

many of his supporters hope and expect, his election would be almost a certainty. It is doubtful if any person at all, not completely tarred with the plutocratic stick, would be defeated this year if nominated by the Democrats and not opposed by a third party of sufficient popularity to divide the radical vote. But it is far from certain that Mr. Hearst will be nominated by the Democratic convention. There is a possibility if not a probability, that some such reactionary Democrat as Jerome may receive the Democratic nomination. In that case the contest might narrow down to Hearst and the Republican candidate, with the chances in favor of Hearst. A Democratic reactionary would count for little, perhaps, with the Democratic rank and file; and the Republicans throughout the State as well as in the city, appear to be resentful enough of the bare-faced surrender of their party to plutocratic combines to give their leaders a savage lesson. Yet any third party candidate looks stronger now than he is likely to look when the votes are counted, in a State of the political character of New York. When that time approaches more closely, it will probably appear that the nomination of a reactionary by the Democrats means the election of the Republican candidate. New York State is not New York City, and Republicans are mightily party bound.

* *

The Primary Law in Illinois.

Governor Deneen's pinchbeck primary law has turned out as might have been expected, and as he and his coterie of Republican "reformers" probably intended it should—barring the necessity it has put them under of compromising with Lorimer. It is a primary law only in name; not at all in substance. While it gives the rank and file of the political parties opportunity to vote at the primaries, it is so framed that their vote does not count at the conventions. A political bosses' law, it makes it quite as easy for political bosses to control nominations as it was before, and gives them the added advantage of seeming to act not only with the might but in the name of the people.

*

The effect of this law in Chicago has been to put Roger C. Sullivan in control of the Democratic machinery, with ex-Mayor Harrison as his lieutenant, and to bring about a division of Republican spoils between the pretentious Deneen and the unspeakable Lorimer. In consequence, the people of Chicago are called upon to choose

between two sets of candidates which, with two or three individual exceptions in each set, are about the worst that were ever presented to a discriminating constituency. In this emergency the Independence League, under the direction of Mr. Hearst, is proposing to nominate a third ticket, composed of men worthy the support of self-respecting citizens. It is to be hoped that such a ticket may be presented. The effect might be merely a division of the Democratic vote and the election of the Republican candidates; but for the sake of genuine democracy, and even of the Democratic party itself, it would be better that the Republican machine should sweep the field and bear the responsibility and odium of putting into office such candidates as it has named, than that the Democratic party should be responsible for Sullivan and his spoils-hunting cohorts.

* *

Human Equality.

Secretary Bonaparte in his Chautauqua speech at Cumberland on the 12th, expounded in a somewhat remarkable manner the American idea of equality. His speech was aimed at what he called "anarchists," whom he amiably proposed to put to death without much discrimination either as to their opinions or their acts. As Mr. Bonaparte explained that socialists and anarchists are from the same root, we must assume that he intended his drastic measures for members of the Socialistic party as well as for the undefined and undefinable type, varying from Quaker to revolutionist, whom he called "anarchist." The most peculiar thing about his speech, however, was his theory of the origin of the crime of "anarchy." He traced it to the doctrine that men are born equal and that their equality ought to be maintained. That it was his purpose to condemn this doctrine is manifest; but what he meant by the doctrine he condemned is not so clear. We must assume that by equality he did not mean equality of height, or strength, or mental or physical ability; to suppose that he did would be to take Mr. Bonaparte for a fool, and it is cheerfully conceded that he is no fool. There is doubtless a good deal of the savage in him, but one may not be a fool because he happens to be a savage. Upon the assumption, then, that he did not mean equality of height, etc., Mr. Bonaparte must have alluded to equality of rights, and therefore must have intended to condemn the doctrine that men are born with equal rights and that equality of rights ought to be maintained. It would seem that Mr. Bonaparte is more in need of having the Declaration of Independence expounded to him than the

people are in need of having him air his savage notions about a class of crime that has no existence, and popular movements and opinions regarding which he is evidently in profound ignorance.

* *

The Denver Election Exposures.

It is strange that any persons whatever who allow themselves to be governed in the least by honest impulses, can contemplate the election exposures in Denver without holding in supreme contempt those judges of the Supreme Court of the State, those leaders of the Denver bar, those public officials of Denver, and those business men of that city, who have lent themselves to the infamous work of suppressing the facts about the election frauds whereby the public utilities corporations were made to appear to have received a popular vote for their plundering franchises. Every foul means seems to have been adopted to check these disclosures, until the ingenuity of the lawyers for the corporations and possibly the rascality of the judges who aided them, had run their course. When finally the matter came before Judge Lindsey, under circumstances which enabled him to proceed with the long delayed and obstructed investigation, the reasons for obstructing the investigation became obvious. That investigation has now gone far enough to show that the corporations (which means "respectable" business and professional men, for corporations are only business masks for living men) committed fraud upon fraud by sending their employes to vote upon the basis of fraudulent tax receipts, and that even then they would have failed to accomplish their purpose had they not bribed election officials to return a fraudulent count. It is from such men as these that the public are being constantly warned about "anarchists." Yet in the very worst possible sense of the word "anarchist," they themselves, these men of the bench and the bar and the business office, are anarchists of the most despicable and dangerous species.

* *

The Labeled and the Unlabeled Thieves.

"Another good man gone wrong," was the way the newspapers used to announce detections of a certain type of successful business men, until a witty editorial writer approximated the truth more closely by altering the formula to "another bad man found out." Of all the exposures of successful business men that have recently been made, hardly one would answer to the description of "a good man gone wrong"; they answer better to the description of "a bad man found out." But even

that description is not quite candid, for these men were long commonly known to be bad. It is not so much the being found out that seems to condemn such men, as being stopped in their careers of wickedness. Here, for example, is the case of Stensland of Chicago, the president of a bank which through his financial treachery has failed, bringing ruin upon thousands of people. That he was doing what has brought about the catastrophe, namely, using other people's money for private speculation, was as well known in business circles months ago as it is to-day. He was not known to be a forger, to be sure; but that is only a detail. Yet he was a successful and respected business man, esteemed worthy of any trust by the business crowd, until the crash came. Then everybody condemned him for the ruin and misery he had brought upon the depositors in his bank. The truth of the matter is that when the crash comes is the time to pity rather than to condemn men like Stensland. The time to condemn them is while they are in the full tide of getting something for nothing, and not after they have been caught. There are to-day in the city of Chicago, in New York, in every other large city men who are doing, with more or less respect for the law, precisely in moral principle what Stensland was doing. They are known to be doing it. Yet they are held up to public admiration as successful business men and honorable public citizens. These men—it may be in legal form, or it may be not, that is a detail—are spreading ruin and misery broadcast with every stroke of what they call business. All who are sophisticated know that they are doing it. But they contribute to churches, they contribute to colleges, they flourish in social clubs, their opinion about public affairs is accepted when the opinions of honest men are rejected, their friendship is sought, they are fawned upon; and if the crash does not come, as in Stensland's case it did, they pass out of this world with honor, and monuments are raised to their memory. They are regarded as examples of business success and civic leadership. More evil is done by one such man who passes through life undetected by the general public than by a dozen who come to grief. It were better to pity the Stenslands who fail and get caught than to admire the Stenslands who succeed.

* *

The Passing of the Sullivan.

Roger C. Sullivan's protestations that Mr. Bryan falsifies the character of the Illinois convention of 1904, from which he derives his credentials as national committeeman, are wholly