his woman suffrage editorial. Although there are spots in it which look like traces of a tendency toward "weaseling," the weasel words, if they were ever in the manuscript, were blue-penciled out of it before its delivery. Mr. Roosevelt's declarations for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall are unqualified and definite. His speech is therefore of the highest importance as a sign of favorable public sentiment. It proves better than newspaper editorials can, almost as well as a census on the subject could, or an election at which it was the dominant issue, that the people of the United States demand the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, demand them all, demand them in their fullness, and demand them now.

Ex-President Roosevelt for President.

That Mr. Roosevelt's Columbus speech was made as a prelude to his becoming the Progressive candidate for the Republican nomination for President was suspected when he delivered it. This motive is now proved. No reasonable room for questioning it remains after one considers that the speech was delivered between the formal request of his friends that he become a candidate and his formal acquiesence, and that this significant sequence is very narrowly bounded in point of time: (1) request, February 10; (2) Columbus speech, February 21; (3) acceptance, February 26. In no respect, however, does that suspicion, now confirmed, minimize the importance of the speech with reference to the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. It rather emphasizes the inference that those methods of democracy are urgently demanded by public opinion. Pitifully at fault would Mr. Roosevelt's instincts be were he deliberately to enter a Presidential race handicapped with unpopular proposals. It must be remembered that his instinctive appreciation of public sentiment is never keener than his instinctive desire for victory. But we have no inclination by this reference to motives to chill any one's enthusiasm for Mr. Roosevelt's candidacy. We emphasize the service he renders the movement for democratic control of representative government by his definite and unqualified pronouncement for it, and we dwell upon the added value of the speech for that purpose if it be considered as his Presidential platform; but this is in order to center attention upon the tremendous advance the movement has made, and not to condemn a new leadership which it has evoked.

To new leadership there should be no objection, provided it be strong and coupled with fidelity. If Mr. Roosevelt be a recent and sudden convert, this should not count against his candidacy. In politics and warfare as well as in business, the question is never of an "original Jacobs" but of "delivery of the goods." New occasions not only teach new duties; they also make strange political associates and bring effective leadership from unthought-of quarters. So far from opposing Roosevelt's candidacy, we welcome it. For even as Roosevelt's Columbus speech is valuable as a barometer of public opinion, so his candidacy will be valuable in drawing a sharp line between the democratic purposes and methods he now bluntly avows, and the plutocratic purposes and methods of which Mr. Taft must therefore be the Republican protagonist undisguised and unashamed.

It does not follow, though, that Mr. Roosevelt should be welcomed by Progressives as the actual candidate of the Republican party, much less that he should be welcomed as President again. It is one thing to be grateful to him for the thunderbolt he has hurled at Hamiltonian plutocracy, and much the same thing to applaud him in his struggle with Taft as the democratic champion in an extraordinary prize fight; but a very different thing would it be to contemplate with gratification his re-entry into the White House and his resumption of the power he has shown so ready a disposition to use arbitrarily. Let us not be misled by his democracy. Bonaparte also was a democrat, but his democracy led to an imperial throne; and Roosevelt is the type of democrat that Napoleon was. When self-governing peoples have fallen under absolute rule, the absolute ruler (except upon conquest from without) has usually been a Bonaparte or a Roosevelt, a man of destiny and instinct whose rough and ready democracy has enabled him to lift himself to irresponsible personal power "in the name and with the might of the people."

We are not unmindful of the circumstances that incline Progressives just now toward this man of instinct as the American man of destiny. He seems to be the politically strong man, the man who can win, the only man under whose leadership plutocracy can be put down at the next election. Part of this strength is due, no doubt, to mere factional revolts against President Taft for "turning down" Roosevelt and Roosevelt's friends and breaking promises to Roosevelt after Roosevelt had made him President; and out of this situation Mr. Roosevelt may number a powerful fol-

Digitized by Google

lowing of mercenaries—powerful in the nominating convention and powerful at the polls. But let us make no mistake, he also has a tremendous and disinterested progressive following under splendid and disinterested leadership. Republicans in shoals who have been only recently awakened to the dangers to American democracy are looking to him. Perhaps it is a mirage they see—the upright image of an inverted democrat. We think it is. Yet they may say that they have drawn from him that Columbus speech; and we freely acknowledge, not only that this is a great triumph for them but that it may be a sufficient guarantee of good faith and an ample bond for good behavior. At any rate we are bound to recognize the force of their contention when they argue that Roosevelt is the only man who, in the Republican convention, can defeat Taft the plutocratic Republican, and the only Republican who can defeat a Democratic reactionary at the polls if the plutocrats carry the Democratic convention.

But will Mr. Roosevelt be as strong politically as progressive Republicans of the Governor Johnson type think him, and as indeed he seems to be? Granted that a large contingent of mercenaries will follow no one but him into the Progressive camp; granted that he has a large following of baseball fans, sporty-minded collegiates, "by-george" bad men, and chewing-gum democrats, as well as a vast following of earnest democratic Republicans; granted that his Columbus speech will tend to fire enthusiasm for him among thoughtful democrats in all parties; granted that if the Initiative, Referendum and Recall were once firmly established in the heart of our representative system of government, we might safely trust good men in office, even the bad good-men, regardless of their opinions or ambitions, and no longer fear usurpation by a democratic Bonaparte,—grant it all, and yet Mr. Roosevelt once in the fight might encounter political obstacles that would make the progressive Republicans wish, even on the point of relative political strength, that they had clung to La Follette. Mr. Roosevelt must struggle with the "third term" objection, the logical unsoundness of which we freely concede. It is true that his election this year would not be for a third term in the objectionable sense. The only sound objection to a third term is that it may enable a President to perpetuate himself in office, as Diaz of Mexico did. Inasmuch, then, as Roosevelt was only acting President in his first term, and there has been an interval since his second, the objection to a third term does not apply logically. But public feeling seldom makes logical distinctions very strictly. Mr. Roosevelt having been President one full term as President and almost one full term as acting President (another distinction not likely to be weighty with the man in the street), his election this year would be for "a third term" in popular apprehension. Moreover, didn't Mr. Roosevelt promise that if elected in 1904 he wouldn't be a candidate again? Here are elements of unfathomable political weakness. With all the power behind ex-President Grant, his friends were unable to nominate him for a third term, although it would have been after an interval and there were no pledges to embarrass them. If it be said in reply that Grant's prior administrations were against him, what about Roosevelt's? His Panama usurpation will be no boy's-play issue in a Presidential campaign if flung at his candidacy. Neither will the now notorious campaign-fund affair, nor his Napoleonic interference with due process of law in behalf of the steel trust's Coal and Iron grab. As it proceeds, Mr. Roosevelt's campaign is likely to look less and less attractive to progressive Republicans, although the Columbus speech with which he opened it is of incalculable value in advertising the popular strength of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, thereby adding strength to strength for those controlling reforms.

Murdering the Souls of Men.

Worse than all the dynamite outrages ever perpetrated—worse for the victims, worse for their families, worse for society—are those cases of soul-murder by rich and respectable beneficiaries of special privileges of which Senator La Follette tells in the March installment of his autobiography in the American Magazine. Here is one of the instances he gives of this wicked and cruel dynamiting of the morals of public men:

> Assemblyman E. was a fine young fellow, and regarded as thoroughly reliable. He was often in the executive office and I trusted him absolutely. . . . He was one of the most enthusiastic men we had, and being a high-spirited, energetic young fellow, he was of great assistance in our fights. Whenever we gathered a little group of the members in the Executive office to talk over any critical situation in the legislature, E. was always with us. He was an active young manufacturer. He often talked with us about his business. I think he had some special machine which enabled him to make his product more cheaply than other manufacturers. One day E. Ray Stevens came into my office and said, "Governor, I wish you would send up and ask E. to come down here. I don't just like the way he talks." "Why," I said, "Ray, there can't be anything wrong with E." Then I began to think that he had not

Digitized by Google