

quired to ratify. This necessitates a campaign over the state of Colorado, which in itself will be well worth while. For its educational effect with reference to the principles and methods of taxation, and to the profound influence that taxing methods have upon industrial and social adjustments, and for that effect alone, the campaign will serve a great purpose.

But there is reason to believe that the Bucklin amendment will receive the necessary popular endorsement. Should that prove to be the case, Colorado will have opened the way for a reform which, while it possesses none of the elements of an emotional and sensational movement, is in the truest sense radical and altogether sane. For that accomplishment full credit will be due Senator Bucklin. He secured the appointment of the commission, he went at his own expense to Australasia, he prepared the instructive and statesmanlike report of the commission, and he has worked without cessation ever since his return, in the most dignified way and with most satisfactory results, to secure favorable legislative action.

A home rule amendment similar in principle to that which the Colorado legislature has just passed under the leadership of Senator Bucklin, is pending before the Texas legislature. Favorable sentiment is strong and growing in Texas, and the committee of one house has reported the amendment back with a recommendation that it be adopted. A vigorous fight for a kindred bill was made in the Delaware lower house. It was defeated, but under circumstances which encourage the hope of its adoption in the early future. By the Elsberg bill before the New York legislature, and the Crafts bill before the legislature of Illinois, the same reform is proposed. A bill of the same character has been brought into the Kansas legislature, and similar bills are pending in other states. Altogether the outlook is promising for

the establishment in this country, at no distant day, of the local option principle of taxation, and for the consequent speedy exemption from tax burdens, of industry, enterprise and thrift, and the taxation exclusively of land monopoly values. By that simple means shall monopoly be undermined, trusts be disintegrated, and all labor be secured abundant opportunity and full and just reward.

After his retirement from the presidency to private life, Benjamin Harrison won a place in the hearts of his fellow citizens which makes his death an occasion for national sorrow in greater degree than the death of an ex-president usually does. His administration was not satisfactory. On one occasion it came near involving us in a jingo war with a South American state, and it was tinged throughout with the worst discolorations of protectionism. This was the administration in which McKinley rose above the surface with his new tariff of abomination, which congress passed and the president signed. Probably no more candidly corrupt misuse of legislative power had ever before in the history of the country been made a party measure. It was so extravagantly corrupt that even James G. Blaine denounced it bitterly. Unfortunately for Mr. Harrison's record as president, that measure, rather than his administrative acts gave character to his administration. He was not at that time clear enough to analyze the fallacious economic doctrines, nor great enough to defy the corrupt and corrupting corporate powers, which were then making his party their own. But from the moment of his return to private life Mr. Harrison began to grow toward that full stature of American manhood and statesmanship to which he had attained when he died. In that interval his real record was made—a record which, for the sake of the democracy and republicanism of the nation, it is to be hoped his countrymen will never cease to honor.

For the voter whose ideas of the responsibilities of citizenship incline him neither to "take to the woods" when confronted with a political dilemma, nor to indulge himself in playing at politics, there is embarrassment enough and to spare in the pending municipal campaign in Chicago. The choice lies between two candidates, Harrison, the democrat, and Hanecy, the republican. One or the other will be elected. And no third candidate has developed strength sufficient to make a vote for him count even as a protest. None has so much as evoked opposition. Aside, therefore, from not voting at all, or from indulging one of several opportunities to play at voting, the Chicago voter's only alternative is Harrison or Hanecy. From partisan considerations, democrats would naturally vote for the former and republicans for the latter. And partisan considerations are not to be ignored. The notion that they have no place in municipal elections is a mistake arising out of the fallacious theory that national affairs are politics while municipal affairs are business. All public affairs, municipal as well as national, are politics; and the same mental tendencies and personal inclinations which separate us into two great camps—one enlisted in support more or less definitely of government by all and for all, and the other in support more or less definitely of government of all and for some—are no more applicable to national than to municipal elections. Moreover, just as our system of government rises from the local unit to the federal aggregation, so, in the nature of things, must our local political parties be as a rule integral parts of corresponding national parties. Partisanship is not necessarily reprehensible. Good partisanship is good citizenship. But partisan considerations are not always properly controlling, and this is most frequently the case in municipal elections. There are times, also, when a conscientious partisan may best serve party purposes in the higher sense by opposing his party. Such is the sit-

uation that at this time confronts the democracy of Chicago. The true interests of the democratic party, both national and local—those interests of principle and policy which alone justify democratic partisanship—call loudly for the defeat of Harrison.

This call would not have been a very embarrassing one to respond to, had the republicans nominated Harlan. Personally above reproach, and in political principle as applied to local government not only a better democrat than he is republican, but an infinitely better democrat than Harrison, democrats could have voted for him without compunction, and his election would at once have saved the democratic party from Harrison's ring, and the city of Chicago from the political cliques and corporate clans that will exploit it no matter which way the election goes. The man the republicans did nominate is a ring politician and corporation tool. If elected he will do all he can to serve the interests of special privilege. But so will Harrison. The only difference between them in this respect is that Harrison cooes gently to anti-monopoly sentiment and Hanecy does not. The monopolists care little which wins. They have stacked the cards so that the game is theirs either way. On this score, therefore, there is nothing to choose, unless Hanecy be favored on the old principle that an open enemy is safer than a treacherous friend.

On the score, however, of purifying the democratic party of Chicago there is something to choose. It is a negative choice, but none the less important on that account. So long as the ring that circles about Harrison remains in control of city hall patronage, so long will the democratic party of the city, and measurably also of the state and the nation, be at the mercy of that ring. To it political principles are nothing. It works with the republican machine of Cook county, trading county tickets for city tickets,

and bartering a presidency for places in the city hall. If anyone refuses to believe that this ring "threw" the presidency last fall, let him compare the deadness of the campaign it then made for Bryan with the very lively campaign it is now making for Harrison. Let him also notice Harrison's popularity among certain kinds of republicans. That Harrison will be re-elected is more than likely. Should he be, it will be part of the price the republican machine paid last fall for Bryan's defeat in Chicago. Nothing could be worse for the democratic party, nor for good local government, either, than the continuance of such a man as mayor in office and of such a ring in control in the party. While that condition remains, the ring dominates democratic primaries, dickers with republican bosses, serves privileged corporations, and altogether demoralizes the party and the community. There can be no true democratic party in Chicago while the democratic ring is in possession of city affairs. The first necessary step is to put it out, and it is not very important who does that. The city can better endure two years of bad government under Hanecy, with the prospect of seeing at the end of that time a campaign of principle, than two years of bad government under Harrison, with no prospect at all except of his using his power of patronage to wring democracy out of the democratic party.

Another negro burning outrage is reported from Texas. The negro was charged with assaulting and murdering a white woman. A confession was obtained from him by a committee of the mob which waited upon him in jail, circumstances which, as all legal experience goes to show, make confessions valueless. He was then chained by the mob to an iron post in the courthouse yard, and after being saturated with oil was burned to death. The tragedy occurred at Corsicana. Worse than the tragedy, in a sense, since it reflects upon the character of the whole peo-

ple, was the coroner's jury verdict. It commended the mob for its crime. But Gov. Sayers proposes to redeem the state from the reputation for barbarism which attaches to it from these negro-burning outrages. He is unrestrained in his expressions of indignation at the behavior of the local authorities at Corsicana, and announces his intention of addressing a special message to the legislature upon the subject.

With reference to southern outrages upon the rights of negroes, the action of Judge Benet and the grand jury of Anderson county, S. C., should not be overlooked. They have brought to the bar of the criminal court, prominent white men of that county for endeavoring, in the guise of labor contracts, to reestablish negro slavery. Back of this courageous judge and grand jury there is, of course, a healthy public sentiment. Otherwise they would have been powerless. And that sentiment is one of the encouraging signs of progress in the south. But there is also an opposing sentiment, which has the temporary strength that comes from tradition, from old habits of thought, and from old race feeling. To challenge such a sentiment, even with the backing of a better but newer one, is no boy's play, and that is what Judge Benet and the Anderson grand jury have done.

By going over to the republican party Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, becomes a pioneer in the movement we have predicted, of the aristocratic and plutocratic elements of the south to join the political procession that Mr. McKinley leads and Mr. Hanna drives. They have been deterred only by fears regarding the race question. As soon as they acquire confidence, as Mr. McLaurin has already, in the intentions of the republican party under Mr. Hanna's management to settle that question in their favor, they will go over to it in shoals. The solid south will then be a memory, except as the negro vote,