

at first aroused sympathetic interest, this interest is turning quite the other way, as later developments come to be better understood. Mrs. Catharine Waugh McCulloch probably expressed the prevailing sentiment when, as a recent suffrage speech of hers in Milwaukee is reported, she said: "I wish English suffragettes could be persuaded to drop their brickbats. The antics of those British women cannot be forgiven. We could not expect to convert a Wisconsin voter to support the suffrage plank by shying brickbats at him."



Henry George's Thought in Sculpture.

Miss Ella Buchanan, the Kansan student of sculpture under Charles J. Mulligan at the Art Institute, Chicago, she whose "Votes for Women"* is attracting deserved attention, has just finished

"Progress and Poverty."



"This association of poverty with progress is the great 'enigma' of our times. . . . It is the riddle which the Sphinx of Fate puts to our civilization, and which not to answer is to be destroyed."—Henry George in "Progress and Poverty."

*See The Public of September 22, 1911, page 971.

a sketch in clay intended to symbolize the great agitational work of Henry George. At the heart of all he wrote or spoke or did, was this one penetrating question: "Why does Poverty keep pace with Progress?" The fact that it does, was to his thought "the central fact from which spring industrial, social and political difficulties that perplex the world, and with which statesmanship and philanthropy and education grapple in vain." All else that Henry George said or did was in explanation of this central thought, and of the necessity and the means of freeing progress from its clinging parasite. Miss Buchanan has seized upon that thought to pay the tribute of an artist to George's work, and of a daughter to the memory of a father who was devoted to George's ideals and ideas. That she has succeeded, both in grasp of subject and in simplicity yet significance of expression, may be inferred but cannot be wholly appreciated from the accompanying side view of her design.



Good Government in Milwaukee.

Citizens of Milwaukee who really believe in honest municipal government will vote for Mayor Seidel's re-election next Tuesday, or stultify their professions. The opposition, led nominally by the Democratic machine with a Republican candidate, is nothing but a "combine" of both machines and a business organization to restore bad government.



Hasn't the Republican machine given Milwaukee bad government whenever it has had the chance to influence government at all? Hasn't the Democratic machine made municipal government in Milwaukee a stench as far as its aroma could carry? And what is the business association which comes into this delectable "combine" but an aggregation of privilege-seekers and law-evaders? There is not in the whole thing so much as a pretense of promoting good government which isn't a joke among the pretenders themselves.



The sole object of that "combine" is to unify prejudices against Socialism so as to turn the Socialists out of local office—business prejudice, political prejudice, church prejudice, and all the rest. But how can genuine good-government voters, genuine non-partisans, voters who truly believe in divorcing national partisanship from municipal administration—how can any such voter vote against the Socialists in Milwaukee and in favor of this Republican-Democratic-Big-Busi-

ness-and-Bad-Government combine? How can any professed good government man do it and not laugh in his own face? The first attempt at good city government in Milwaukee for years, and the most non-partisan, is that which the Socialists are giving under the administration of Mayor Seidel.

That mistakes have been made by the Socialists is probably true, but they were not made dishonestly; Milwaukee has been free from graft under Mayor Seidel. That there has been Socialistic partisanship is also doubtless true; but under the "non-partisan" gangs now seeking restoration as bi-partisans, there was seldom anything but partisanship, apart from graft—and not always apart from graft either. The Socialist party in Milwaukee has clearly sought to give the best service to all the legitimate interests of that city, regardless of party; and what else is it that genuine non-partisans demand? There is certainly nothing else they can demand consistently. Then what assurances of good faith will non-partisans of Milwaukee who are not Socialists have to offer, if, after the Socialists have given them the best municipal government they have ever had, they restore the gangsters to office because, forsooth, the Socialists are a political party and the gangsters have for election day only become "non-partisan"?

No Trifling with Reactionaries.

William J. Bryan's announcement regarding Governor Harmon's Presidential aspirations is a welcome pledge. Explaining that Governor Harmon cannot be nominated without the active aid of the Interests, and justly implying that his nomination would not be democratic in any sense that could make a Democratic victory worth while, Mr. Bryan's editorial in the Commoner of last week announces:

If Nebraska's Democracy instructs for Mr. Harmon, Mr. Bryan will refuse to serve as a delegate (in case he is elected), but will, instead, go to Baltimore as an individual, and as an individual do what he can to secure the nomination of a progressive Democrat.

This is full and fair notice to the Interests, and all their political office boys, that they cannot baffle the democratic uprising in this country by annexing the Democratic party. You who think differently, read the history of your country in the early fifties, when the slave oligarchy did what the plutocracy of today is trying to do. Read that history and be wise. Should a reactionary like Governor Harmon be nominated by the Demo-

crats, Bryan himself could not keep millions of his followers from voting for the Republican candidate. Not unless the Republican candidate were a reactionary like Taft; and in that case Bryan could not prevent millions of his followers from uniting with millions of La Follette's to defeat both reactionaries. No manufactured third party would this one be. It would be a spontaneously generated third party, like the Republican party of more than half a century ago.

In Recognition of Fidelity.

It may not be very important whom the Democrats nominate for Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, nor perhaps whom the people elect, although this office has legislative functions which might at any crisis be important; but wholly aside from any question of the functions of the office, there is a democratic reason why democratic Democrats should vote for Frank D. Comerford. Every such vote is a tribute to his fidelity as a former member of the legislature. When first elected to the Illinois legislature, he discovered its "jackpot" methods and publicly denounced them. The "jackpotters" expelled him; his district re-elected him; and the "jackpotters" crookedly kept him out of his seat. That was before the limelight had fallen so brightly upon "jackpot" methods at Springfield. What all the people now know regarding those methods, Mr. Comerford tried to tell them nearly ten years ago and was disciplined for it by the gang, nor with any tender touch. To nominate and elect him Lieutenant Governor now, would be a gracious recognition by the people of Illinois of his fidelity to their interests at a time and under circumstances when that kind of fidelity was a costly indulgence. Why not be as keen, good people, to reward costly fidelity in office when it is discovered as to denounce profitable infidelity when it is exposed?

Roosevelt's Democratic Views.

As there is no reason yet to believe that Theodore Roosevelt in a place of power would be any less Napoleonic than ever in his personal ambitions and usurpation tendencies, his defeat at the North Dakota primaries last week is an event to be glad of; but his service as an advocate of democratic progress is not to be despised, and in this he has never appeared to such advantage as in his Carnegie Hall speech in New York on the 20th. That speech is a model above anything in the way either of speech-making or of democratic sentiment that