

smallpox. If they had been so imprisoned by a mob in a panic of fear the wholesale outrage might well be excused. Fear knows no reason. But they were imprisoned deliberately by public officials for the purpose of performing upon them, or such of them as had not yet gone through the ordeal, a medical rite as superstitious in character as any savage hoodoo or rite of ancient priest. As soon as a bit of diseased animal matter had been injected into their blood, or they had proved by the scar that this had been recently done, they were all allowed to go free. This was not done by a mob in a panic of fear, we repeat, but by policemen and doctors acting under superstitious influences. For vaccination is a superstition. Possibly in some mystical manner it does prevent smallpox. We do not know, and neither do the doctors. They are unable to trace any rational connection between the rite and the possibility of its preventive virtue. So far as rational medicine is concerned, those board of health doctors in Philadelphia might as well have compelled the victims of their imprisonment to drink rattlesnake soup. Chinese doctors use this in some cases with as good results, experimentally, so they say, and with as little reason, as our doctors use diseased animal matter for the prevention of smallpox. Yet 16,000 persons were imprisoned on that May Sunday in Philadelphia, for half the day and deliberately by officers of the law, not to prevent their carrying the smallpox germs of one case outside the area of their imprisonment, but for the purpose of compelling 1,000 of them to submit to the superstitious rite of vaccination and the rest to prove that they had submitted to it!

\*      \*

#### Mayor Dunne's Latest Victory.

Despite obstruction by the traction interests and their beneficiaries and sympathizers in the City Council of Chicago and in both political parties, Mayor Dunne's municipal ownership policy (pp. 98, 105, 123) moves forward. One victory after another comes to him. His latest is the refusal of the Supreme Court of the United States to reconsider its decision nullifying the 99-year claim, which the traction companies and their abettors have used so long as a club to frighten the timid and discourage the hopeful. Of this claim, nothing whatever now remains. It is powerless to hurt and powerless to scare. The companies have left only a few rapidly expiring franchises, and most of their system they are operating by mere sufferance. Mayor Dunne offers them the job of reconstructing the whole system and turning it over to the city upon de-

mand. They have not yet accepted or indicated a disposition to accept the offer. It may be that they cannot come to an agreement among themselves, but that is no longer any concern of the city's. If they do not speedily agree to Mayor Dunne's eminently fair terms, a new construction company will be organized and the work of constructing a municipal traction system will proceed without further reference to them or their situation than may be involved in compelling them to give good service on the streets they continue to occupy.

\*      \*

#### Appointments and Disappointments.

Mayor Dunne has recently had an experience which may be of more than local interest notwithstanding its distinctly local flavor. When he chose Walter L. Fisher as his traction counsel (p. 52), he performed a great service to the particular cause he was elected especially to promote, and to the general public interests with which as Mayor he is charged. But many of his friends, most of them genuine friends of his cause and of good government, too, sharply criticized him for this appointment. Blinded by their own partisan spirit, they could not see for the time, either that Mr. Fisher had exceptional personal merit or that the circumstances of the situation made him the best possible selection. Mayor Dunne recognized both facts, and with a degree of moral courage to which men in his position seldom rise, he made this choice in spite of the fact that Mr. Fisher is not only a prominent member of the opposite political party but was a prominent leader in opposing Mayor Dunne's election. Events are rapidly justifying the Mayor's judgment in the matter.

\*

When Mayor Dunne made this selection, the Record-Herald cordially approved it, presumably because it was indeed the good appointment it is proving to be, and not because Mr. Fisher happened to belong to the particular faction in the Republican party which the Record-Herald represents. But now that Mayor Dunne has promoted William L. O'Connell, the deputy commissioner of public works for nearly three years, to the vacant office of commissioner, the Record-Herald compares these two appointments in such manner as to indicate that it is influenced rather by solicitude for its own political associations and associates than by disinterested devotion to the public good. In making the comparison the Record-Herald says complimentary things of Mr. Fisher which are well deserved, no

matter what their motive may be, but it makes sinister prognostications regarding Mr. O'Connell, and on no other apparent basis than that Mr. O'Connell "does not train in its crowd." If Mr. O'Connell's official record is bad it was right that the Record-Herald should say so and therefore criticize his promotion as unfit. But it does not denounce his record. With reference to Mr. O'Connell it does essentially what Mayor Dunne's critical friends did with reference to Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher was none of theirs, and therefore they, etc. Mr. O'Connell is none of its, and therefore the Record-Herald, etc. Merely upon its own impression that O'Connell "rises to the stature of a ward politician and no higher," the Record-Herald prophesies "a very little service at a very high price." This prophecy may turn out to be good foresight, but with the Record-Herald's editorial the wish seems to be father to the thought. Either a bad record should have been produced against Mr. O'Connell, or a reasonable time been allowed for him to justify the Mayor's judgment in his case as it has been justified in Mr. Fisher's. To denounce the Mayor for his promotion as having "made a blunder," and as "bereft of understanding," as having eyes but seeing not and ears but hearing not, as the Record-Herald does, and without producing the slightest evidence against the appointee, is only to repeat the sentiment and almost the very language with which the Mayor was at first improvidently denounced by critics of the Fisher appointment. It reads more like partisan billingsgate than judicial criticism. It is now reasonably well proved to have been unfair in the Fisher case; the same thing may possibly be proved in the O'Connell case. At any rate, common fairness demands that the Mayor's appointees be judged by their past records or by their future service, and not by personal or factional prejudices. This spirit toward public officials is especially demanded of newspapers everywhere that profess to place considerations of good administration above personal and party preferences.

\* \* \*

### WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT.

Is there any difference between a Democrat and a Republican? If not, then a political campaign should be only a question of getting the best men elected regardless of party.

If there is a difference between the two parties in principle, then candidates must be regarded as bearing the standard of the party to which they respectively belong, and the principles are

the vital things to be discussed, understood and voted on.

If you are a Democrat or a Republican because your father was, that is no reason at all. By the same reasoning you might as well wear his style of hat or coat. Every man is entitled to form his own opinions, and those opinions should be formed on good reasons which he understands and can give.

If you are a Republican because it is the party in power and gives you more chance to be elected to some office, then you'd better remain a Republican, because no decent party cares for camp followers who have no higher principle than to get office or graft.

It stands to reason that, taken as an average, Republicans are no worse than Democrats, and Democrats are no better than Republicans. The question one ought to answer is, Why am I a Democrat? or, Why am I a Republican?

Most men belong to a party from mere habit. They do not seek office. They do not believe all the bad men are in the other party. In fact, there are many Republicans who should be Democrats and many Democrats who should be Republicans, and the following may help each thinking man to classify himself.

\*

The two parties might be classified in a general way by saying that the Republican party is the party of the rich, of the privileged classes, of the trusts; and the Democratic party is the party of the common people. Anyone who will stop and think this over will see it is true as a great general proposition.

For example, would a Democratic or a Republican committee have the richest people to go to for campaign funds? Think that out.

The great railroads, the banks, the insurance corporations, the trusts, all throw their weight for the Republican party. Why? Think it out.

Most people do that from which they expect the greatest benefit. Why do the privileged classes favor the Republican party? Why is the Senate, that body of trust and corporation agents, Republican? Because the Republican party favors those ideas which have created the privileged classes, and because the privileged classes can get from the Republican party that protection and those further favors they want.

The Democratic party of the South in 1861 and for some time prior thereto was thoroughly undemocratic, in so far as it protected human slavery and stood for class privilege. And the Republican party of that day was truly the demo-