

delegation from Illinois," which has long been a standing price for all Hearst favors in this State.

+ +

The Forthcoming Los Angeles Election.

Job Harriman's nomination for Mayor of Los Angeles at the direct primaries last month should gratify every sympathetic reader of *The Public*.* We speak of him alone because he is at the head of his ticket; but we allude also to his associate nominees, for no one could in such circumstances wish for the election of a Council hostile to the Mayor. That Mr. Harriman and his associates may be elected in December we earnestly hope. Not that we stand for Socialism in its class-conscious politics or all its doctrinaire economics. We do not. But we believe that the time is past in this country for opposing Socialists merely because they are Socialists. Practical democratic policies are now so far upon us that tolerance of differences of opinion on particular points—however important those points may be in the abstract, if they are not yet "the question before the house" in our politics—should be the order of the day among those of us who are struggling for democracy. To be sure this is no reason for voting the Socialist ticket where the party is still a political toy. That is the special function of thorough-going Socialists, if it is anybody's. But where Socialist candidates are factors in an election, their opponents must be exceedingly attractive in point of democratic pioneering to deter any fundamental democrat from voting for the Socialists.

+

No democrat not a Socialist wants to join the Socialist party; it is too narrowly class-partisan for that—too creed-bound in its terms of membership, too absurdly cock-sure and arrogant not to say domineering in spirit, and too specific in the program it makes for future generations. On the other hand, the Socialist party doesn't want any members who are not thorough-going, creed-bound Socialists. But party membership should not govern in the matter of votes. With genuine democrats the promotion of their cause is all-controlling. What if they do not participate in the councils of a victory they help to win? Only the few can do that under any circumstances, and the ballot is participation enough if there be effective machinery for using it. Not the party but the cause—that is the thing. And how better can genuine democrats promote their cause in Los Angeles at the approaching election than by voting for Job Harriman? Surely not by voting

for Mayor Alexander. He is a "goo-goo," not a democrat; and while some democrats are "goo-goos," and some other "goo-goos" become democrats, the natural characteristics of the "goo-goo" are those of the tory, who would superimpose "good government" from above instead of developing it from within. And if it be urged against Harriman that he stands for "class" in government, shall it be overlooked that Mayor Alexander does also? And that Mayor Alexander's "class" loyalty is to a dominant and more or less parasitical "class," whereas Mr. Harriman's is to the "class" that pays its own way in the world with its own work? Say "interests" instead of "classes," and see where you come out in a comparison of those two candidates.

+

We have had some experience in this country now with Socialist Mayors, and there doesn't seem to be much for them to be ashamed of. The blush of shame should be on the other face. Since Tom L. Johnson's administrations in Cleveland there has been no better-governed city than Milwaukee under Mayor Seidel, simply as matter of good government; and the administration of J. Stitt Wilson as Mayor of Berkeley, California, though this is a smaller city, gives promise of equally gratifying results in administration and democracy. Harriman is a Socialist of similar type, a citizen of similar qualities, from whom as much may be expected if he becomes Mayor of Los Angeles. There is no reason why "good government" men who mean good government for all, Singletax men who want land values taxation as soon as possible, and all other genuine democrats who have the conviction and the courage of their democracy, should not vote for Job Harriman. Reasons why they should are abundant.

+ + +

GOVERNOR GARVIN'S BIRTHDAY.

This is to celebrate the seventieth birthday of the forty-fifth and forty-sixth Governor of the State of Rhode Island—not because he was twice Governor of Rhode Island, nor merely because he is seventy years old, but because he has for thirty of those seventy years devoted his thought and energies to the service of his fellow men.

+

Lucius Fayette Clarke Garvin was born in Tennessee, at Knoxville, on the 13th of November, 1841. Except by accident of birth, however, he was not a Southerner but a New Englander,

*See current volume of *The Public*, pages 493, 899.