

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1904.

Number 346.

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.

That new political alignments are probably at hand is as prophetic as political history can make it. The Presidential election of 1904 resembles that of 1852, the culminating year of the old regime, as two peas in the same pod resemble each other.

In 1852 there were two principal parties, and, growing out of the chattel slavery evil, a minor party. In 1904 there were two principal parties, and, growing out of economic evils, several minor parties.

The minor party of 1852, the Free Democracy, was fundamentally democratic. It polled a popular vote of only 156,149, about 5 per cent. of the total, and not one electoral vote. The minor parties of 1904—Socialist, People's, Prohibition, etc.—were democratic in various interpretations of the term, even if their germ principles are more or less paternalistic. Their popular vote is as yet unknown, but in percentage it is probably about 6 or 7 per cent. of the total.

Of the two principal parties in 1852, the Democratic was bound hand and foot by the slave oligarchy. In its platform it declared that "the Democratic party will resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." Of the two principal parties in 1904 the Republican stood in a similar relation to plutocracy.

The second principal party in 1852 tried to make itself as valuable a defender of slavery as the other. In its platform it declared that the slave compromise acts, including the fugitive slave law, are a "settlement in principle and substance of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace," and deprecating "all further agitation of the question thus settled, as dangerous to our peace," pledged the party to "discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation whenever, wherever and however the attempt may be made." The second principal party of 1904 stood in a similar relation generally to the other on the issue of plutocracy; and in Parker's telegram proclaiming the eternity of the gold standard there was a striking resemblance, in form even if not in substance, to the Whig declaration of the eternity of the slavery compromise.

Those being the impressively analogous circumstances, let us turn to the election results. There was an electoral-vote landslide in 1852, apparently for the Democratic party, but really against the recreant Whig party. There was an electoral-vote landslide in 1904, apparently for the Republican party, but really against the recreant Democratic party. The electoral vote of 1852 was 254 for the Democrats and only 42 for the Whigs; in 1904 it was 335 for the Republicans and only 141 for the Democrats.

Now for the sequel. A new party sprang up during the four years following the election of 1852. It was not the Free Democracy of 1852, but an entirely new party born out of the issues and the occasion. In 1856 it polled 114 electoral votes to 174 for the Democrats, and in 1860, 180 to 84—

thus going into power eight years after the Democratic party had swept the country. The slavery issue, decided overwhelmingly to all appearances in favor of slavery in 1852, was thus decided the other way in 1860. A few years more and slavery had been abolished. The issue of plutocracy vs. democracy, decided overwhelmingly to all appearances in favor of plutocracy in 1904—how soon will that issue be decided the other way and plutocracy be wiped out, if these historical parallels continue as they have so significantly begun?

That history will continue to repeat itself in this matter, as it does in most matters, one can hardly doubt. It is not to be inferred, however, that the repetition will be perfect in detail. History repeats in broad outline, not in minor particulars. So it must not be assumed that a powerful party will spring up between 1904 and 1908 as one did between 1852 and 1856. Neither is it to be assumed that such a party will not spring up. New political alignments are inevitable, but the parallel with the '50's will be just as close without a new party as with one, if the realignments straighten out the battle line between plutocracy and democracy.

That this will be done by the old organizations and under the old names is the more probable outcome. At any rate it is something which leaders cannot control. Mr. Watson, for instance, can no more make a new party than he can make a new moon. Even Mr. Bryan, with a vastly greater hold upon popular confidence, great as Mr. Watson's indisputably is, could not make a powerful new party. Parties are not made, they are born. They spring out of occasions, full born

and not still-born. No one has to be dragooned into lending a hand at the advent of a new party. Everybody knows it is coming, and the difficulty which worries those who attend upon its organization is not the dragging of strong and reluctant leaders in, but the keeping of weak and officious leaders out. By this sign can the vitality of a new party movement be known: When you have to beg men to serve on committees and implore them to become candidates, your new party is still-born; when you have to scrutinize your volunteers for committee work and sift your excessive supply of candidates, your new party, though it may not grow to maturity, is at any rate alive at birth. We see no evidence of that kind of vitality now. We do see many indications of democratic vitality within the Democratic party.

Election returns are still too meager for intelligent analysis. It is impossible to say more than that the Democratic party under plutocratic leadership and controlled by plutocratic influences, with the silver question omitted from its platform and the gold standard banner held aloft by its candidate, with a large campaign fund and immunity from obstruction by the democratic leaders of the party, has been beaten enormously worse than was the same party under democratic leadership and controlled by radical influences, with the silver question in the foreground, with a campaign fund hopelessly small, and with all manner of obstacles interposed by the plutocratic leaders and papers of the party.

In these circumstances it is gratifying in the highest degree to compare the splendid poise and gracious magnanimity of Bryan with the narrowness and meanness of the plutocratic leaders and papers in his party four and eight years ago, and only six months back, when they supposed they had politically buried what they called "Bryan-

ism" even as he knows that they themselves are politically buried now. Bryan's editorial in the *Commoner* of November 11 (reproduced in our *Miscellany* this week), in which he discusses "Democracy vs. Plutocracy — the Election's Lesson," is a complete vindication of the judgment of all who in these eight years of journeying through the political wilderness have seen in Bryan elements of great leadership which so many with intentions just as sincere were not able to see.

Whatever the differences of opinion may be among Jeffersonian democrats as to the details of Bryan's programme in the future, there ought to be none in the slogan he proposes for battling against trusts—"Death to every private monopoly," he says, "must be the slogan of the party on this question; any other position is a surrender." Mr. Bryan may still regard monopoly as the fruit instead of the germ of trusts; but that makes no practical difference at the present time. So long as "death to monopoly" is his objective, his policy of no surrender will in due season expose the seat of this social disease and suggest the cure. It will be observed, moreover, that the specific reforms Bryan advocates are aimed less directly at monopoly as a product of the trust evil than at monopoly as its cause.

A similar view of the political future is taken by Joseph W. Folk, the governor-elect of Missouri. He says that "one principle runs through all the evils the country suffers from, and that is the principle of 'graft.'" Used in the comprehensive manner in which Mr. Folk uses it, this new term, "graft," is synonymous with "monopoly." All legal privileges are "graft"—from tariff protection and Federal loot, to street car franchises and city spoils, from money-mongering to landlordism. "Graft" is a better term than "monopoly," also, because it visibly includes the agents, lawyers, lobbyists, legislators, bank-

ers, clergymen and other servants and parasites of monopolists—classes that do not obviously fall within that category themselves. A significant term is "graft." The only objection to its use in Democratic politics is that we should then be "anti-grafters," wherefore the Republican newspapers might again sneer at us as "anties." "Anti-graft" would be as objectionable to them as any other "anti"—more so to many of them.

But names are as yet of no more importance than candidates. The thing is the thing itself, and not its name. As to candidates, both Mr. Folk and Mr. Bryan say the true word. Says Mr. Folk: "Political contests should be made for principles, not for men;" while Mr. Bryan says: "It does not matter so much who the nominee may be; during the next three years circumstances may bring into the arena some man especially fitted to carry the standard; it will be time enough to discuss a candidate when we are near enough to the campaign to measure the relative availability of those worthy to be considered; but we ought to begin now to lay our plans for the next national campaign and to form the line of battle." From those sentiments of two worthy men who do measure up to the standards of availability, yet put their cause first and themselves second, the friends of Mr. Hearst should draw a lesson. Whether or not Mr. Hearst has intended it, his methods in the past have justly created a widespread impression that he puts himself first and not second relatively to his cause. Should that appearance continue until the time for selecting candidates comes, he is not likely to be found among the relatively available.

Among the suggestions at once wise and inspiring for reorganization of the Democratic party is that of John DeWitt Warner, a distinguished lawyer of New York city, who has served with democratic purpose and exceptional force in Congress. Immediately

after the election Mr. Warner made this declaration:

As to reorganization of the Democratic party, it strikes me that what is most needed is organization from the voters up, in the good old democratic way. If that is had there would not be left enough of the lately beaten machine to obstruct it. If it is not, there is not enough of that machine to be worth repair. Personally I believe that the issue Democrats are best agreed upon and can best make is that of government of the people, by the people and for the people, against government of trusts, by trusts and for trusts. This means repeal of tariff taxation and the adoption of a more equitable system; it means government control, or rivalry, as fast as any necessary of life becomes a private monopoly; it means, first of all, stopping private railroad monopoly in inter-State commerce; it means that just as government a century since assumed the carriage of letters, it shall now take control of its postal service, including carriage, and so extend it as to provide for most of what is now controlled by private express monopoly.

One of the gratifying results of the recent election is the evidence it furnishes of progress in discriminative voting. Whether the discriminations were wise is not the point; the fact that they were made is the encouraging thing. In the home of Tom L. Johnson, for instance, although the county returns a landslide plurality of something like 34,000 against the Democratic national ticket, it reelects Robert C. Wright as auditor by a plurality of 2,598. Not the least significant thing about this result is the fact that Mr. Wright is well known to be a single tax man. He is, in fact, one of the ablest supporters of that idea in the country; and for several years, both in office and out, he has been at Johnson's right hand in promoting his movement for radical revenue reform.

While the discriminative vote has not depended wholly upon the true Australian ballot system, its manifestations have been most marked where that system is established. In Massachusetts, for instance, there is no "straight" voting. Every candidate must be voted for by putting the cross against his name. Largely as a

consequence of this, although Mr. Roosevelt carries Massachusetts by 85,000, Mr. Douglas, the free trade Democratic candidate for governor, wins by 35,000. One of the most urgent duties of every honest legislature where "straight" voting, this "bosses'" device, is allowed, is to abolish it at once. Not alone does it facilitate "straight" voting by those who wish to vote "straight," which is not objectionable; but it deters discriminative voters from "scratching," lest they may make their ballots defective, which is not only objectionable but highly so. If any voter is to be facilitated in his voting, at the expense of inconvenience to others, it is the discriminating voter who uses his judgment and conscience, and not the "straight" voter who is as a rule the mere tool of a "boss."

A significant news paragraph from Syracuse, N. Y., has been obscured by the more exciting news of the elections. According to this paragraph, which we take from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 8th, a tramp has been rewarded in a remarkably indicative manner, under the circumstances, for returning a considerable amount of lost property. We quote:

As a reward for having saved the New York Central \$15,000 by picking up valuable jewelry and personal effects and turning them in after the Western express had been wrecked at Lock Berlin, near Lyons, on September 24, Charles Casey, a "bobo," then walking the tracks, has been given a good job as freight brakeman in the Central yards at Dewitt.

That paragraph is significant for several reasons, some of which we shall state in interrogative form. Is work so scarce that jobs at freight-braking are given and accepted as rewards of merit for exceptional honesty? Has opportunity to earn a bare living at laborious and dangerous work become so great a boon? Then where is our boasted prosperity and why do we rail at the tramps as idlers? Think it over.

The independent newspaper is a feature of the time. But there

are different breeds. The newspaper that stands for principle regardless of party is independent; so also is that paper "independent" which holds out for the heaviest or the most respectable bribe.

THE MARRIAGE PROBLEM—MARRIAGE.

In the series of editorials of which this is the last, we have thus far considered the general subject with reference principally to its more notable problems.

In doing so we first distinguished marriage itself, or natural marriage, from the conventional symbols or contract declaratory of the natural marriage relation (p. 405), concluding that all marriage problems must be determined in the last analysis, not by considerations respecting conventional marriage, which are necessarily superficial, but by considerations respecting marriage itself—a relationship so obviously an institution of natural and not of human law.

Next we paused to speculate upon the probability of spiritual elements in the marriage relation (p. 421) which might give an eternal quality to marriages—a speculation which can not be without practical value to all who accept the idea of human immortality.

Polygamy and "free love" were then considered (p. 437), with reference to the principles of natural law already disclosed.

After that, the remarriage of a party to a former marriage upon the death of the other party (p. 452) was brought to the test of the same principles of natural law, and approved.

In preparation for a discussion of the divorce problem, marriage ceremonies (p. 468) or conventional as distinguished from natural marriages, were then examined and their importance affirmed.

The last but one of the editorials preceding the present, approved liberal divorce (p. 484) simply as a decree of nullification and regardless of remarriage; and the one immediately preceding this final one advocated freedom of remarriage after divorce (p. 499), on grounds of expediency with reference to conventional mar-