

Not at all improbable. When the Supreme Court was placed by the Constitution upon an equality with Congress, the seed of judicial despotism was sown. When Judge Marshall raised it above Congress politically by deciding that it was empowered to veto Congressional legislation in private law suits, the seed began to sprout. Its despotic fruits will be ripe for picking as soon as an aristocratic President and a plutocratic Senate pack it with graduates from the law offices of great corporations. Short of a revolution (or impeachments of a revolutionary character), the United States will then be governed, not by the people through Congress, but by plutocratic corporations through five judges of their own selection. It is possible that President Taft will be the aristocratic President to complete the judicial usurpation which Hamilton designed with so much aristocratic forethought and Marshall fostered so skillfully.

+ +

#### "A Cold Day" in the Philippines.

If Congressman Martin of Colorado can induce Congress to look into that Philippine land deal (pp. 3 and 245) which Mr. Taft's attorney general finds warrant for, he will have done a good piece of work. But can he? He says that 55,000 acres of Friar lands acquired by the United States at approximately \$18 an acre in settlement of the Catholic question in the archipelago, have been sold to the Sugar Trust by President Taft's secretary of war for \$6 an acre, and that President Taft's attorney general, a former law partner of President Taft's brother (who was a lawyer for the Sugar Trust), decides that this is no violation of the law against sales of more than 2,500 acres to one person or corporation, because that law was passed before the government bought these lands. If Congressman Martin has his facts right about this cozy politico-business affair, it will be "a cold day" in the Philippines when he gets a Republican Congress to investigate. Muck-raking has got to stop.

+ +

#### A Business Boosting School Board.

No prophetic powers were necessary to foretell as we did (pp. 194, 222) the removal of Architect Perkins by the Busse Business school board of Chicago. It was a foregone conclusion months before the fact. What is a Business school board for but to serve private business interests at the expense of public educational interests? Such a board has no use for an architect who has a long record of faithful service to public educational in-

terests at the expense of the building contractors' ring. Mr. Perkins is to be congratulated upon his removal by the Busse business board. It is a certificate of professional competency and personal probity.

+ +

#### Progressive Public Opinion.

Like Henry George, Jr., whose letter of travel and observation in the Middle West appears this week in Editorial Correspondence, John Z. White has found a pronounced tendency toward radicalism in public thought. Leaving Chicago last autumn he has been constantly busy keeping lecture appointments in places and before audiences that have only begun to open the doors either of their auditoriums or their minds to the kind of sentiment that Mr. George and Mr. White are offering. Before reaching Denver, where he has been doing platform work for two weeks, Mr. White had worked through the Middle and the Pacific as well as the Rocky Mountain States. In the Pacific States, from Seattle to Los Angeles, through Portland, Sacramento, San Francisco, and many other cities on the route, he spoke to clubs, churches, chambers of commerce, labor organizations, universities, schools; and almost everywhere the newspapers multiplied the influence of his work with full and fair reports. The Sacramento Bee, for example—California's ablest, cleanest and most progressive daily—was notable for its co-operation. The experiences of Mr. White and of Mr. George in the West, like that of Herbert S. Bigelow in Delaware and Maryland (also under the auspices of the Henry George Lecture Association), are but indications of a trend and growth of public opinion, which is constantly expressing itself in these and other ways, to the gratified comprehension of such as have ears to hear and eyes to see the signs of the times.

+ +

#### Death of Simon Mendelson.

Simon Mendelson, an old friend and early helper of Henry George, died on the 5th in New York, at the home of his son-in-law, August Lewis, another of George's friends and coadjutors and one to whom, along with Tom L. Johnson, George dedicated his posthumous book the "Science of Political Economy." Mr. Mendelson was nearly 89 years old. His interest in George's teachings was awakened in 1886, when Mr. George first ran for Mayor of New York on a "land for the people" platform; and though he took no conspicuous part in the George movement, yet among those who did he has been well known

for his unceasing devotion to it for almost a quarter of a century. In his death that movement loses another of its faithful and useful supporters—one who got back from it through the latter part of his long life much of the inspiration and cheerfulness that endeared him to a multitude of friends. Without pain or fear, peacefully and happily, his intellect undimmed, his sympathies unchilled, his faith in the democracy of human brotherhood unquenched, he died the normal death of old age at the end of a useful life.

\* \*

### **Business Principles.**

President Taft doubtless thinks he stands firmly on business principles when he says that the government will take the product of a certain steel works if it is up to contract and won't if it isn't, without regard to its labor controversies. But is that necessarily in harmony with sound business principles? Suppose we were back in the '50's and Mr. Taft were in James Buchanan's place, would he say that the government of the country when it buys supplies is concerned only with the quality of the goods and not at all with the humane treatment of the slaves engaged in doing the work? Why, no decent slaveowner would have considered it "business" to do that, even as a business man. He would have revolted at buying the best possible goods from a manufacturer who resorted to cruelty with his slaves to produce them, just as he would if they had been stolen goods. Should a people's government be less scrupulous? To be sure the steel workers are not chattel slaves; but what is the difference between inhumanity to men who have to work for you on your terms or be flogged, and men who have to do that or starve? So long as government maintains economic conditions that keep freedom of choice out of the labor market, can its highest official be applauded for advising any such easy policy of purchase as that of buying with reference only to product and not at all to the working conditions under which the product is made?

\* \*

### **The Chicago Election.**

One pronounced victory for democratic Democracy was achieved at the municipal elections in Chicago last week. This was the re-election of William E. Dever. He was opposed by the raw grafters and the whisky ring, and the personnel of the voters of his district has so changed during his long service in the Council, as to make his struggle for re-election harder. Yet he has won again. Mr. Dever is one of the real leaders in city poli-

tics. He is a good government man but not a "goo-goo," a politician but neither a low degree nor a high degree grafter, a Democrat who is democratic, and an official to whom public office is a public trust and not a private snap. One man of the same type, Alderman Finn, was defeated; but several new men who are well vouched for to begin with, have been elected. George C. Sikes, among the very best of the candidates, was defeated, probably for that reason; but Alderman Thompson, an insurgent Republican, was re-elected with a large plurality well-earned. Although the elements in the Council are better on the whole than before, the body itself is evidently under the thumb of the Interests. This would at least appear to be so from the chairmanships of committees having the interests of the Interests in hand.

\* \* \*

### **SOCIALISTIC MILWAUKEE.**

One need not be a Socialist to rejoice heartily and sincerely over the great victory of the Social-Democratic party at the municipal election last week in Milwaukee.

For genuine democracy it is the most hopeful event in many a long day.

More than any other recent occurrence in American politics, this victory is significant of the possible passing of the old order and the coming on of the new. It suggests with strong emphasis, at any rate, the breaking down of traditional party lines under pressure of democratic impulses.

\*

This is not to say that Socialism has triumphed, or is about to triumph, in the United States or in Wisconsin or even in Milwaukee. The Socialist who shall think so after the first flush of victory has left a calm in his mind, will mark himself down a poor observer of American politics and a poor judge of the resources of plutocracy, besides piling up for himself mountains of sadness from disappointed expectations.

The Socialist party is indeed in power in Milwaukee, as completely as any party can be in any American municipality under our written constitutions and with hostile courts to interpret them. But it did not get into power through, nor can it stay in power by, the grace of Socialist votes alone. No special expertness in reading election returns is necessary to establish the conclusion that the Socialist candidates in Milwaukee were elected by democratic Democrats and insurgent Republicans, who are not now and but few of whom are ever likely to become strict party Socialists.