to feel toward a Republican President, even though it is quite obvious that the President reciprocates.

A. F. C.



McChapin in Philadelphia Public Ledger.

Moses in the bullrushes?

that his principal reason for regularity was his belief that all sorts of failure followed from an open revolt, and no gain. Mr. Norris, though we understand that he voted for both Roosevelt and La Follette, trailed along with his colleague until, in 1928, he decided that he could endure it no longer.

What they look for—perhaps, as Mr. Norris fears, "long after we have died"—is a political division based on economic and social lines, in which the clash between Progressives and Conservatives shall come at the polls as well as on Capitol Hill. Both of them, we happen to know, have given great study

