

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1903.

Number 292.

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.

The check which Tom L. Johnson's programme of democratic Democracy met in Ohio on the 3d, over which every plutocrat in both parties from coast to coast is jubilant to-day, is nothing but a check, and a very temporary one at that.

"When do you intend to renew the fight?" Johnson was asked after the first dispiriting news had been confirmed on election night. "To-morrow!" he replied. And so it will be. Johnson, like Bryan, is enlisted for a war, not merely for a battle or two.

And no one could realize better than Johnson has realized all along, that not in one battle, nor in two, nor it may be in many, can a final victory in this irrepressible conflict between plutocracy and democracy be won. More than that, he has realized all along, no less clearly than in this hour of temporary defeat, that the final victory will be preceded by local and temporary defeats as well as local and temporary victories.

How could it be otherwise? The forces against which Johnson has contended and must yet contend, are not weak forces. If they were, they would have collapsed with Johnson's first splendid victories. But note how strong they are. First are the plutocrats of all political shades and conditions, from the millionaire monopolist to the "penniless plute." Then there are the political bosses and heelers of all parties and all grades, from bar-room loafer to senatorial grafter. Then there are the

bribed newspapers, little and big, which find their profits in fooling readers. And then there are the great thoughtless and bedeviled masses themselves, upon whom all these lions and jackals prey. It is these masses that must be reached with sound doctrine and honorable appeal, and thus drawn away from the "confidence" men who annually play off profitable buncombe games upon them in the name of patriotism and prosperity. The man who takes up as his life work the task of dealing with that situation, as Johnson has done, could not drop it if he would, merely because one of his earlier efforts fails.

Doubtless the one great force that operated against Johnson in Ohio last Tuesday was the hourly reiteration by hundreds of Republican speakers throughout Ohio, of the dire prediction that if Hanna were defeated hard times would come again, whereas Hanna would preserve prosperity. It is not complimentary to the intelligence of any voter to suspect him of being influenced by such transparent buncombe, but there is much reason to believe that scores of thousands of Ohio voters were so influenced. The fact that the legislature is even more overwhelmingly Republican than the popular vote for governor, confirms this view; for it was upon the legislature and not upon the popular vote that Hanna's election depended.

Nevertheless, something besides the "hard times" scare had much to do no doubt with the dispiriting result. The State was debauched with the largest campaign fund ever used in an Ohio election. This fund was contributed by the railroad, street car, public lighting, and other monopoly interests of the whole country, for the purpose—not so much of electing Hanna, for they can get

other servants as good as he; but for the purpose of crushing Johnson, over whom they know they have neither control nor influence, nor any possibility of acquiring either. Out of this gigantic fight Johnson has come with clean hands. He has had no great campaign fund. He has spent no money except for the barest necessities for enlightening the people. He has used no billingsgate, has made no personal attacks, has confined his criticisms to the public records of his adversaries and devoted his discussions to principles rather than men. With seven victories to his credit since he began his crusade for even-handed justice in government, and only four defeats, his character and record stand out bright and strong against the day for another battle with the Princes of the Powers of Darkness in American politics.

The solitary place in all the United States which has not been wholly submerged by the plutocratic tidal wave of last Tuesday's elections, is Rhode Island, where Gov. Garvin is re-elected, in spite of the baleful power of Senator Aldrich, though by a reduced majority. Gov. Garvin is a democratic-Democrat. He belongs in the same political category with Tom L. Johnson, even to being a single taxer. Like Johnson, too, he is a man who not only knows but dares. His administration in Rhode Island has made him conspicuous even nationally. The people of his State are to be congratulated upon having defeated their plutocrats with so able and so radical a democrat.

The November issue of "Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly" should be in the hands of every American who has any sincerely patriotic interest in the welfare of his country. For an article by the editors

lays bare the new kind of lobby by which the people of this country are governed and plundered from Washington. This lobby is not a "third house," as the old lobbies were; it is composed of the members and senators themselves. Leslie describes it in a phrase: "Congress its own lobby."

Few disclosures of concealed facts are made in the Leslie article, but facts well known or reasonably suspected are so put together as to leave no doubt of their sinister significance. Quite correctly the editors of Leslie's assert that "the great curse of national legislation is the campaign contribution." Proceeding, they explain the new lobby as resulting from campaign contributions, saying:

In a Presidential or Congressional election the great corporations pick the candidates and the party to whom they feel they can look for favors; then they contribute enormous sums to carry the election. Frequently a definite bargain is made with the national committee that something shall be done or another one not done. It is a cold matter of business. Commercial Acumen which has built up vast fortunes in a generation or two, like those of "the Standard Oil crowd" or of Carnegie's coterie of young men, can usually pick a winner, or make a winner, in a national campaign. It did so in 1888, when it turned its back on Cleveland and contributed to the Harrison fund for M. S. Quay to spend. Again it did so in 1892, when it switched from Harrison back to Cleveland and gave the millions to William C. Whitney and Don M. Dickinson, with which they swept the country. It could not choose in 1896 and 1900 because William J. Bryan was running for President on a platform which made the corporations quake, so Commercial Acumen emptied a sum equal to a king's ransom at the feet of Marcus A. Hanna at the behest of such men as Cornelius N. Bliss, Senator Aldrich, Senator Allison and Senator Quay. The great interests which contributed in these four campaigns got what they paid for. Under Harrison they got the McKinley tariff law, with protective duties marked up sky high. Under Cleveland's second administration they got exactly the schedules they had bargained for in advance. Under McKinley they literally lived in clover—the richest man in the United States has quadrupled his fortune in the last seven years.

And then Leslie's goes on to prove its case with incontestable testimony.

It is a remarkable fact that two

of the corruptionists named in the Leslie editorial are manifestly to be arrayed against each other by the circumstances of this week's elections, for a gigantic struggle in the presidential campaign of 1904. They are Marcus A. Hanna, Republican, and Wm. C. Whitney, Democrat. As with the presidential elections named in that article, the one of 1904 is now almost certain to be a battle for and with a huge campaign fund. For the unexpectedly triumphant election of McClellan as Mayor of New York, through the management of Wm. C. Whitney and with Wall street funds collected by him, points to McClellan almost unerringly as the Democratic candidate for President. On the other hand, Hanna will probably be forced to accept Roosevelt. Nothing but a miracle in politics can relieve him of that burden. So Hanna will have to stand sponsor for Roosevelt in raising the campaign fund. But no king's ransom will drop at Hanna's feet this time, as when the trusts quaked at Bryan's nomination, or as they quaked when Johnson's broad shadow crept over their door sills. The situation will be like that of 1888 and of 1892, and not like that of 1896 and of 1900. This time there will be a competing bidder for the "king's ransom." Mr. Whitney will come into the field for McClellan, as in 1892 he came for Cleveland. And which of the two—Hanna or Whitney—will get the richest contributions? The one, of course, who can give the best assurances of his power to deliver the post-election goods which he offers for the pre-election campaign fund. This will give the bulk of the fund to Whitney. For Hanna will not be able to satisfy the great campaign contributors of Wall street that the erratic Roosevelt can always be depended upon to make Hanna's bargains good. The outlook for Democratic success in 1904 is certainly much more promising than it was the day before this week's election. It is not improbable that the Democratic Mr. Whitney, with his new presidential protege, will come into nation-

al power just in the nick of time (as with his protege of 1892) to make the Democratic party appear to have caused the business depression which is now about due.

By a vote of 41 to 22 the city council of Chicago has apparently sustained the suspicious behavior of one of its committees relative to negotiations with traction stock-jobbers for an extension of traction franchises. But hasty inferences should not be drawn from this vote. There is no certainty that all who voted with the majority are on the stock-jobbing side of the question. Questions of temporary expediency were involved in the motion voted on, and nothing decisive was at that time at stake. The sheep in the council, therefore, are not yet wholly separated from the goats. But the time is fast approaching when this separation will be made and an inventory of the people's stock of goats in the council can be taken.

To suggest corruption in the Chicago council, after so much has been so widely reported of the reformation of that body, may be startling. The suggestion may even be received incredulously. But there is no implication that those reports of reform are untrue. The Chicago council has probably been pretty completely purified of vulgar bribe-takers. But it has acquired in their place a collection of high-toned business "grafters"—men who make money not by taking bribes for ordinances, but through investments, directly or indirectly in the profits accruing from measures they vote for. For such men the traction question opens up rich and reputable opportunities. No matter how much money they may make out of traction franchises, they make it so strictly in conformity with conventional business methods that their social and business standing is improved rather than impaired thereby. The yeast of this kind of