

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1904.

Number 315.

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.

"When I grow up," asked an observant little girl of her mother, "shall I have to marry a man like pa, or else be an old maid like Aunt Kate?" "Yes, my dear," replied the mother. The child's comment was thoughtful and deliberate: "Well, Ma, it's a tough world for us women, ain't it?" Somewhat analogous must be the feeling of Democrats who care less for the Democratic label than for the democratic principle, when they contemplate the baffling alternative of Parker or Hearst.

To that alternative there is not even a Hobson's choice. For, let Hearst be what he may, Parker is no better unless in a purely social sense; and social considerations are not properly controlling ones in choosing a President. If Parker has ever given utterance to a political sentiment, the fact has missed the record. He has always voted the Democratic ticket, we are told; but that is true of "Bathhouse John." The only indications of Judge Parker's trend of thought in matters political are such as are afforded by the character of his political friends; and those indications, however satisfactory to men like John D. Rockefeller, J. Pierpont Morgan and James J. Hill, are far from reassuring to the people whom these parasites are plundering.

Judge Parker was taken up by David B. Hill, who is now managing the campaign in his behalf. He is primarily Hill's chosen candidate, and Hill is his chosen manager; which ought to damn his can-

didacy with every one whose sense of political decency is not hopelessly blunted. He is August Belmont's man, and the favorite of every big financial conspirator of Wall street; which ought to discredit his candidacy with all voters who revolt against the plutocratic tendencies of present day politics. He is the second choice of the conscienceless fox of Maryland, Senator Gorman; which ought to cast a shadow over his candidacy with all believers in candid politics. He is Grover Cleveland's own substitute for himself; which ought to and doubtless will insure the hostility to him of every independent voter who would vote against Grover Cleveland. Any man who conceals his political opinions from the public, as Judge Parker does, yet is heartily supported by Hill, Gorman, Cleveland, Belmont, and the Wall street "business classes," as Judge Parker is, may be reasonably suspected of having confided acceptable opinions to them.

Nor are those suspicions allayed by the circumstances under which this man of no general fame has suddenly become the favorite of what the distinguished Howard Crosby used to describe as "the dangerous classes." Hill had him in training. But Gorman was for Gorman, Cleveland looked on, and Wall street was doubtful. Then August Belmont, a Wall street financier, with inherited traditions of the Rothschilds resting heavily upon his shoulders, appeared upon the scene. In some way he seems to have touched an electric button. Gorman and Cleveland promptly put the stamp of their approval on Parker, and forthwith the plutocratic air of Wall street was fairly ablaze with responsive signals. Behold! David B. Hill, Grover Cleveland,

August Belmont, and the corruption-fund gang of Wall street have agreed upon a "harmony" candidate! His name is Parker; his well worn label is "Democrat;" and his political opinions are a secret, unless you are in Mr. Belmont's confidence or know how to take a hint.

With the alternative of such a choice on the one hand, and Mr. Hearst on the other, there is probably no better candidate for the purpose of pushing them both aside than John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. Mr. Williams has proved himself a competent leader. He is a man whose Democracy yields much more upon examination than a chemical trace of democratic principle. He has won a national reputation, and not had one handed him on a golden platter by Wall street financiers. He is not in sympathy with plutocracy, nor is he objectionable to any Democrats, however divergent their opinions, if the divergency is upon principle and not for revenue. The only objection to him is that he is from the South. That in itself is not a valid objection. The Civil War is over, and damned should be the man who tries to revive its bitterness. In only one contingency could the fact that Mr. Williams comes from the South be a legitimate objection; and that would be the revival, not as a Civil War issue but as a present day issue, of the race question. Yet on that very question Mr. Williams could take no stand against the legal rights of Negroes which plutocratic Northern Democrats (Republicans, too, for the matter of that), do not take with less reason than Southerners have, and from a lower human impulse. If the representative Southern men, hostile as they are to Cleveland and suspicious as they ought to be of Parker, will suggest Williams, they will be surprised by the en-

thusiastic welcome their suggestion will receive.

The Brooklyn Eagle replies with characteristic candor to our criticism of its insinuation (p. 3) that Bryan demoralized the Democratic party in Illinois in 1896. In support of that contention it compared Cleveland's victory in 1892 with Bryan's defeat in 1896 and 1900, but said nothing of the utter break-up of the Democratic party at the intervening Congressional elections of 1894 while Cleveland was President and before Bryan's advent as a national leader. We supplied its very significant omission in that particular. Now observe the amazing effrontery of its reply:

The Eagle said that the Democracy carried Illinois in 1892 and lost it in 1896 and in 1900. In 1892 Cleveland was the candidate. In 1896 and in 1900 Bryan was the candidate. But, ah, says the Public, the Democracy lost Illinois in 1894 when Cleveland was President! Precisely, and when, and because. Altgeld was Governor, and when, and because, Altgeld pardoned anarchist murderers in a manner to show that intellectually he sympathized with them. The Eagle jumped the space between Presidential elections because it was considering those elections alone. We did not refer to State elections between Presidential elections, for we were not considering State elections, but only Presidential ones.

Humbly begging the fluttering Eagle's pardon, it was not considering Presidential elections at all as the issue or question in controversy. It was considering them only as evidence bearing upon that controversy. The gist of the question in hand was its contention that Bryan found a Democratic majority in Illinois when he succeeded Cleveland in the leadership of the Democratic party in 1896, and that under his leadership, and in consequence of it, this majority disappeared. It was in support of that contention that the Eagle pointed to the election returns for Illinois in the Presidential year 1892, and compared them with those of the Presidential years 1896 and 1900. For a very obvious reason, the same reason that tempts attorneys in lawsuits to ignore evidence

that tells against their clients, the Eagle "jumped," to use its own language—"the Eagle jumped the space between Presidential elections." It jumped that space not because those elections were the subject under consideration, but because that space had to be jumped in order to give any force to the evidence it offered. Without "jumping" this most important interval between Presidential elections, it could not hope to deceive its readers as to the matter in controversy. Without that "jump" it could not point to Bryan as the disrupter of the Democratic party.

And now, in its reply to The Public, the Eagle "jumps" again. It "jumps" the point that when Cleveland was elected in 1892, Illinois elected 11 Democratic Congressmen out of a total delegation from the State of 22; whereas, in 1894, while he was head of the party and head of the nation, Illinois elected only 2 Democratic Congressmen. It "jumps" once more when it suppresses the fact that two years later, under Bryan's leadership in 1896, Illinois returned 3 Democratic Congressmen—a gain of 1 over Cleveland's disastrous legacy. In 1900, still under Bryan's leadership, Illinois returned 11 members. What does all this imply but that Cleveland had demoralized the party in Illinois on national issues between 1892 and 1894; and that Bryan began to revive it in 1896, and in 1900 had restored its Congressional membership fully? The Eagle cannot twist itself out of its self-made dilemma by objecting to our bringing into the case pertinent evidence which it chose to leave out. Nor can it escape by calling the Congressional elections in Illinois "State elections." Congressional elections are national elections as well in politics as in law. They are as commonly accepted barometers of national sentiment as Presidential elections are.

As to the Eagle's gratuitous sneer at Altgeld, we shall not be tempted into allowing Mr. Cleveland's Brooklyn organ to shift its

ground. Its mendacious use of an epithet here is only another symptom of its unhappy malady, groverclevelanditis. Victims of that disease are frequently observed to shriek "anarchist!" whenever argument fails them. But there is no question here of Altgeld's views on anarchism. He was not a candidate in 1894. When he did come before the people of Illinois, in 1896 and after that pardon, he polled, notwithstanding his defeat, 47,000 more votes than Cleveland had polled in Illinois four years before. If the Eagle wishes to debate the merits of the Altgeld pardon, it will give us pleasure to accommodate it. Meantime we recommend Altgeld's pardon message as wholesome reading, even if irritating, for jury fixers and corporation judges, their apologists, their newspaper organs, and their beneficiaries in general. But the question here is not Altgeld's pardon. It is whether that pardon accounts for the Democratic collapse at the polls in Illinois in 1894. That is the question the Eagle raises when it explains the reduction from 11 to 2 in the Democratic representation in Congress from Illinois that year by attributing it inferentially to Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists. To that question it is a sufficient answer to say, what is the fact, that the issue in the Congressional elections in Illinois in 1894 was not Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists, but Cleveland's administration. Passing this point, however, with a mere mention, let us ask the Eagle a question. If it believes that it was Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists and not Cleveland's administration, that reduced the Democratic representation of Illinois in Congress from 11 in 1892 to 2 in 1894, then how does it account for the reduction in the Democratic representation from other States? Was it Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists in Illinois, and not Cleveland's administration, that reduced the Democratic representation in Congress from New York, the Eagle's own State, from 20 in 1892 to 5 in 1894? Does that pardon by Altgeld, instead of Cleveland's ad-