

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1901.

Number 186

**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 column of last page.

The earlier reports regarding the municipal election in New York, which were full of assurances that Mr. Low would have a "walk-over," are giving place to reports of an entirely different character. At present, although the Republican committee claims a plurality of 80,000, the surface indications point to Mr. Low's defeat. These indications are confirmed by the preliminary canvasses of the *Herald* and the *World*, which show, upon the basis of the presidential vote of last year, that Shepard will probably be elected by nearly 20,000 plurality.

A different result is most improbable. It would be strange indeed if at this crisis in national affairs and at this promising juncture in the politico-economic movement, the Democratic city of New York should elect a Republican mayor, when it has the alternative of electing a Democrat who is democratic. Between Shepard, the anti-imperialist Democrat, even as "Boss" Croker's nominee, and Low, the imperialist Republican, as "Boss" Platt's nominee, the political duty of an independent democrat should be plain enough. Politically, Shepard is far more democratic than Low. Economically he is certainly no more conservative, and probably much more radical. His personal character being as pure and his abilities higher, his administration of local concerns would be as good or better. And as to the objectionable source of his nomination, he represents what is bad in Tammany Hall no more than Low represents what is bad in the Platt machine. Shepard's

nomination has removed every reason, unless personal pledges be expected, why men of democratic faith should vote for Low. Reasons are abundant why they should vote for Shepard.

The mask of non-partisanship under which Low came into the field has been dropped. That could not be helped. For in fact there was not a truly non-partisan movement of magnitude behind him. When the Citizens' Union, which went through the form of first nominating him, after Mr. Platt had refused to unite with that body upon any candidate who had voted for Bryan—in other words, any democrat at all,—when this non-partisan body made a call for campaign funds, the call met with no popular response. The officers of the organization were obliged to confess that the non-partisan movement was upon the point of breaking down. It has broken down, in fact. The Republican machine is now in complete control of the Low campaign.

All that remains of the so-called "fusion" movement may be classified in six groups. First comes the Republican party machine, which secured Low's nomination by the docile Citizens' Union, and then endorsed him. Low was an ideal man for Platt's purpose. Though always a Republican he was never quite orthodox until a year ago. He had regularly voted the machine ticket, but had been seen to "hold his nose" while doing it. This record, with some genuine non-partisan service, had given him the non-partisan trademark which Platt needed. The trademark lost some of its brilliant coloring a year ago, when Mr. Low decided no longer to "hold his nose," but to swallow the Republican programme

—protectionism, imperialism and all—as if he liked it. Since then he has been in good standing with the Republican machine. While this fact decidedly lessens his value to Mr. Platt as a candidate, it would immensely increase it as mayor. The second group of the "fusion" residuum is composed of individuals of both parties, most of whom are sincere non-partisans in local affairs, many of whom are genuine radicals, but none of whom bring any effective political following. In the third group are a few respectable survivals from the old "County Democracy," a faction which as a political force was as corrupt while in power as Tammany Hall itself. This group is insignificant. Then comes the fourth group, a collection of gold Democrats like ex-Mayor Hewitt and Mr. Stetson, ex-President Cleveland's former law partner. They opposed Bryan not only on the money question, but also on the issue of imperialism; and it was to this group that Platt limited the non-partisans in their choice of a Democratic candidate for mayor, thereby driving them to accept Mr. Low. The fifth group is composed of ex-Tammanyites—Sheehan, Crimmins, etc., to many of whom Tammany Hall is indebted quite as much as to Croker for its bad character and reputation. This is a new element in anti-Tammany politics, and its strength cannot be estimated. It is the only strong factor in support of Low besides the Republican machine. The sixth group is a miscellaneous lot of camp followers, among whom the perennial "Jimmy" O'Brien is conspicuous. Why should independent democrats regard their support of such a "fusion" as an act of non-partisanship?

One of the reasons urged upon independent democrats in behalf of the

candidacy of Mr. Low is that the election of Low would break up Tammany Hall. But why break up Tammany Hall? It is the political evils for which Tammany Hall stands, and not Tammany Hall itself, that needs to be broken up; and those evils may be as well represented by other organizations as by Tammany Hall. Were Tammany Hall broken up by the election of Mr. Low, those evils would be represented by the Platt machine just as certainly as Mr. Low's campaign is now managed by it. The evils of Tammany Hall, as distinguished from the organization, are much more likely to be broken up by Shepard's election than by Low's. Were Platt as successful in electing Low as he was in nominating him, Low's election would but transfer the evils from one political organization to another, besides counting as a political triumph and a pernicious factor in national affairs. Shepard's election, on the other hand, would put at the head of the Democratic city of New York a Democrat in national concerns who is conceded to be at least the equal of Low as an able and honest municipal administrator.

The essential fact to be borne in mind about Tammany Hall is that no election, no political reform, no municipal or economic reform, can rid New York of Tammany evils, short of a reform so radical, one going so close to the root of the evils, that if it were imminent Mr. Low would hasten to imitate Mr. Hewitt in hysterically imploring Tammany Hall itself to help him "save society" from its fancied ravages. The political evils that are associated with Tammany Hall are effects, not causes. Wherever great wealth is congested in the possession of a small class, as in New York, and grinding poverty is suffered by the masses, there will be bad local government if popular suffrage exists. Organizations like Croker's and Platt's will spring up. If one is put down the other will take its place. If

both are disrupted new ones will come into being. These organizations cement their power by getting jobs for their followers; for where such social conditions exist nothing is so much wanted as a job. Nor does this impulse come from a desire to shirk work. A laborious job on the "big pipes" or at making pavement is as truly effective for political purposes as a sinecure. The impulse comes from the condition of limited opportunities for earning even a poor livelihood. Tammany Hall's pronounced success in utilizing this condition is not because its members are peculiarly corrupt. They are no more corrupt than other politicians, and politicians generally are no more corrupt, under corresponding temptations, than the business class. The success of Tammany Hall is due to two general causes. In the first place, the inclinations of the poor—"Alameda citizens" or "penniless plutes" excepted—are instinctively democratic; and as Tammany Hall affiliates with the Democratic party, and the masses of New York city are of the poor, a natural political bond exists between them. In the second place, Tammany Hall works with and among the poor, faithfully and all the time. Not for a few weeks before an election; not for good government for the rich, and the devil take the poor, nor to do them good "and regulate their lives;" not as gentlemen to vagrants with votes. Not in that fashion. But as man to man, morning, noon and night, three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, getting them jobs, getting them and their friends out of trouble, helping them over hard places, participating in their amusements, dancing with them at their weddings, and mourning with them at their funerals. The work of a local Tammany leader is the hardest kind of work. Only that of a faithful country doctor can compare with it. When "non-partisans" do this kind of work as well as Tammany does they may break up Tammany Hall. But the evils of Tammany will then be theirs. The evils will not have been

destroyed. To destroy these evils, one of two things is necessary. Either the ballot must be taken from the poor, which would enable the comfortable classes to realize their own ideal government; or poverty must be abolished, by destroying privilege, which would lift the poor to higher planes of citizenship.

In attempting to attract Bryan democrats to Mr. Low, the Platt Republicans show their utter lack of the saving sense of humor. Why should a Bryan man, as such, vote for Low against Shepard? It would be an absurd stultification. Of course, a Bryan man might do this on grounds of local policy, as a non-partisan in local affairs. We should in that case respect his opinion while wondering at his judgment. But to do it, not as a non-partisan, but as a Bryan man, would come close to the comic. It might be urged that Shepard is not a silver man as Bryan is; that he is a gold man. But so is Low. And after that the similarity disappears as to national politics, in respect of which alone can Bryan's name be mentioned in New York. Low is an imperialist Republican. Shepard is an anti-imperialist Democrat. And that Shepard's democracy sinks deeper than partisan limits, is attested by his "Life of Martin Van Buren," and more recently by his speech last fall in support of Bryan. It is not possible after reading that speech carefully to retain a conviction that Mr. Shepard was only perfunctorily re-aligning himself with his party. Consider these sentences, which only suggest the democratic character of the speech as a whole:

We face a grim alliance between aggressive imperialism on the one hand, reckless of the rights of men and ready to despoil them when they are weaker and we are stronger, and on the other hand a union of mighty organized interests. . . .

If the wrong begin in the Philippines, it will come to its full fruit in the United States. . . .

The assertion of the right to govern without the consent of the governed is truly mated with that scheme of tariff and other privileges to small and special classes which is so rap-

idly and lamentably ending the day of small merchants, small manufacturers, and independent mechanics.

The sole issue of the campaign in New York is succinctly summed up by a leading Bryan man of that city, Henry George, Jr., who in a letter of the 18th to George Foster Peabody, says:

Permit me to commend the position taken in your published letter from Lake George dissenting from the belief that there can be no salvation for the New York city government except by and with the support of the party still controlled by Senator Platt. That, it seems to me, embodies the real issue in this municipal campaign—whether the democratic party or the republican party shall control New York. By all the standards of his opponents, Edward M. Shepard is in character and ability worthy of the mayoralty; and they do not any more pretend that he has made discreditable bargains or that he can be used by bad elements than that Mr. Low has made such bargains or can be so used. Yet they do deny that Senator Platt effected the anti-Democratic nomination, and that that nomination has a bearing on national politics; whereas, it is well known that the senator and his able adjutant, Lieut. Gov. Woodruff, were from the start, openly or covertly, the champions of Mr. Low, and that the senator made the fusion nomination possible only on national Republican lines by repeatedly declaring that he would oppose for such nomination any man who had voted for the late Democratic candidate for the presidency—Mr. Bryan. The municipal situation is, therefore, unlike that of 1897, inasmuch as there are no independent mayoralty candidates. The choice for the voter lies between the Democratic and the Republican nominees. For myself, I shall make the choice that most nearly expresses my views, and shall vote, as I am certain my father would likewise have done, for the Democrat.

During the past week the Democratic campaign opened vigorously in northern Ohio. It began with a large meeting in Cleveland, presided over by John H. Clark and including Mayor Johnson among the speakers. Republicans as well as Democrats were invited to this meeting, both as auditors and speakers. Republican candidates for the legislature were offered the platform, turn about with Democratic candidates, and guaran-

teed fair play and a respectful hearing, the subject being taxation. But the republican candidates did not respond. They were sturdily trying to stand by the policy of their party, which insists that national and not state issues are at stake this year in Ohio.

This policy was somewhat petulantly maintained by the speakers at the opening meeting of the Republicans at Delaware on the 19th. They referred to the issue of taxation in state and municipality as a sort of foreign substance which Johnson is trying to inject into the state campaign. Whether or not this policy of evading the question of taxation succeeds in the rest of the state, it has proved a dismal failure in the Western Reserve. Dismayed by the hold the question of taxation has taken upon the people in Cuyahoga county in consequence of the disclosures of Mayor Johnson in Cleveland, the Republican candidates for the legislature have been forced to break the silence imposed by the state managers of their party and formally to address the people upon the taxation subject. It would seem that the state managers were right. Silence upon this subject could not have been worse for them, and might have been better, than this weakly defensive address. They say, for example, that "substantially everything that has been done in Ohio to lighten the burden of taxation upon real estate has been done by the Republican legislature." To lighten the burden upon real estate! But what galls the people is not the burden as a whole, but its inequality. It is this inequality that Mayor Johnson is endeavoring to correct, and in that the Republican party has opposed and obstructed him.

When he sought to raise the assessment of railroads to 60 per cent. of market value, so as to bring it within the rule as to farm and residence property, Republican auditors overruled him. When he went before the state board, that body, all Republic-

ans, also overruled him. It did so upon the basis of an opinion furnished by the attorney general whom Mr. Hanna's party had nominated in place of the Republican attorney general, Monett, by way of punishing Monett for prosecuting trusts. When Johnson asked the decennial board of appraisers to equalize real estate valuations in Cleveland, and offered to demonstrate its feasibility, they refused to consider the matter, contenting themselves with raising the appraisal generally, so that real estate owners already overassessed were overassessed still further. In spite, however, of these obstacles, thrown in his way by Republican officeholders, Mayor Johnson has reduced the tax rate of Cleveland from 3 per cent. to 2.67 per cent. He did this through the local equalization board, a majority being appointees of his own, which added \$20,000,000 to the tax duplicate, by increasing the values of street car and other public franchise companies.

But he has done still more important work in fiscal lines. Through the tax bureau which he organized under the management of Peter Witt, he has made public the gross inequalities of real estate taxation which the Republican decennial board refused to correct. Mayor Johnson's explanation of this work is of universal interest. He has addressed the people of Cleveland in a letter in which he not only makes that explanation, but couples with it other explanations of equal value regarding points referred to above. He says:

The work in the so-called tax school, though not finished, has progressed far enough to show what the final result will be. Small shops and homes, including the rented homes of the poorer people, are assessed relatively higher than any other real estate in the city. A great majority of these small properties, valued at less than \$2,000, are assessed at more than 60 per cent. of their true value, some being actually assessed at more than the owners offer to sell the property for. If all of this property were reduced to a 60 per cent. basis it would, in my opinion, reduce the tax duplicate at least \$10,000,000. The more