

disclosed by his official acts, and his greatest strength at the coming election, apart from purblind partisanship, will be the support they are giving him. Through Mr. Murphy, the Tammany leader to whom Mayor McClellan is as obedient as a dog to his master, these interests are assured protection and further plunder. Tammany Hall, which, under the Murphy-McClellan regime is reported to have turned away from protecting and fattening upon vulgar vice, has become to the franchise grabber what it was aforetime to dens and dives. Though the lid be on in the "red light district," it is off in the prowling places of the great business grafter.

That the Republican machine is in sympathy with this situation is evident from the nomination it has made for mayor. William M. Ivins would never have been nominated by the Republicans except for a sacrifice in a losing fight in aid of Tammany Hall and the combine of great business grafters. To read Mr. Ivins's speech of acceptance is to see that an administration which he dominated would strike with panic all those business interests that are generally under Republican guardianship and which control or are allied with those that do control private ownership of public property. That this is so may be inferred from the way in which his nomination impresses the Chicago Record-Herald, which cautiously but truly said of it on the 15th that—

those who are familiar with Mr. Ivins's reform affiliations and activities in the past will find his present position on municipal issues natural and consistent. He has not only declared for municipal acquisition of every lapsed or forfeited franchise, and the relentless prosecution of franchise grabbers guilty of fraud, but he has avowed his belief in the general principle that "the wealth created by the community should be held in perpetuity for the benefit of the community." This broad phrase is used by single taxers and applies to land values generally, and not merely to franchises. Mr. Ivins may still be a disciple of George, a social radical. That he

is the candidate of the Republican party of conservative New York is certainly a remarkable circumstance.

But a heavy vote for Ivins, as the Republican candidate, would doubtless be, in spite of his ringing declaration, less effective against the franchise-grabbing interests of New York and elsewhere, than such a vote for Hearst. For Hearst's nomination sprang from sources and is supported by influences which depend upon no official for their persistence. Such a vote for Ivins would not be significant; for Hearst it would be significant. It is not lightly that we say this. We realize as keenly as anyone the embarrassments of trying to rally to Hearst's support the truly democratic influences in New York. When it is remembered that after helping to foster the movement which nominated Henry George eight years ago, his paper not only abandoned that movement and turned to the support of Tammany Hall, but also opened its columns for abusive attacks upon George personally, it is impossible to expect undampened enthusiasm for Hearst's candidacy. The record of his San Francisco paper in serving the railroad ring by defeating Franklin K. Lane, a democratic-Democrat, for governor of California, is not calculated to add to his genuinely democratic strength. His favorable attitude toward imperialism, his leaning toward protectionism, his desire for a big navy, all manifested editorially in his papers, will be a handicap. The bad character of his papers in some respects will be another handicap, notwithstanding their good character in others. His confirmed policy of making his papers so largely a medium for the fulsome advertising of his own personal vanities and political ambitions, cannot but operate as a check upon many who sympathize with the movement his candidacy represents. His linking with his own personality of every popular cause his papers advocate—as a condition at times, almost if not quite, of

their advocacy—must inevitably burden the movement with suspicions of the sincerity of its leader. But after these and all other adverse considerations are given full weight, a controlling fact remains which counts the other way. Hearst's papers in New York and Chicago have made possible such political victories as have thus far been won over plutocracy in those cities. But for Hearst's papers the Chicago referendums would have been impossible, and the traction companies would already have owned the streets practically in perpetuity. But for Hearst's papers there would be no such sentiment as now exists, both in Chicago and New York, in favor of municipal ownership—a sentiment so strong that all parties in both cities are obliged to profess belief in it, and no candidate of any party dare oppose it except in ways that are dark and by tricks that we trust may be vain. In view of this record of service to the public interest and of the political situation in New York, where Mr. Hearst is the spontaneously chosen candidate of the municipal ownership movement, much of the past should be overlooked and forgotten for the sake of what is now involved. A large vote for Hearst means added strength to the movement for municipal ownership, in Chicago as well as in New York; a small vote for him would have a tendency to check that movement in both cities. By his vote, and only by his vote, will the public opinion of New York be gauged for perhaps four years to come, on the subject of municipal ownership of municipal utilities. For this reason alone it is important that he should have the support of every voter who believes in that policy.

Lining up Chicago aldermen.

Mayor Dunne has now succeeded in making a fairly complete segregation (p. 433) of aldermanic goats on the traction question. Some goats may yet be herding on the hither side of the line, and there may still be one or two strays

among the goats; but for all practical purposes, Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's aldermanic collection is now sufficiently distinguishable for public inspection. As the record stands there are 37 Morgan aldermen out of a total of 69, the Democrats contributing 7 and the Republicans 30. The vote test was taken on the 16th upon an official recommendation by Mayor Dunne that the local transportation committee be directed by the Council to obey the popular referendum forbidding the extension of franchises, by "ceasing forthwith all negotiations with existing private companies except as to the purchase of their properties by the city of Chicago." On this proposition an evasive vote was impossible. A negative vote distinctly meant approval of the policy of extending Pierpont Morgan's franchises, and was therefore flat in the face of the popular mandate against that extension. At least 10 of the aldermen who voted for the Morgan policy are under written pledges to their constituents, on the faith of which they were elected, to vote against that policy. With this lining up and identification of the traction ring aldermen, the contest between the people of Chicago and Mr. Morgan for control of the streets of Chicago revives in a manner little calculated to encourage the Morgan combine. There is every reasonable indication now that unless the rough and ready bribery faction of the combine overrule the gentler referendum faction of the combine, the present proposed extension ordinance will die the death of the tentative ordinance.

Among the aldermen who lined up with the goats in this collection was R. R. McCormick, a young Republican who is the candidate of his party at the approaching election for president of the sanitary board. As the local Republican organization is committed to the Morgan policy, whether in return for campaign contributions or from sentiments of congeniality, it

is wielding the party whip in behalf of the Morgan traction ordinance. This might account for young McCormick. But if the Record-Herald correctly reported a public speech of his last June, nothing but the sentiment of that speech is necessary to account for him. Judged by his speech he doesn't believe in popular government, for according to the report in the Record-Herald of June 3 he described the Referendum League and other organizations as —

vigilance committees, organized to have their matters of opinion prevail, and they do it by lynching methods, not with nooses but with ballots. There is no question in anybody's mind that this is wrong. We can condone a vigilance committee for hanging a horse thief, but not for hanging a man because he differs in opinion from them. They come up to the aldermen with an ordinance and say: "You've got to pass it. If you don't we'll skin you. Surrender your judgment or we'll beat you at the polls." I believe in reform associations of all kinds, but all on proper lines. They should do educational work and should not go out to lynch men politically.

That speech, which exhibits a queer notion of the principles of popular government, may very well account for Alderman McCormick's voting for Morgan's interests against the people's declaration of their estimate of their own interests. It may also be accounted for by Mr. McCormick's fear of the party whip; for in the same speech he said, according to the Record-Herald's report:

I would advise no one to take to politics as a profession. The tenure of office is uncertain, and there are temptations. I don't mean money temptations, but the temptation that comes when you see your position in jeopardy. It is a terrible sight to see a man with a good record approached by a boss who says: "Vote for that, or I'll take your scalp." It is pretty hard to resist that, if there is nothing else in sight.

Mr. McCormick spoke then with deep feeling and evidently from exasperating experience. Has a Republican boss again approached him, this time on the Morgan ordinance, saying "Vote for that or I'll take your scalp"? And was there so little in sight for Mr. McCormick that he found it impossible to resist?

Municipal politics in Auburn.

A peculiar and gratifying movement has developed in the municipal politics of Auburn, N. Y., under the leadership of Thomas Mott Osborne, who for two terms has been mayor of that city and is now a candidate for reelection. In the past campaigns, he and his associates have appealed to men of all parties on national issues but at one with them on local issues, to accept the Democratic local nominations as non-partisan national, for the purification of the city and the realization locally of genuinely democratic ideals. This movement having proved successful, Mayor Osborne has now induced his party to demonstrate its sincerity by nominating for local office men who are Republicans in national politics but in sympathy with the purified Democracy locally; and pursuant to that wise policy the local Democratic party has this year, in renewing its appeals for non-partisanship, divided its nominations between Democrats and Republicans. It is now in another vigorous fight with the Republican machine, which, until the advent of Mayor Osborne, had had things its own way in Auburn. In promotion of this new movement in municipal politics for which the Democratic party of Auburn stands, an old paper, the Auburn Bulletin, has been secured and under the name of the Auburn Citizen has been made a clean, attractive, and honest though militant daily newspaper; putting public and private morality above business, and standing for local issues in local politics. This paper, controlled by Mayor Osborne as president of the company publishing it, and the rejuvenating political movement it represents, are not of the goody-goody "good government" order. They are now engaging the people of Auburn in city house cleaning, but as a necessary first step in municipal progress. With them house cleaning is not an end, it is the means to an end. The impulse of the movement is essentially democratic.

The Cleveland mayoralty elections
The friends of the Republican