

for their respective clients are in harmony with the fundamental political principles they respectively avow.



Judge Dunne for Governor.

Both the strength of Judge Dunne's candidacy for Governor and the importance to the democratic Democracy of Illinois of making it successful, are attested by the hysterical opposition its announcement has called out from Hearst. Whoever is any longer misled by Hearst, sins against light. In the politics of San Francisco, of New York and of Chicago he has revealed himself for what he is—a mere self-seeker, unprincipled, unattached, and ready for any kind of political adventure that promises spoils for Hearst. The spoils Hearst seeks now are *delegates* to the Democratic national convention, where he calculates to figure as a "dark horse." Part of his plan is to push into the background, with his buccaneering newspapers, every strong candidate for President, and into the foreground temporarily the weaker ones. Hence his slambang opposition to Governor Wilson; hence, also, his fatal friendliness to Speaker Clark, with Mayor Harrison held in reserve in case Clark grows strong. The other part of Hearst's plan—"delegates, delegates, delegates for Mr. Hearst," as his factotum, the irrepressible Mr. Lawrence, is wont to express it—necessitates his opposition to the gubernatorial candidacy of Edward F. Dunne. The matter is perfectly plain. At the approaching Democratic primaries any vote *against* Dunne, from whatever motive, will turn out to be a vote *for* Hearst. The democratic Democrats of Chicago understand this. If those in the rest of the State do not, they would do well to inform themselves before they vote.



Graham Romeyn Taylor.

Thousands all over the United States will sympathize in a spirit of friendliness with this young man in his suffering from the deadly blow of a mysterious assailant. As one of the editors of The Survey, he has come to be widely appreciated for a devotion and usefulness that were known before and are better known now by personal friends in Chicago. A son of Graham Taylor, he grew up at the Chicago Commons among struggling masses to whose influence it was in his infancy supposed to be the height of folly to subject the youth of a Christian family! His career has fully justified his parents' democratic confidence. It has been surmised—an error probably—that it was this

career that provoked the assault from which he suffers, for his work has not been calculated to comfort interests that keep thugs among their retainers. At any rate, The Survey has been doing valiant and valuable social service, and Graham Romeyn Taylor has the right to share in the honor of it even as some have surmised he is now sharing in its incidental dangers.



Hiram Petty.

Well known in Rochester, Minnesota, and throughout his county of Olmstead, as a courageous and vigilant soldier in the army of the Common Good, and one of the long-time friends and promoters of The Public, Hiram Petty died with the coming in of the new year. He was a highly respected man in his community; none the less so because he utilized his wide knowledge of public affairs effectively in unofficial public service. Neighbors to whom his carefully thought-out opinions seemed a novelty at first, learned to respect them and to take light from them in their citizenship. From such men and in such ways this world gets its progress. To the full corn in the ear, their neighborhood work is as the seed which dies only to sprout again and multiply itself.



The Russian-Treaty Abrogation.

Those of us who recall the proceedings for abrogating the Russian treaty will remember that great stress was laid by Administration agencies upon the "offensive tone" of Congressman Sulzer's resolution which the House adopted and the Senate shelved. That resolution ought not to be forgotten. It declared the true democratic attitude of the United States in all such matters, with reference not alone to American Jews, but to Americans of *all* races and religions. Since its terms were objectionable to President Taft and to a majority of the Senate, we quote the declaration in full:

That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the government of the United States concludes its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate, between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citi-

zens, on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of one year after the date of notification to the government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the government of Russia.

Now, why were the President and Senators opposed to that resolution? Was it the democracy of it? Did they see that it would include Negro citizens, for instance, and might become embarrassing as a precedent? They didn't say so. What they said was that the Russian government had protested against that form, and that therefore its adoption would be an affront to a friendly Power. But Russia had in fact not protested. An error of the Associated Press, widely published, indeed gave an appearance of truth to this plea of a Russian protest; but the Associated Press correction, not widely published, was ignored. Here is the proof, over the signature of the General Manager of the Associated Press, Mr. Stone, in a letter to Congressman Sulzer:

It is quite true that in a dispatch dated Washington, December 16th, The Associated Press was led to say that the Russian Government had protested against the House resolution through Ambassador Bakhmeteff. But on December 18 we carried and transmitted to the American newspapers a rather lengthy dispatch from St. Petersburg in which the Russian Foreign Office denied explicitly that any such protest had been made. Also, on the same date we carried a dispatch from Washington quoting Secretary Knox as saying that Russia had not protested either "against the abrogation of the treaty or against the language of the Sulzer resolution." So that it seems to me we have already clarified the situation as well as it is possible for us to do.

Evidently the pigeon-holing of the Sulzer resolution was not to oblige Russia. Nor was it lightly done. There was a purpose, and now this purpose seems obvious. For the Senate solemnly to declare the equality of citizenship rights under treaties, regardless of race, might make much trouble in the future for gentlemen of Senatorial and Presidential size who never cross race lines except when angling for race votes.



La Follette and New Political Parties.

It is doubtful if the philosophy of new political parties has anywhere or by any one been more exactly and briefly stated than by Senator La Follette in his autobiography in the American

Magazine for February. "New parties," he writes, "are brought forth from time to time, and groups of men have come forward as their heralds, and have been called to leadership and command. But the leaders did not create the party. *It was the ripe issue of events.* It came out of the womb of time, and no man could hinder or hasten the event. No one can foretell the coming of the hour. It may be near at hand. It may be otherwise."



Singletax Progress.

Sad indeed is the fate of that Singletaxer who in these days sits upon his back-porch and mourns because the Singletax does not progress. Were he to shift positions to his front-porch, and wipe away his blinding tears, he could see the Singletax procession moving forward on the main highway. Many a Singletaxer can remember—it isn't very long ago—when he would have given his right hand to be assured that by this time the Singletax would be half as far ahead as it actually is. But back-porch mourners are so lost in sorrow that they forget to help make the procession move. Because it isn't yet moving exactly in the way or in the place they hoped for, they leave the work and the responsibility to others. The English movement is across the seas, alas; and alack, the Canadian movement is over the border; while Seattle is only a town, and Oregon and Missouri are in the far-away woods! Yet in Seattle and Oregon and Missouri the Singletax fight is on. Whether it wins or not in any of them is a secondary consideration. The merits of the question will be talked about and written about and thought about in those places—yes, and elsewhere—until the vote is cast, and afterwards too, no matter how the vote goes—with a keenness and vigor that only such campaigns as these can provoke. For propaganda purposes alone, these opportunities are magnificent compared with ordinary ones, and for home purposes everywhere these campaigns will be beneficial, and if successful where they are waged will be triumphs everywhere.



But who is doing it all? *You*, if you are helping. But before you are the men and women of Seattle and Oregon and Missouri, without whose activity and devotion not even the chance for a fight would be at hand. They can't make the fight what it ought to be, though, if they are unaided; and there is your opportunity, public spirited reader! If you have done something and are will-