

denounced unsparingly as "populistic" less than a quarter of a century ago. And the people rather like the practical application of those principles. Time was when democrats and republicans could be rallied around their party standards for the accomplishment of any old selfish corporation purpose by merely yelling "populism." That day has passed. While far from being an old man, the editor of Will Maupin's Weekly can recall when Nebraska democrats could be lined up by J. Sterling Morton or Dr. Miller or Tobe Castor for any corporation scheme imaginable by merely denouncing the other fellows as "wild-eyed pops." And during that same era of politics John M. Thurston, the shallowest man ever achieving popular favor, could rally his republican henchmen around the old flag to protect any old thieving gang by merely denouncing as "repudiationists and fanatics" all who were opposing graft and extravagance. If Mr. McNeny thinks that he or any other man, or set of men, can halt the march of progress by merely yelling "populism," he should pause and indulge in another spell of thoughtfulness. As a matter of fact, it wouldn't surprise us much to see the "imperial mandate" in force in this country inside of the next decade.

Of course Governor Aldrich's rather sharp and caustic letter to County Attorney English of Omaha will bring down upon the executive head the wrath of certain Omaha parties. But to date Governor Aldrich has not shown any desire to escape the wrath of the aforesaid. If he compels the enforcement of the Alberts law in Douglas county he is going to put a quietus to a very flourishing business that has managed to get a pretty tight grip on the management of both political parties in that bailiwick.

Col. Will Hayward announces that he is soon to shake the dust of Nebraska from his feet and go to New York City to engage in the practice of law. "If I stay in Nebraska I'll fool away my time in politics, but in New York I'll attend to my law business," says Col. Hayward. It is to be regretted that so able a young man as Hayward finds it necessary to go to New York. We need such as he right here in Nebraska—not as politicians, but as pushers for Nebraska's development. But we feel sure that Col. Hayward will get to the front in New York. He has the western push, coupled with natural ability, to make his presence felt. While regretting his determination to leave Nebraska we wish him unbounded success in his new field.

Nooting the fact that Henry L. Stimson of New York, the new secretary of war, is being mentioned as a running mate for Taft next year, the Kearney Hub says: The time must come when the republican party—if it is to continue a national party—must look to the middle west or west for president or vice president." Upon what does the es-

teemed Hub base its prediction? As long as the republican party is the republican party it will be dominated by eastern interests. When it ceases to be dominated by eastern interests it will cease to be the republican party as it now is. And would the esteemed Hub refuse to support republican candidate running on any kind of a platform adopted by a convention made up of delegates labeled republican?

Francis I. Madero, who engineered the successful Mexican revolution, is now tasting the first sweet fruits of victory. In a short time he will bite into the wormy spots, and then the taste will be different. Just now he is being acclaimed a hero. Later he will be denounced as a base ingrate who has forgotten the friends who made him. It is the way of the world.

John W. Gates of "bet a million" and steel fame, declares without equivocation that President Roosevelt was buncoed to a finish by the steel trust when he permitted the absorption by the trust of its only real competitor, the Tennessee Coal and Iron Co. Morgan and the other steel kings made Roosevelt believe that if he didn't sanction that bald violation of the anti-trust law a panic would result. Gates, who is on the inside of the steel business if anybody is, says that it was a gigantic bunco game and that Roosevelt fell for it. As a matter of fact, the more people delve into the Roosevelt history the more they will discover that Roosevelt played—innocently perhaps—into the hands of the "big business interests" with astonishing regularity. The Tennessee Iron and Coal Co. deal, notoriously in violation of the Sherman anti-trust law, is a case in point. Roosevelt's signature as governor to the Alton bond deal is another. By the Tennessee deal he merely riveted the shackles of the steel trust upon the limbs of the people, and when he was criticized for it he flew into the usual Rooseveltian passion and denounced his critics as liars. Now comes one of the beneficiaries of that rotten deal and coolly informs the public how it was buncoed, and reveals how easy it was to fool Roosevelt.

Senator Cummins of Iowa—erstwhile progressive but always bitterly partisan republican—sees a boggy man. "The shadow of a bloody revolution hangs over this republic," declared Cummins at Washington College of Law recently. "Within a decade we will see whether the grievances of today will be settled by law or by the manner that has been in existence for two thousand years, the revolution of bloodshed and violence." We humbly suggest that the Iowa senator take something for it. There is about as much danger of a bloody revolution in this republic as there is that Pike's Peak will slide into the Atlantic ocean. Time was when we hailed as

statesman the man who shook his head mournfully and proclaimed in thunder tones that bloody revolution impended if the reforms he advocated were not speedily brought about. Now we just laugh. Catch us exposing our persons to shot and shell and bayonet to accomplish something far easier accomplished by voting intelligently. We are making rapid forward strides along reform lines, thank you. Not so rapid as we would like, of course, but still quite rapid enough to keep our blood from growing sluggish. Just as soon as we can make it impossible for courts to shackle our energies and deprive us of our rights by judge made laws, we'll make even more rapid advance. Some of these days we'll make it impossible for men to purchase special privileges from lawmakers, and then we'll attend to the matter of equalizing opportunities. We'll not achieve perfection this year, nor next. Nor will we achieve it in this decade, or the next. But it will be achieved, just the same. A few years ago the initiative and referendum was dubbed "revolutionary." It's here, and without a trace of blood upon it. We are going to get all the rest of them in exactly the same way, dear Senator.

OUR UNJUST TAXING SYSTEM

Elsewhere is printed the report of the taxation division of the Rural Life Commission of Nebraska. It is especially recommended to the attention of those progressive citizens who are seeking to secure some advanced method of raising revenue—a method that will be just to all.

There can be but one end to any rational investigation of the taxing system made with a view to devising an equitable system. That will be to cease putting a tax on enterprise for the benefit of speculators; to cease fining a man for being thrifty and public spirited and giving the increase to men who have done nothing. In other words, it will result eventually in giving us a revenue system whereby the public expenses are paid out of community made values. In other words, the values that are created by communities will be used by the communities for the benefit of all, not for the benefit of speculators. And the men whose toil and enterprise and thrift make cities and towns will not be fined for their push and progressiveness. There is just a hint of this in the report mentioned—the taxing division's roster showing the names of enough single taxers to leaven the whole lump if given time. The wonder is that such a crude, unjust, bunglesome and inequitable system of taxation as the one we suffer under today has been allowed to exist as long as it has.

With state buildings in such unrepair that infant inmates are seriously injured by falling plastering, isn't it about time to think of electing a legislature that knows the difference between economy and niggardliness?