

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

Mr. Roosevelt has ever before achieved. Simply as a speech, it is better thought out and better constructed than his speeches usually are; and as a declaration of democracy it is analytical, discriminative and consistent to a degree quite unusual with Mr. Roosevelt. If general confidence in the ex-President's appreciation of and faithfulness to the utterances of this speech were equal to the respect the speech and its sentiments deserve, Mr. Roosevelt would occupy a worthier place than he does in democratic estimation. But as it is, the minds of thoughtful and reasonably cautious democrats of all political parties slip back very easily from enthusiasm over the speech to recollections, from the Philippines to Panama, of Mr. Roosevelt's autocratic conduct when in power. By doing as Governor Wilson has done, acknowledging earlier errors and distinctly renouncing them, Mr. Roosevelt would give vastly more value to his later opinions as the pledges of a candidate in the Presidential campaign.



Apart from his candidacy, however, the merit and usefulness of that Carnegie Hall speech must be acknowledged. It is no small matter, in the work of democratic progress, that Mr. Roosevelt, whatever his motives or however vacillating his democratic fidelity, should set the whole nation to thinking upon such responses as these to President Taft's plea for aristocracy:

Whenever there is tyranny of the majority I shall protest against it with all my heart and soul. But we are to-day suffering from the tyranny of minorities. It is a small minority that is grabbing our coal deposits, our water powers and our harbor fronts.

It is a small minority that lies behind monopolies and trusts.

It is a small minority that stands behind the present law of master and servant, the sweat-shops and the whole calendar of social and industrial injustice.

The only tyranny from which men, women and children are suffering in real life are the tyrannies of minorities.

I am not thinking only of those special interests which by grosser methods, by bribery and crime, have stolen from the people. I am thinking as much of their respectable allies and figureheads, who have ruled and legislated and decided as if in some way the vested rights of privilege had a first mortgage on the whole United States, while the rights of all the people were merely an unsecured debt.

Mr. Taft's position is the position that has been held from the beginning of our government, although not always so openly held, by a large number of reputable and honorable men who, down at bottom, distrust popular government, and, when they must accept it, accept it with reluctance, and hedge it around with every species of restriction and check

and balance, so as to make the power of the people as limited and as ineffective as possible. Mr. Taft fairly defines the issue when he says that our government is and should be a government of all the people by a representative part of the people. This is an excellent and moderate description of an oligarchy. It defines our government as a government of all of the people by a few of the people.

On the subject of Recall of judges, Mr. Roosevelt is in this speech discriminative without "weaseling," and sound beyond successful contradiction. These clauses of his speech are examples:

Mr. Taft says that the judiciary ought not to be "representative" of the people in the sense that the legislature and the executive are. This is perfectly true of the judge when he is performing merely the ordinary functions of a judge in suits between man and man. It is not true of the judge engaged in interpreting, for instance, the due process clause—where the judge is ascertaining the preponderant opinion of the people (as Judge Holmes states it). When he exercises that function he has no right to let his political philosophy reverse and thwart the will of the majority. In that function the judge must represent the people or he falls in the test the Supreme Court has laid down.

In a great many States there has been for many years a real recall of the judges as regards appointments, promotions, reappointments and re-elections; and this recall was through the turn of a thumbscrew at the end of a long distance rod in the hands of great interests. I believe that a just judge would feel far safer in the hands of the people than in the hands of those interests.



### Lifting Burdens.

Speaking of tax burdens on producers, let this offer of The Equitable Taxation League of Kansas City be thoughtfully considered:

Last year the Commercial Club asked the business men of this city to contribute \$100,000 for a publicity and convention fund. Much hard work was done, but only \$37,385 was subscribed. It was a keen disappointment that this fund was not raised. Nevertheless the Club brought many notable conventions to our city, but those gatherings gave us only a temporary advantage. We have a much better proposition to offer. The proposed amendment to our tax laws will give a thousand times more trade and advertising advantage every year, and that benefit will not only continue, but will steadily increase with the coming year. And further, you can secure the greater benefit at less cost. The adoption of the amendment will lift \$15,000,000 annual burden from the industries of Missouri.

Do you ask how that grand result is to be secured? The process is simple. Merely abolish all taxes on producers. And that is what this Tax League proposes. But how, then, are public services to be paid for? Out of those values which good government gives to the *monopoly* of land but not to the use of land. Think it over.