

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1902.

Number 240.

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.

Of lessons of the elections there may be as many and of as great variety as there were local campaigns; but considered as a whole, these elections teach one lesson of transcendent importance and national significance. This is the lesson that within the Democratic party there are two parties, distinguishably different and absolutely irreconcilable, which must be formally separated before the plutocratic leadership of the Republican party can be overthrown in American politics.

One of these parties within the Democratic party is as plutocratic as the Republican organization itself. It has no political principles which are not acceptable to the commercial combines. Grover Cleveland is the best type of its leadership. He spoke for it at Morristown, N. J., last week when he boasted of New Jersey's traditional Democracy—a Democracy that is identified emphatically with nothing but the pro-slavery cause and the "copperheadism" of the sixties. On the only live issue of the present time he dared go no further along democratic lines than the Republican party in the West has gone. He advocated a kind of tariff reform which would deprive the working classes and the small business classes of the protection they think they are getting under Republican rule, but would not give them the manifest benefits of free trade. The other of the two parties within the party assumed distinguishable form in 1896, when Bryan sprang to the front in its leadership. Conservative and radical are the characteristic quali-

ties and tendencies respectively of these two factions; and swinging from one to the other as it seems stronger or weaker, are the mere place hunters in politics whose typical leader is David B. Hill.

That these two wings of the Democratic party cannot act together has now been fully demonstrated. When the radical or democratic wing secured control of the party in 1896, the conservative or plutocratic wing abandoned it, and an election that could have been carried by the united party was lost. The plutocratic forces of the party played in the same role in 1900 and with the same result. This year they have done the same thing in States where the democratic Democrats controlled the party organization, and not unnaturally the latter have played the return game where the conservative wing was in control. As the elections of 1896 and 1900 proved that the plutocratic wing of the Democratic party will not support the party when the other wing controls, so those of this week prove that the democratic wing of the party will not fall in behind the plutocratic element.

In Wisconsin, for instance, as well as Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and most of the States other than Ohio, the conservatives boasted too freely that they were back again in the saddle, and the democratic rank and file of the party refused to support them. Thus elections were lost which the plutocratic Democrats were sure of winning if only they were entrusted with leadership. Even in the Congressional district of New Jersey, where ex-President Cleveland made his only speech, and where the Democratic candidate had been so loyal to the plutocratic wing of his party that

he supported McKinley, the Republican, in preference to Bryan, the democratic Democrat,—even in that fully "reorganized" district, the Republicans carried the election. So Pattison, of Pennsylvania, with peculiar advantages, is defeated by the malodorous Quay. With greater or less majority, but with significant uniformity, the "reorganizers" of the Democratic party have everywhere been repulsed at the polls. Their reduction of pluralities counts for nothing. The vital fact is that there were enough radical democrats to ensure their defeat. Conversely, the plutocratic elements of the party threw their influence effectively against Johnson in Ohio and Bryan in Nebraska.

The emphatic lesson of it all is that these two wings of the party must separate. Until they do, the rank and file of each will be to the death against the leadership of the other. Nor is that the worst thing about this anomalous affiliation of two such discordant elements in one party organization. So long as plutocratic Democrats are prominently identified with the Democratic party, democratic Republicans will distrust it. This puts democratic Democrats at an extraordinary disadvantage. Whenever they make a radical move they lose the conservative support of their own party without attracting the democratic elements from the republican party. The latter will not believe in the good faith of an organization whose sincerity as an organization they have learned—and rightly learned—to discredit, so long as its plutocratic leaders are in good standing in its counsels. Final separation of the two hostile wings is the only remedy.

This does not signify the necessity of a third party, but it does require

a fight instead of a false truce within the old party. The method is simple and can be made effective. Let the democratic Democrats organize everywhere within the party, between now and the next national convention, with a determination to carry that convention. Not for a man, but for radical democratic principles. In doing so, let them adopt a policy with reference to their principles, which will be too democratic for the conservative element even to pretend that they accept it, and stand or fall by that policy. Should democratic Democrats succeed in defeating the plutocratic wing of the party at the next convention, upon a platform genuinely and radically democratic, the defeated wing would soon be driven out of control everywhere. They would either disintegrate and join the Hanna Republicans, or make a party of their own and bid against the Republicans for Wall street support. In either case the renovated Democracy would soon command the confidence of all democrats. If, on the other hand, the plutocratic wing should defeat them in the convention, then let them organize a distinct Democratic party, based upon democratic principles and the best democratic traditions. They would not win that year, but they would assure the defeat of the old organization under circumstances that would make resurrection impossible; and at the ensuing elections the new Democracy would have the democratic field to itself and inspire the democrats in all parties with confidence. That can never be done while this drama of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde is annually played in the Democratic party. The fast forming issue in this country is between democracy and plutocracy, and parties as well as voters must align themselves accordingly.

Bigelow's defeat in Ohio and its temporary check upon Tom L. Johnson's campaign for home rule and just taxation was caused by the anomalous association of conflicting

elements in the same party organization to which we have already referred. These two men, genuine democrats both, were opposed by all the plutocratic influences of both parties; yet, being nominally associated with the plutocrats of their own party, they could not secure the confidence in large degree of Republicans whose political principles are essentially democratic. It is only as Johnson comes to be recognized for what he is, as the foe of economic privilege and political rascality in both parties, that the movement he leads can cut its way through the barricades of the party "bosses" of the State.

But let no one imagine that this repulse which Johnson has met in Ohio is equivalent to defeat. As the civil war was not won at Bull Run nor the Revolution at Bunker Hill, neither could Johnson be expected to win the State of Ohio in his first fight against the plutocrats of the two parties. But he has planted the seeds of popular confidence, which will sprout and grow as the befooled and befuddled people of the State begin to realize that in voting against his wing of the Democratic party they were voting with the plutocratic wing of the same party as well as with the commercial combines and political rings of the Republican machine. Neither he nor Bigelow could have more than hoped for victory in the first battle. Both of them know that the forces which oppose democracy never have been weak, for both have long taken their democracy from Henry George, who wrote:

Let us not disguise it. Over and over again has the standard of Truth and Justice been raised in this world. Over and over again has it been trampled down oftentimes in blood. If they are weak forces that are opposed to Truth, how should Error so long prevail? If Justice has but to raise her head to have Injustice flee before her, how should the wail of the oppressed so long go up?

Both of these men, resting now under the shadow of disappointed hopes, not for themselves but for mankind, have pinned their faith to the doctrine that Truth and Justice, though

they often lose battles, never lose a war; and no sooner shall the reports of the contest of Tuesday be fully in, than both will be preparing for the municipal contests of next Spring, which in turn will be but the prelude to more important ones later on.

One especially gratifying fact about the Ohio election is the discovery that the heavy plurality against Bigelow was due altogether to the combination of the bi-partisan "bosses" of Cincinnati. The Republican "boss," Cox, cooperating with Bernard, the lieutenant of the Democratic "boss," McLean, and thereby controlling all the election machinery of both parties, was able to make Hamilton county appear to have cast a plurality of 30,000 against Bigelow. So it appears in the count. This is at least 30,000 more than a normal Republican plurality, and it more than accounts for Bigelow's loss in the State as a whole. He falls less than 20,000 in the State behind the Democratic plurality of last year, the plurality against him being less than 90,000, while that against Kilbourne last year was almost 70,000. Outside of Hamilton county, therefore, Bigelow made gains. What is more important, he carried Senator Hanna's own county, Cuyahoga, which is normally Republican, and where Hanna did his strongest campaigning, by 2,500 plurality, and Hanna's Republican city of Cleveland by 5,000. Upon these facts it is to be reasonably expected that the Cox-Bernard-McLean "combine" of Cincinnati will be read out of the Democratic party of Ohio at the next State convention, and that a thorough canvass of the State will elect a democratic Democrat for governor next year.

The most satisfactory election result in Illinois, with reference to candidates, is the brilliant victory of Clarence S. Darrow, the counsel for the coal miners before the arbitration commission, who has been elected as an independent to the Illinois

legislature by over 11,000 votes, about double the vote of either of the other two successful candidates in his senatorial district. He will thus have an opportunity to force upon the attention of the legislature at its approaching session the overwhelming vote of the people of Chicago last Spring for municipal ownership of public utilities and the equally overwhelming vote of the State this fall for an enforceable initiative and referendum for the cities and for the State. A local labor party is now forming in Chicago with a view to making Darrow the next mayor of Chicago. This movement will be encouraged by a large proportion of the Democratic party.

Another extraordinary outcome of the election will be especially gratifying to single tax men. It is the triumph of ex-Senator Lucius F. C. Garvin, who was elected governor of Rhode Island on the Democratic ticket by 6,000 majority. Gov. Garvin has for years been the leading single tax man of New England. His election is a triumph for home rule, and an indication of what is in store for the Republicans of Ohio when the people of that State realize the significance of the board rule code bill which Hanna, Foraker and Cox have just enacted. The Republicans of Rhode Island had presumed upon their power to undertake to govern Democratic cities by the "board" and "boss" system, and the result is a complete reversal of the politics of the State, with a single tax leader like Johnson at the head of the poll.

One other triumph for democratic Democracy is the election of Robert Baker to Congress from a New York district. Mr. Baker has long been known in New York State as a single tax man and this was made the principal ground of opposition to him. He was elected by 500 plurality. Another single tax man who made a brilliant campaign was Franklin K. Lane, of California. He is defeated in that strong Republican State by less than 2,000. Still another is Western Starr, who reduced the ma-

majority of the notorious Humphrey for Senator from the Seventh Illinois district from 7,000 to 250.

Still another election victory for a democratic Democrat must be noted. We refer to the election of William R. Hearst for Congress from a New York district. What makes his election notable is not the fact that he has been elected, for his district is normally Democratic by 5,000. The notable thing about it is that Mr. Hearst multiplied this plurality by three. He was elected by a plurality of 15,000.

A satisfactory explanation of the defeat of the Liberals at the English election in the Liberal constituency of Devonport (p. 471) has been furnished. The defeated Liberal turns out to have been a Liberal of the Rosebery brand. Rosebery Liberals in England and Cleveland Democrats in the United States are much alike. As the Cleveland Democrat supports Republican candidates against democratic Democrats, so the Rosebery Liberal supports Tory candidates against democratic Liberals; and as the democratic Democrats are learning to return the compliment here, so the democratic Liberals are learning to return it there. Just as in the United States there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Democratic party to defeat Democratic candidates of the Cleveland type, those who are Republicans in all but name, so there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Liberal party of England to defeat a Rosebery candidate when he gets hold of the party nomination. That is what happened at the Devonport election.

President Butler, of Columbia university, makes an excellent distinction when he contrasts collectivism with anarchy, condemning both, and seeks for middle ground. But one might question the middle ground which he describes as "institutionalism." As reported, at any rate, he does not make it very clear. To say that institutionalism "stands for freedom of speech, a free press, pro-

tection of private property, respect for individual rights, and liberty for all," as President Butler does, hardly distinguishes it from either anarchy (individualism) or collectivism. The crucial question with reference to private property still remains open, namely, What is private property? As far as individualists insist upon the sanctity of private property in what is justly individual property they are right; so far as the collectivists insist upon public property in what is justly common property they are right. But in so far as the one ignores public rights in common property and the other denies private rights in individual property they are both wrong. The principle of property yet to be learned and enforced is this, that titles must rest in justice and not merely in institutions. That is the principle that is being worked out, and which will be the issue of the future. The quicker collectivism progresses the sooner will it measure strength with the principle of moral righteousness in public matters. The faster those men advance in political power who would abolish the idea of "mine and thine" in favor of "ours," the earlier will they come into decisive conflict not with those who cling to "mine and thine," but to those who stand for "mine, thine and ours."

The Federal judges sitting in the United States court of appeals at Chicago, with Judge Grosscup in the lead, have been manufacturing more law. It goes almost without saying that they have done it for the protection of one of the great interests. To use the language of the opinion of Judge Grosscup, it is to protect the "great news agencies," the "great newspapers" and the "great telegraph and cable lines." Such little interests as those of authors have long appealed to the courts for similar protection; but they have appealed in vain. The courts have told them that they must go to the legislature for their relief, for the precedents do not