

Bryan did not bring up the Nebraska delegation in the wake of the Illinois delegation for Hearst? Or was it because Bryan denounced Hearst's political partner of that year as a train robber?

+

And what does all this Hearst-Harrison palaver mean now? It means now what the Hearst-Sullivan alliance meant in 1904. Hearst is to get the Illinois delegation—this time with Harrison's aid as the other time with Sullivan's. Everything democratic is to be sacrificed to that one object by Hearst and his factotum Lawrence, as heretofore in Illinois everything democratic has been sacrificed by that precious pair.

+

And the pity of it is that some of our best democratic Democrats down the State are innocently turning themselves and their influence over to Hearst. Among them are good men who, on the principle of never allowing yourself to be fooled twice by the same man and in the same way, ought to know better. They have had sad enough experience with Hearst politically already. But their hostility to Sullivan is such that they fall an easy prey to Hearst with his new outfit of velveted claws. Knowing, as Sullivan did in 1904, that Hearst cannot be nominated for President, they, like Sullivan, are willing he should have the Illinois delegation in return for his aid in putting down what they consider more important. It is more important, but the price they pay is risky. The Illinois delegation has been Hearst's standing price in this State for anything and everything in all his political relations here. For granting it, Sullivan got into Hearst's good books; for denying it, Dunne was pitched out of them.

+

We need not say that we sympathize heartily with down-State Democrats like Judge Thompson and Congressman Graham in their desire to end the Sullivan regime. Sullivan has been an Old Man of the Sea on the back of the Democratic party in Illinois ever since he combined politics with illuminating-gas investments, and never has his game been more subtle or intolerable than now. But our democratic friends won't end the Sullivan regime by giving Hearst a power of attorney to do it for them. They can end it by recognizing Dunne's well-deserved popularity, closing their ears to Lawrence's insinuations against him, and making perfectly plain what the fact is, that Sullivan's present support of Dunne, so far from being friendly, is as sinister as ever.

Should they give Hearst and Lawrence the power to crush Sullivan, this power would not unlikely be used for Sullivan instead of against him, should Sullivan decide in 1912, as he did in 1904, that Hearst, through Lawrence, is the man for him to make terms with.

+ +

William Randolph Hearst for President.

Only the thinnest veil is any longer thrown by the Hearst papers over Mr. Hearst's Presidential purposes at the election next year. He does not announce his candidacy himself, but his papers quote other aspirants for the Democratic nomination in such a way as to leave to any habitual reader of the Hearst papers no doubt at all of their proprietor's designs, innocent though the men quoted doubtless are of intentionally promoting them.

+

The nearest Mr. Hearst himself has come to making a formal announcement is in his "return-of-the-prodigal speech" at New York last week. That speech might be condensed and fairly paraphrased into something like this: "Gentlemen of the Democratic party—Here I am again, back in the Democratic fold just in the nick of time to demand your Presidential nomination for myself. I shall fight every other aspirant for it who doesn't give me the right hand of fellowship; and I shall make monkeys of those aspirants who do." Champ Clark is freely quoted by the Hearst papers among the latter, and among the latter he is pretty certain consequently to find himself when Mr. Hearst's monkey-making process begins. His humiliated companions at that time will probably include Mayor Harrison and Oscar Underwood, both of whom are in Mr. Hearst's Presidential gamebag now. No, hold a bit about Mr. Underwood. He is the only Presidential possibility quoted in the Hearst papers as expressly naming Hearst for the Democratic nomination, and this may imply that Mr. Underwood is to be graciously allowed the place of running mate. "I understand," says Mr. Underwood in Hearst's Chicago Examiner of October 22, congratulating the Democratic party on Hearst's return to it, that "the Hearst following will use its influence to have the New York delegation at the convention place Mr. Hearst's name in nomination for the Democratic nomination for President, and I feel sure the California delegation will attend the convention pledged for Hearst." We of Chicago know, of course, that Harrison is pledged to give Hearst the Illinois delegation if he can; and from the way Lawrence, Hearst's manager, is playing

cat-and-mouse with down-State Democrats it looks as if he might "turn the trick." So the Hearst boom is fairly launched. The Democratic possibilities for President who do not stand upon the Hearst pitfall, are Folk, Harmon and Wilson.

* *

New Judges for Chicago.

At the approaching election in Cook County, Illinois—November 7,—ten new judges are to be chosen. Over the nominations much reckless criticism has been indulged in by newspapers with their own axes to grind, and the voting public are confused in making a choice. To some extent the Bar Association may be a guide; but in this connection the important fact should not be ignored that the Bar Association is not the bar. It is a social club of some lawyers, the members of which are not unnaturally governed by those considerations of good fellowship that weigh in all other social clubs. On our own part we make no pretensions of freedom from any of the ordinary influences that govern in such matters, but it is our purpose as nearly as possible to recommend with reference to four qualifications. The first is the democratic spirit of the candidate, without which other qualifications are of little value. The second is good character; not respectability with a "superior" class, but good *character*. The third is legal education, not necessarily legal training, but legal education—for legal training, while it may make a very efficient lawyer may by the same token make a very bad judge. The fourth is judicial as distinguished from legislative sensibilities. By those tests there are five candidates for the bench at the coming election in Chicago whom we feel fully warranted in naming as worthy the confidence of our readers. One of them we judge in part by his public record, both on and off the bench; the others, and that one also, by the estimate in which they are held by men who know them best for the qualities we have named. They are Daniel L. Cruice, Clarence A. Goodwin and John P. McGoorty (Democrats), Seymour Stedman (Socialist) and McKenzie Cleland (Republican). None of these men, as we fully believe, will disappoint any voter in respect of democracy, personal character, legal equipment, or appreciation on the bench of the true judicial function.

* *

Charity's Appeal to Justice.

The new spirit that has entered into the operations of organized charity finds expression at the

Illinois Charities Conference in session at Urbana. *Prevention* of poverty instead of relief as an end, with *social justice* as the means to accomplish the end, appears from the newspaper reports to vitalize the proceedings of that gathering. These and other signs give hope for the national conference next year; and in distributing credit for it, The Survey and its editorial corps must be remembered for their thoughtful, industrious and patient work.

* *

A Good Fight in Pennsylvania.

Good wishes and Godspeed go out to the Keystone Party of Pennsylvania in the fight it is making against Oliver-Penroseism in Pennsylvania. It is the Progressive fight localized in a State where predatory wealth got its first grip and will make its last stand. A vote for the Keystone Party in Pennsylvania at this election is a vote against capitalizing republicanism and democracy for the benefit of plutocracy.

* *

Woman Suffrage and Direct Legislation.

It is regrettable that Dr. Anna H. Shaw, if the Cincinnati papers report her rightly, has thrown the weight of her influence as president of the National Woman's Suffrage Association against the Initiative and Referendum movement in Ohio. One of the weaknesses of leaders crystallized in a particular cause long hopeless but approaching its own, is to try to force the cause into practical politics out of season. Sometimes they are right, but not always; and if ever any one of them was mistaken it was Dr. Shaw if she urged woman suffragists in Ohio to insist upon woman suffrage in preference to the Initiative and Referendum in the Constitutional convention contest now pending there. Probably no more effective method could be hit upon for making woman suffrage in Ohio difficult and for years impossible.

* *

There are two reasons, from our point of view, why such a policy would be a mistake. For one thing, it would be a mistake from the viewpoint of democracy. Woman suffrage is democratic or it is nothing. It cannot be defended on any other basis. The moment you reject democracy, you discredit every worthy appeal for woman suffrage, for man suffrage and for any other suffrage. But concede democracy, and the only argument against woman suffrage is the reduction