

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1904.

Number 335.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Among the many explanations of David B. Hill's promised withdrawal from politics, the most encouraging is the suggestion that he has been made to realize the futility of expecting preferment under Parker should the latter be elected.

It has been assumed that Hill would be Parker's Secretary of State, and it is difficult to see how that appointment could be refused him. In the public eye Hill has for two years appeared to be Parker's manager. He has stood out in bold relief as the party leader on the conservative side of the reorganized Democracy. He and Parker are fellow workers of old in politics. Parker's methods preceding the nomination were the familiar Hill methods. For these and other reasons it would seem to be impossible for Parker to refuse Hill the recognition that Garfield gave to Blaine.

Yet it may be that Parker has had no such purpose. It may be that Hill's overshadowing attentions have been unwelcome. It may be that Hill has been an intruder instead of a manager. Color of probability is lent to this inference by the fact that Parker sent his St. Louis telegrams to Sheehan and not to Hill. It may be therefore, that Hill, scenting humiliation from afar, has decided to make the best of it by a magnanimous withdrawal of the burden of his personality which Parker has been staggering under.

If this is indeed the true explanation of the Hill episode,

there may be reason to hope that in his letter of acceptance Judge Parker will sufficiently encourage the democratic-Democracy of the country—not by platitudes, but by courageous pledges—to see in the whole situation a convincing sign that the reorganized Democracy is after all something better than an organic office-hunger. A belief that Parker is not the alter ego of Hill would be much in itself; but it must be supplemented, to be effective, with a conviction not only that Parker is not of the tribe of such political gamblers as Hill, and stands for Democratic principle in the abstract; but also that he has the courage to identify himself with purposes and policies in furtherance of that principle, and the disposition to ally himself less with the plutocratic and more with the democratic elements of his party.

Another hopeful thing about the Democratic situation is the possibility of the nomination of Edward M. Shepard by the Democrats for governor of New York. Mr. Shepard is not an all-round radical Democrat. He could not properly be called, even in the truest sense of the word, a radical in any respect. His temperament, his training, his professional and other associations all tend to make him conservative of existing adjustments and fearful of sudden disarrangements. But in principle he is a democrat. And though in practice a conservative who would incline to over caution, his tendency is steadily toward the uttermost goal of genuine democracy. Considering that Mr. Shepard is a man of great ability and undisputed probity, the fact that he is politically unwelcome to the plutocratic elements of the party is highly significant. At a time when the line between plutocracy and democracy is not

clearly drawn, the shrinking of the distinctly plutocratic classes from any man of ability and honesty when he looms up in politics, is in itself a certification to that man's democratic tendencies.

Should Shepard be nominated by the Democrats for governor of New York, with the hearty approval of Parker, it might go far toward reconciling the democratic-Democrats of that State to a national ticket which has not appealed to them—which, indeed, has repelled them. We do not mean that it would draw back those Democrats who in disgust at the plutocratic atmosphere which has enveloped the Parker candidacy, have committed themselves to third parties. This element, which might have given great strength to the Democratic party, is irretrievably lost so far as the present campaign is concerned. But there are many democratic-Democrats who, belonging to the party organization, have felt that they must retain their connection with it, realizing that other campaigns are coming—men whose view of the complex situation is represented nationally by William J. Bryan and Tom L. Johnson. It is difficult work for these men to hold their following together in support of Parker. The following of such men is an intelligent following. It cannot be shifted now this way and now that, as a leader dictates. But everything that occurs to give true democratic color to the Parker candidacy makes the task of the Bryans and the Johnsons, little and big, all over the country, an easier task. Shepard's nomination for governor of New York would be one of these things. And if that could have the background of a courageous democratic declaration from Parker in his letter of acceptance—something which would

ring as true and seem as courageous to the democratic-Democrats as did his gold standard telegram to the plutocratic Democrats—there would be something for the leaders of democratic-Democracy to work for with hope for the future, and with enthusiasm and effectiveness in the present.

Eastern Democrats are at present threatened with future mental suffering, by John P. Hopkins and Roger C. Sullivan, of Chicago. These delectable Democrats assure their Eastern coadjutors not only that Illinois will give its electoral vote to Parker (which politically is proper, since they are responsible for Illinois), but that Indiana is a "sure thing" and that prospects are bright for Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Nevada and Utah. When Hopkins and Sullivan return to Illinois, which they themselves have made hopeless, they will doubtless report bright prospects in another quarter. They can't fool Western Democrats with glittering predictions about such States as Illinois, Montana and Colorado; but they might arouse enthusiasm over prophetic victories in Maine, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

Municipal-ownership advocates who object to municipal operation, might profit by an object lesson in Union county, New Jersey. There is a trolley line in that county, in the region of Roselle, which is owned by the county but operated by a private corporation. Behold the result. The private corporation has a lease which is virtually perpetual; the fares cannot be regulated; the private company is as masterful and arrogant as if it owned the property of which it is only a tenant; and the county not only furnishes the trackage and other line equipment, but keeps them in repair. The net benefit, therefore, to the county is nothing, minus cost of erecting and maintaining the line; to the operating company it is the same as private ownership, plus the advantage of having a line furnished and maintained for it free by the county.

Traction is not the only subject regarding which Union county, New Jersey, affords valuable object lessons. This is one of the localities in which even the water supply is furnished by a private corporation. Water, gas, electric lighting, street car service, steam car service, trolley service—all but the one county-owned trolley line—are under private ownership, and all are under private operation. Union county, therefore, is a place where the beauties, comforts and general perfection of private enterprise in the management of public utilities may be expected to shine forth. But it doesn't shine. The character of the water service in comparison with cities that own and operate their water supply may be inferred from the fact that in this region of abundant water conveniently located, the charge for serving a cottage is over \$30 a year. And as to "graft," what is the graft of the graftiest political grafter in comparison with the enormous graft of the owners of this Union county water privilege? Nor is it a matter alone of graft and dear service. The owners of this water supply privilege dominate both political parties with a degree of arbitrary power which might make any mere political boss envious to distraction. Look to it, you who are doubtful of the wisdom of municipal ownership and operation of municipal utilities! Investigate the wretched experiments in private ownership and operation of Union county, New Jersey, before you close your minds to the successful experiments in public ownership and operation elsewhere.

Two or three weeks ago it was announced that Eugene V. Debs had been requested by McClure's Magazine to reply to ex-President Cleveland's defense in the same periodical of his action in the Chicago strike (p. 195), and that the magazine had been obliged to reject Mr. Debs's article because it was abusive. What purports to be the same article has

now appeared in the Socialist papers,—among others, in the Chicago Socialist of August 27. As it is there printed, we fail to find anything in the Debs article that can fairly be characterized as abusive. It is certainly not as abusive as Cleveland's. Controversial it is, and overwhelmingly destructive of Cleveland's defense of his action. But if this constitutes abuse, Mr. Cleveland should be wrapped in paraffine paper and put in a glass case where he may be admired but not "abused." McClure's was under no obligation to print any reply to Cleveland. There are good reasons why it should have refused, for it is doing vigorous and valuable work against plutocracy at great risk and may be pardoned for avoiding further risk. Besides, the publication of Cleveland's article may be justified on the business ground that it would largely enhance the demand for the magazine, whereas, on the other hand, Debs's would have little or no effect of that kind, if, indeed, it might not be prejudicial. But nothing can excuse the rejection of Debs's reply as abusive, if it was not more abusive than its present publication shows it to have been.

It is a great mistake, we beg to remind both the confident conservative and the impatient progressive—a very great mistake, to suppose that the Henry George movement, because it makes little or no organized display, is making no progress. In one way and another, here in advancing legislation and there in developing public sentiment, in one place crudely, in another timidly, in a third boldly, but everywhere persistently, this movement is advancing with leaps and bounds, though many there be who having ears hear not and eyes see not. Its advances in Australasia, in Great Britain, in Canada, and even in the United States are notable; but in Germany it is supposed to have made none whatever. Yet now come reports from Germany which show that even there, crudely and without