moment, as was shown when this republican president made a southerner and ex-confederate, a Roman Catholic and democrat, chief justice of the United States."

Can anyone imagine that any of Mr. Taft's predecessors would be afraid to make public the written and verbal recommendations upon which the appointments to the supreme court were made? "No sectional, no religious, no partisan considerations will weigh with Mr. Taft for a moment," but it happens that every one of his associate justices line up with his new chief justice in reversing the twenty year attitude of the United States supreme court. They unite in making that chief justice's minority opinion the court's opinion and registering a decree which George W. Perkins has called the only vestige of an attempt in behalf of the republican party to redeem the party's platform pledge that the Sherman anti-trust law would be amended.

No wonder Mr. Taft is afraid of the light!

THE REAL CAUSE

The Omaha Bee takes a paper to task for saying that personality counts more in a national campaign than the platform. The Bee refers to the campaign of 1896 as an illustration mentions the crowds and charges the defeat of the party to the platform. It intends to compliment Mr. Bryan at the expense of the politics for which he stood. The Bee is mistaken, however, in overlooking the most potent factor in that defeat, namely the power of money. The republican party collected from favor-seeking corporations and spent in that campaign more than that party had spent in all its former campaigns combined. Every man who would sell his vote was bought, but even this would not have been sufficient. It was supplemented by coercion practiced by money loaners on borrowers, by bankers on merchants and manufacturers and by employers on employes. It required all of these aids to save the republican party from defeat and than it barely escaped. Twenty thousands votes changed from one side to the other in the close states would have changed the results. Let us keep the record straight.

The party was not defeated in 1896 because of its platform—that platform is being vindicated by time and is being indorsed by republicans today, but even then it would have been indorsed had the people been free to vote as they shouted.

WHY MR. TAFT DOES NOT ANSWER

"It would be practically impossible to convict a trust magnate in a criminal court," asserts William J. Bryan in The Commoner. Taking up President Taft's challenge relating to the supreme court's recent decision relative to the trusts, which Bryan characterizes as a "bluff," Bryan answers and challenges the president to give facts regarding the appointment of the supreme court justices. In view of the fact that all President Taft's appointments to the supreme court took the trust side of the question it is not at all likely that the president will reveal the influences that caused him to make the appointments. Taft has so far shown that he is true to the powers that made him, and will continue to be. Taft does not trust the people. This explains his tactics since he began his western trip. He has a hard road to travel in making apologies for his mistakes, and has no time to answer Mr. Bryan.—Los Angeles Democrat.

PRESIDENT TAFT'S IDEAL

In his speech at Pocatello, Idaho, President Taft is reported to have said: "I love judges and I love courts. They are my ideals on earth that typify what we shall meet afterward in heaven under a just God."

Because the recall can not be used on the Almighty he seems to think that the recall ought not to be applied to men on the bench, but he forgets that judges are not CREATORS but CREATURES. They are chosen by the people through elections or by officials through appointment. If they are appointed by officials the people should know upon whose recommendation.

Who asked President Taft to appoint Chief Justice White, Justice Hughes and the other justices who took the trust side of the trust question?

OUGHT NOT TO BE SECTIONAL

They say the initiative, referendum and recall are not as popular in the east as in the west. Are the people not so well informed on the issues? Or have the people less confidence in themselves?

A WORD TO FIRST VOTERS

Young men, life is before you. Two voices are calling you—one coming from the swamps of selfishness and force, where success means death; and the other from the hilltops of justice and progress, where even failure brings glory. Two lights are seen in your horizon—one the fast fading marsh light of power, and the other the slowly rising sun of human brotherhood. Two ways lie open for you—one leading to an ever lower and lower plain, where are heard cries of despair and the curses of the poor, where manhood shrivels and possession rots down the possessor; and the other leading off to the highlands of the morning, where are heard the glad shouts of humanity and where honest effort is rewarded with immortality.

JOHN P. ALTGELD.

A PALPABLE HIT

Speaking of the Tobacco trust's plan of dissolution, Attorney General Wickersham says: "I am surprised that the business men of this country have not taken more advantage of that section of the law which permits the collection of threefold damages when they have been injured by a trust. That section is a powerful lever, and if the smaller business men would resort to it more the big fellows who are organized illegally would have more respect for the law."

Commenting upon Mr. Wickersham's statement, the New York World makes this palpable hit: "On the other hand, the country can not understand why the administration does not take more advantage of that section of the law which makes it possible to send to jail individuals guilty of violating the anti-trust act. This section is also 'a powerful lever,' and if the administration would resort to it 'the big fellows' who are organized illegally would have more respect for the law. How long in cases of combinations such as have recently been adjudged illegal will the men really responsible for their unlawful acts and methods be permitted to escape criminal prosecution?"

STRAINING A POINT

The New York World pays the late John M. Harlan a tribute and then takes occasion to use his honorable career as an argument against the recall of judges. The World says:

"For thirty-four years Justice Harlan made history as a member of the greatest judicial tribunal known to civilization. His record is one that no historian would ever feel called upon to explain or apologize for. It has always explained itself. But as he passes from the scene the institutions that produced him are afflicted with a curious propaganda and bedevilled by an amazing mania. We are asked to believe that a system which puts a John Marshall Harlan upon the bench is wrong, and that schemes should be devised by which federal judges could be elected by popular vote in the heat of partisan campaigns. We are asked also to believe that other schemes should be devised by which such judges should no longer serve for life or during good behavior, but should be recalled by a minority of the voters whenever they happen to run counter to popular passion and prejudice in the administration of justice.

"We know of no better answer to this reckless agitation than the career of Justice Harlan himself. A judicial system that produces John Marshall Harlans is its own defense and its own justification."

The World is straining a point pretty badly. Surely its readers will not forget that when it came to trust decisions there was among the nine members of the court only one John M. Harlan.

And the illustrious career of this grand old man may not be used as a certificate of character to the undeserving.

LESSONS TO ASPIRING YOUTH

The career of John Marshall Harlan conveys many lessons to aspiring youth. He was a typical, though what is called a well-born American. A Kentucky whig, it was in the nature of the case when the sectional agitation culminated in a war of secession, that he should be a unionist; but so staunch was his constitutional teaching and his patriotic ideals, that he resigned his commission, whilst not abating his loyalty, rather than continue his support of what he regarded as an unconstitutional usurpation of power.

With his antecedents and obduracies of conviction and prejudice, he could never have trained with the democrats. And yet, ascending to the supreme bench the most ardent and active of partisan republicans, no jurist's opinions have been more in line with the conservative and orthodox intentions of the original framers and interpreters of the constitution and more opposed to the reactionary constructions of latter-day opportunism. He was to the end an old-line whig.

There was never a doughtier spirit incased in an exterior so unconventional and amiable. In his person and conduct of life he was a democrat of democrats. With the patrician race of Virginia lawyers from whom he was sprung—of whom it used to be said that "they lived high, worked hard and died poor"—Justice Harlan had no concealments and few reserves. The purest and most affectionate of husbands and fathers, he was among public men the least pretentious. Appreciation of all things clean and good and genial was strong within him. He became a great, a very great, member of the court, and Kentucky, as well as history, will enroll him among the foremost of her sons.—Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal.

THE TENNESSEE SITUATION

Mr. Bryan has received several letters from Tennessee of which the following are sample extracts:

"You are familiar with the democratic situation in Tennessee, and therefore realize the importance of the two factions being united. The rank and file of both factions are anxious for harmony in order that Tennessee may keep step with the victorious march of democracy in her sister states, and I am convinced that the two factions will unite in some way in having a direct state primary for the expression of presidential preference, for the election of delegates to the national democratic convention, and a new state executive committee, and the nomination of presidential electors, all candidates for state offices, and a United States senator; and it will be of the utmost importance in Tennessee to have every democrat in the state participate in this primary. I write to ask you, if such a primary is called, and is managed by equal representation of the two factions, such representatives being chosen by each faction irrespective of whether the two committees select these representatives, provided the representation in holding the primary is bona fide, will you not consent to come into the state sometime prior to the holding of the primary, and make at least six speeches, urging all democrats to participate in the primary? You would, of course, be expected to speak in behalf of the primary principle and the success of the democratic party, urging all voters to go into the primary. In all probability the primary will be held the second week in April, and we would like to have you in the state during the latter part of March. Your promise to make such speeches in the state would be a most powerful factor at this time in bringing about the much to be desired harmony."

To these letters Mr. Bryan sent the following reply: "Of course I shall come to Tennessee whenever I can be of any service to the democracy there, and I do not know of any more valuable service that I can render than to help the democrats of Tennessee to get together, and a primary is the only way."

The democrats of Tennessee should get together. It is not worth while to discuss the past or to try to locate the blame. Burke once said that it was impossible to write an indictment against a nation—so it is impossible to write an indictment against a faction when that faction is as large as each faction is in Tennessee. They had their fight, and it is over; now let the democrats of Tennessee drop their quarrels and unite for the national campaign of 1912. We have a senator to elect from Tennessee. He should be a democrat. The state officers should be democrats. Tennessee is a democratic state. The primary is the place to settle differences and to try strength. Let the two factions agree upon rules that will insure a fair primary, and then let the majority rule. That is democracy.

All the democratic states around Tennessee have primaries, why not Tennessee? It would be an insult to the intelligence of the democrats of that state to deny that they are able to select their candidates by direct vote.

Of course Mr. Bryan will urge all democrats to attend the primary. He favors primaries everywhere. He owes a great deal to the loyal democrats of Tennessee, and he will be glad to pay a part of the debt by helping the democrats of that state to get together. We need their united strength in the coming campaign.