

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume VIII Number 397

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOV. 11, 1905.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Significance of the elections.....	501
Hearst's victory	501
Tom L. Johnson's third election.....	501
The overturn in Ohio.....	502
Mayor Jones's successor.....	502
An impeachment of the Senate.....	502
Pharisees and hoodlums.....	502
Curiosities of Taxation (Miller).....	503

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

New York	506
Cleveland	507

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Reports from the elections.....	508
The election in New York city.....	508
The election in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania	509
The Ohio election.....	509
The election in Toledo.....	509
Retirement of "Boss" Cox.....	509
Reelection of Tom L. Johnson.....	509
The election in Chicago.....	510
The San Francisco election.....	510
Other election results.....	510
Progress of the Russian revolution.....	510
Autonomy for Finland.....	511
News Notes	511
Press Opinions	511

MISCELLANY:

The Breaking Dawn (verse).....	512
The Referendum Has Reached China.....	512
Chicago Newspapers, and Labor Speeches	513
Honesty (Potter)	513
Only a Factory Girl (C. J. Buell).....	513

BOOKS:

The Words of Garrison (Burlingame).....	514
Jefferson's Life and Writings.....	515
Pillars of the Temple.....	516
Trusts versus the Public Welfare.....	517
Books Received	517
Periodicals	517

CARTOON.—The Dual Rockefeller (Bengough)	516
--	-----

For terms and other particulars of publication see cartoon page

EDITORIAL

Significance of the elections.

It is not to be inferred from the elections of the 7th that a majority of the voters have agreed either irrevocably or at all upon any particular programme of reform or progress. The real significance of these elections is that the people have shattered the crystals of their partisanship.

This is the most hopeful kind of all political events at present possible. There can be no progress while great masses of the people are wedded to fading issues and dying parties, and follow

the lead of designing bosses. In politics as in religion, conviction of sin must precede conversion to righteousness, and these elections indicate that the people are coming under conviction.

But there may be many ups and downs in our politics yet, before satisfactory evidence of any general conversion to righteousness appears. Therefore let no one be so jubilant over this week's results as to be dismayed when he sees the popular wave receding. What is needed in times like these is not mere enthusiasm while the tide runs high; it is level headed loyalty and unflinching zeal at all times, be the tide high or low.

The democracy of this country is in a gigantic struggle with its plutocracy. Democracy is many-handed, many-headed and many-hearted, and when united is irresistible. But its units are easily scattered, and when the power of democracy is thus disrupted plutocracy has a free hand until circumstances again unite the democratic units. For this reason the road of progressive democracy is a hard one. For the same reason, plutocracy does not yield though democracy overwhelm it. He is much mistaken who imagines that plutocracy can be easily conquered. Those who enlist on the side of democracy should realize that there is no royal road to victory, and be prepared not only for hard work and steady work and unselfish work, but also for those saddest of all kinds of disappointments—the shameful defeats that so often follow great victories.

Hearst's victory.

That Hearst was fairly elected mayor of New York no fair and intelligent man will think of disputing. By false voting and false counting, McClellan has been given an apparent plurality of 3,500 in 600,000 votes. It is a pitiful plurality pitifully procured. Mr. Hearst threatens to contest.

The man who ought to contest is McClellan himself. His own honor demands that he require the most careful sifting of the returns, with a determination to refuse the office "Boss" Murphy offers him if it appears that the people did not intend him to have it. Whether McClellan takes this manly stand or not, and whether Hearst succeeds in a contest or not, Hearst's most irreconcilable enemy must concede the brilliancy of his victory. Without organization and against tremendous odds and enormous corruption, he has come concededly within a few votes of election, and has in public estimation been honestly elected. Both the manner of his campaign and its result, as well as his conduct now, make him loom up no longer as a self-seeker but as a genuine leader in a great cause.

But what is of more importance, than any man's victory is the tremendous vote that was rolled up in New York distinctly for municipal ownership of municipal utilities. This is the people's answer to the pretense that the vote for municipal ownership in Chicago last Spring came from a momentary impulse and that it will not be repeated. The sentiment is as strong in Chicago to-day as it was last Spring, and as it was in New York last Tuesday. The wave has not yet begun to recede. Let the plutocrats of Chicago make no mistake about the situation. Their extension franchise ordinance will be torn in fragments by the referendum vote next Spring, and some of its aldermanic supporters will learn that there are other influences to reckon with than those that emanate from the sanctums of traction speculators. The New York election has its lessons for the politicians, the grafters, and the parlor reformers of Chicago.

Tom L. Johnson's third election.

It must be confusing to the readers of the average plutocratic newspaper to learn that Tom L.

Johnson, whom they had become accustomed to think of as a political corpse, has just been elected mayor of Cleveland for the third time, and by double the largest plurality he had ever before received. Not only is he elected, but his whole ticket is elected with him, and this includes a body of democratic Democrats to the legislature, which will be Democratic in both houses and be supplemented with a Democratic governor who has the reputation also of being a democratic Democrat. Slow as goes the fight against plutocracy, it does go when it has leaders who are not only enthusiastic in the hour of victory, but persistent both in victory and in defeat.

The overturn in Ohio.

Ohio has been wholly overturned politically. The governor and both houses of the legislature are Democratic. Hannaism is out, Coxism is out, and it is reasonably to be hoped that a democratic brand of Democracy has taken their place. Should this prove to be true, the wretched municipal code of Ohio will be superseded by a code giving self-government to the corporation-ridden cities of that State. The Democratic party now has an opportunity to demonstrate in Ohio the genuineness of its democracy, and in no respect can it do this better than by lodging self-government with municipalities.

Mayor Jones's Successor.

The late Mayor Jones of Toledo performed political wonders at elections in that city, and now he has a worthy successor. His old friend, Brand Whitlock, who was not only his personal friend but a profound sympathizer, has been elected mayor as an independent. Whitlock is a welcome addition to the popular leaders who are springing to the front in the great fight of democracy against plutocracy for the possession of this country.

An impeachment of the Senate.

In his "Frenzied Finance" in the November Everybody's, Mr. Law-

son makes a specific charge, names alone omitted, which challenges the United States Senate to defend its honor against Lawson's aspersions, if they are aspersions, or against its own internal corruption if Lawson's charge is true. His charge relates to the second election to the Senate of Clark of Montana. Clark and Rogers (Standard Oil Rogers) were then business enemies, Clark being aligned with Heinze. Rogers had a conference with him after his second election—a notoriously corrupt election—and intimidated, so Lawson tells the story, that—

as long as the Montanan remained the ally of Heinze he could not enter the Senate, that the cards were again stacked for his expulsion, and that he had better patch up with "Standard Oil" before it was too late. Clark did not believe that even the Master of "Standard Oil" could actually "deliver" the Senate of the United States, and bluntly he told Rogers that he believed he was bluffing. He was willing to put the threat to a test—if Rogers could show him a majority of the United States Senate pledged in writing to refuse him admittance, he would concede defeat, drop Heinze, and join "Standard Oil." On the other hand, if Rogers failed, "Standard Oil" should cease its opposition to his admittance to the Senate. In making this proposition Clark imagined that he had imposed an impossible condition . . . but his weasel eyes opened wide when Mr. Rogers quietly but pointedly said: "It's a bargain. If I don't give you the proof as I say one week from to-day, I will not trouble you again in connection with our Heinze affairs." At the appointed time the great manipulator of men, as calmly as though he were exhibiting a bill of sale for a carload of barreled petroleum, allowed Clark to inspect a list of two over a majority of our grave and reverend seigniors. Clark delivered his goods like the conservative business man he is, . . . has gone untroubled on his way, and from that time to this has faithfully performed his obsequies before the great Oil Throne.

Who were the Senators whose votes were thus, over their own signatures, put at Rogers's command? Or, is Lawson "lying again"? Will the Senate have any curiosity to know which?

Pharisees and hoodlums.

Munkacsy's great picture of "Christ Before Pilate," furnishes a lesson which some

of the clergymen of Chicago might profitably ponder. In the foreground is a hoodlum with hand upraised, evidently shouting "Crucify him! Crucify him!" And by Pilate's right hand sits a rotund pharisee, who listens to the hoodlum and looks on the proceedings with unconcealed satisfaction. The pharisee and the hoodlum are working together, from different motives but for a common purpose. Doubtless it was not the first time that pharisee and hoodlum had pooled their issues, and it certainly was not the last. Here in Chicago to-day, a similar spectacle is presented. Because Mayor Dunne has closed the dives and gambling hells, which his predecessors left open, the hoodlums are his enemies; and because he has not closed the beer saloons on Sundays, which his predecessors left open unquestioned, some of the preachers denounce him. It is the old, old story of a certain tendency of hoodlum and pharisee to affiliate.

At the meeting of the Congregational clergymen on the 6th this pharisaical performance was rebuked by some of the clergymen in attendance. One of them was the Rev. D. D. DeLong, pastor of Fellowship church, who is reported to have sensibly said that the immediate question in Chicago is municipal ownership. "The biggest battle," he urged, "is for the city's rights to the streets;" and then he added: "If we start this fight for Sunday closing now, we may lose both Sunday closing and municipal ownership." He was supported by two or three others, but most of these gentlemen of the cloth were not to be side-tracked by municipal ownership. What they evidently really want is to have municipal ownership side-tracked. They had done nothing for Sunday saloon closing for a score of years. They had not supported the Prohibition party last Spring, the only party that demanded it. They had supported Harlan who was committed to the open Sunday policy. They are silent now about the Republican