

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

candidate for mayor of Cleveland (p. 440) boasted of his victory in debate with Mayor Johnson somewhat too soon. As the battle has gone on the Republican candidate has been unhorsed at every charge. Similar boasting had been done before and with similar results. Every time the boasters were sorely disappointed. Johnson's first public speaking was in debate with a distinguished orator who was his adversary for Congress, and the tradition of his victory has not died out in Cleveland yet. Mark Hanna was shrewd enough to do his debating with Johnson at long range; he never dared accept a challenge. But Hanna's candidate for the mayoralty in 1903 did accept, and his followers soon wished he hadn't. The Republican candidate this year has the debating mettle his friends claimed for him, but he has not measured up to Johnson, and his friends are evidently growing weary of the contest. It is believed that Johnson will be re-elected by an emphatic majority.

The following sensible observations about this debate are made by the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 13th:

Behind it, and through it, is the spirit of the city of Cleveland manifesting itself unmistakably as the political genius of a genuine municipal democracy. . . . The local campaign has concentrated itself in these debates between Mr. Johnson and Mr. Boyd. And there is a sharp line of demarcation between city issues on the one hand and State and national issues on the other. Cleveland is settling its own affairs for itself, and the champions of the two parties are focusing the attention of an intelligent citizenship on the real issues. The conduct of the debate is characteristic of a city that has been said to have a good administration because its citizens are good. The speeches are couched in a spirit of fairness, and the audiences insist on fairness. "It is not a campaign of personality, but of issues," say the candidates. It is not a noise of brass, but of brains, might be added. In a city where nomination on any ticket never insures election, where public opinion of any shade finds respectful hearing in the press, on the Public square—Cleveland's "Forum"—on the platform or in the pulpit, such a campaign occasions little comment. In Cincinnati

or Philadelphia, or even in Boston, it might arouse astonishment that any large city of the American democracy should be so oddly democratic.

That allusion to the "public square—Cleveland's forum,"—is especially significant. Cleveland's public square has been for years a place for public meeting and debate, where any orderly crowd could gather, and any peaceable orator could preach any doctrine. Frequent efforts to abolish this forum have been made, but all have failed. The result is the "odd democracy" of which the Plain Dealer justly boasts.

#### Ohio politics.

It is not impossible that Ohio (p. 200) next month will elect a Democratic governor. At any rate the conditions are unusually favorable. Gov. Herrick himself, Mr. Hanna's protege, has paved the way. Last winter the Anti-Saloon League sought restrictive saloon legislation through a bill known now as the Brannock law. The bill was bitterly fought by the Liquor Dealers' Association, and Gov. Herrick aided the latter by insisting upon destructive amendments. The Anti-Saloon League resent this attitude of the Governor, and are supported very largely in their revolt by church sentiment. This antagonism to Herrick's reelection is favored by the Democratic nomination of John M. Pattison, a temperance advocate. The depth of feeling in church circles may be inferred from the attitude of the Western Christian Advocate (Methodist), published at Cincinnati, which in its issue of September 13 took occasion to say editorially that—

there are scores of thousands of Republicans in Ohio who believe that the interest of their party and the interests of the State will be promoted by the election of Mr. Pattison, and they are publicly, as well as privately, announcing their intention to vote for him.

That feeling is deeply intensified by the fact that George B. Cox, the Republican boss of Cincinnati, whose power in the Democratic party Tom L. Johnson and Herbert S. Bigelow have been for four years trying to dislodge, has extended his dominion from Hamil-

ton county to the Republican party of the entire State. Of this factor the Advocate says, in the editorial already quoted from:

Mr. Cox was for many years a saloon-keeper, and owed his political power and prominence to that fact. For some years he has held Cincinnati in his grip like a vise. Since the death of Senator Hanna, he is reported to have become the political boss of the State. His methods and ideals are those of the saloon, and the million or more of Christian citizens of Ohio are unwilling to support politicians and public officials who are dominated by Mr. Cox. The revolt of the Republicans is a protest against Mr. Cox, as well as against Gov. Herrick.

Mr. Pattison, the Democratic candidate for governor, is reputed to be an advocate of Mayor Johnson's policy of taxing corporations equally with farmers and householders, and also to be not merely a party Democrat but one of democratic proclivities.

#### Herbert S. Bigelow's choice.

The probable uprooting of Coxism in Cincinnati began with the campaign of Herbert S. Bigelow (vol. v, pp. 323, 335, 343, 346, 349, 353, 361, 472, 482, 485, 497) for Secretary of State in 1902. Mr. Bigelow was, as he still is, the pastor of a historic Congregational church in Cincinnati, a man of strong convictions and of patient and courageous character. At the earnest solicitation of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland he accepted the Democratic nomination for secretary of state, tendered in spite of the opposition of the Democratic ring of Cincinnati which then did and doubtless still does cooperate with Cox, the Republican boss. Mayor Johnson urged this duty upon Mr. Bigelow, and the latter accepted, with a view of breaking up the domination of Cox. It was a hopeless, thankless fight, for the people had yet to be awakened. But the seed of that sowing is now bearing fruit. Just at this hopeful time Mr. Bigelow is invited to leave the scenes of a painful political struggle in Cincinnati for the comforts of a placid pulpit service in Minneapolis. The temptation was no doubt great, but here is his reply:

The civic independence of Minneapo-