

# The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &  
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR  
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
LINCOLN STEPPENS, Connecticut  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FRÉDÉRIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware  
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. GALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XIV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1911.

No. 708

Published by Louis F. Post

Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents

Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

## EDITORIAL

### Democratic Politics in Illinois.

Impudence could hardly go farther than the attempt of William Randolph Hearst to identify the Hearst-Harrison partnership of this year with the movement that Governor Altgeld led. Consider how grossly impudent it is. Describing the recent Hearst-Harrison gathering at Springfield as "an exact parallel" of the "rally led by Altgeld in 1895," the Hearst Examiner of October 16th says that "the Sullivanites stayed out of the Democratic State organization until they came back about seven years ago by an 'exhibition of strong arm politics' that William J. Bryan characterized as the methods of train robbers." Are Democratic memories so short in Illinois that Hearst's relations to that train-robber performance are forgotten? Didn't Hearst himself make it possible for Roger Sullivan to seize the Democratic party of Illinois on that occasion? If Sullivan was a train-robber, Hearst was his pal.

The consideration? Sullivan's agreement to give Hearst the Illinois delegation to the national convention. Sullivan kept his agreement, and Illinois consequently made a ridiculous nomination of Hearst for Presidential candidate. It was then that Hearst broke with Bryan and began a newspaper campaign against Bryan which culminated in 1908 in Hearst's giving back-door support to Taft. Did Hearst break with Bryan because

### CONTENTS.

#### EDITORIAL:

Democratic Politics in Illinois.....	1089
William Randolph Hearst for President.....	1090
New Judges for Chicago.....	1091
Charity's Appeal to Justice.....	1091
A Good Fight in Pennsylvania.....	1091
Woman Suffrage and Direct Legislation.....	1091
The Street Car Question in Cleveland.....	1092
Accounting for "Oregonian" Editorials.....	1093
Education.....	1093
Signing a Blank Check (John Freemantle).....	1093
Important Facts Not "Even Faintly" Appreciated (Levi S. Lewis).....	1096

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

The Victory in California (S. W. Tulloch).....	1097
--	------

#### INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

Looking Through the Curtain (A. D. Cridge).....	1098
Travel Glimpses (C. F. Hunt).....	1098

#### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Chinese Revolution.....	1099
The Fight for La Follette.....	1099
National Convention of Woman Suffragists.....	1099
A Significant Political Departure in New Zealand.....	1100
News Notes.....	1101
Press Opinions.....	1102

#### RELATED THINGS:

Progressive Right and Oppressive Wrong (Michael McGovern).....	1104
The Seat of Incompetence and Corruptibility (F. R. Crane).....	1105
The Referendum in Court.....	1105

#### BOOKS:

A Word for the Times.....	1106
Business Character.....	1107
Books Received.....	1108
Pamphlets.....	1108

Bryan did not bring up the Nebraska delegation in the wake of the Illinois delegation for Hearst? Or was it because Bryan denounced Hearst's political partner of that year as a train robber?

+

And what does all this Hearst-Harrison palaver mean now? It means now what the Hearst-Sullivan alliance meant in 1904. Hearst is to get the Illinois delegation—this time with Harrison's aid as the other time with Sullivan's. Everything democratic is to be sacrificed to that one object by Hearst and his factotum Lawrence, as heretofore in Illinois everything democratic has been sacrificed by that precious pair.

+

And the pity of it is that some of our best democratic Democrats down the State are innocently turning themselves and their influence over to Hearst. Among them are good men who, on the principle of never allowing yourself to be fooled twice by the same man and in the same way, ought to know better. They have had sad enough experience with Hearst politically already. But their hostility to Sullivan is such that they fall an easy prey to Hearst with his new outfit of velveted claws. Knowing, as Sullivan did in 1904, that Hearst cannot be nominated for President, they, like Sullivan, are willing he should have the Illinois delegation in return for his aid in putting down what they consider more important. It is more important, but the price they pay is risky. The Illinois delegation has been Hearst's standing price in this State for anything and everything in all his political relations here. For granting it, Sullivan got into Hearst's good books; for denying it, Dunne was pitched out of them.

+

We need not say that we sympathize heartily with down-State Democrats like Judge Thompson and Congressman Graham in their desire to end the Sullivan regime. Sullivan has been an Old Man of the Sea on the back of the Democratic party in Illinois ever since he combined politics with illuminating-gas investments, and never has his game been more subtle or intolerable than now. But our democratic friends won't end the Sullivan regime by giving Hearst a power of attorney to do it for them. They can end it by recognizing Dunne's well-deserved popularity, closing their ears to Lawrence's insinuations against him, and making perfectly plain what the fact is, that Sullivan's present support of Dunne, so far from being friendly, is as sinister as ever.

Should they give Hearst and Lawrence the power to crush Sullivan, this power would not unlikely be used for Sullivan instead of against him, should Sullivan decide in 1912, as he did in 1904, that Hearst, through Lawrence, is the man for him to make terms with.

+ +

#### William Randolph Hearst for President.

Only the thinnest veil is any longer thrown by the Hearst papers over Mr. Hearst's Presidential purposes at the election next year. He does not announce his candidacy himself, but his papers quote other aspirants for the Democratic nomination in such a way as to leave to any habitual reader of the Hearst papers no doubt at all of their proprietor's designs, innocent though the men quoted doubtless are of intentionally promoting them.

+

The nearest Mr. Hearst himself has come to making a formal announcement is in his "return-of-the-prodigal speech" at New York last week. That speech might be condensed and fairly paraphrased into something like this: "Gentlemen of the Democratic party—Here I am again, back in the Democratic fold just in the nick of time to demand your Presidential nomination for myself. I shall fight every other aspirant for it who doesn't give me the right hand of fellowship; and I shall make monkeys of those aspirants who do." Champ Clark is freely quoted by the Hearst papers among the latter, and among the latter he is pretty certain consequently to find himself when Mr. Hearst's monkey-making process begins. His humiliated companions at that time will probably include Mayor Harrison and Oscar Underwood, both of whom are in Mr. Hearst's Presidential gamebag now. No, hold a bit about Mr. Underwood. He is the only Presidential possibility quoted in the Hearst papers as expressly naming Hearst for the Democratic nomination, and this may imply that Mr. Underwood is to be graciously allowed the place of running mate. "I understand," says Mr. Underwood in Hearst's Chicago Examiner of October 22, congratulating the Democratic party on Hearst's return to it, that "the Hearst following will use its influence to have the New York delegation at the convention place Mr. Hearst's name in nomination for the Democratic nomination for President, and I feel sure the California delegation will attend the convention pledged for Hearst." We of Chicago know, of course, that Harrison is pledged to give Hearst the Illinois delegation if he can; and from the way Lawrence, Hearst's manager, is playing