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 crystalized 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

to absurdity that women are not human. If then the democratic basis for woman suffrage be granted, and we rationally recognize existing political conditions, the situation in Ohio plainly demands that the democratic electoral mechanism known as the Initiative and Referendum have right of way at the present election—not to delay other demands of democracy but to facilitate their advance. It has right of way over other phases of democracy because it is the almost indispensable implement of democracy, and because it is at the present Ohio election pre-eminently "the question before the house"—the question on which the people of Ohio are most generally and distinctly dividing. To insist upon thrusting into such a contest a subsidiary question—no matter how democratic and important it may be in itself, if it be subsidiary in respect of immediate political alignments—is to fight against democracy and not with it. For another thing, the policy attributed to Dr. Shaw in Ohio would be a mistake from the viewpoint of woman suffrage. Who can doubt that an authoritative identification of the woman suffrage movement with opposition to democracy must tell against its own progress? Woman suffrage must come through voting by men. Any other possibility is too remote for consideration. If it comes through voting by men, the stronger they are impressed with a desire for it, and the sooner they get control of the means for adopting it, the better for the cause of woman suffrage. But, at one fling, Dr. Shaw throws her influence against both necessities, if she is reported rightly. She makes it in the first place more difficult to convert to woman suffrage men of democratic tendencies and more difficult to hold such men who as yet only incline toward it, for she identifies in their minds the woman suffrage movement with the undemocratic hostility of Big Business to the Initiative and Referendum. In the second place she helps to prevent men voters from getting the power to add woman suffrage to the Constitution. If a majority of the voters of Ohio now favor woman suffrage, which is of course as it may be, they would undoubtedly get a chance to say so from an Initiative and Referendum convention for remodeling the Constitution. But if they are identified with opposition to the Initiative and Referendum, it will be exceedingly difficult to get that concession except from delegates who are for the Initiative and Referendum on principle. In any other kind of Constitutional convention that can be elected in Ohio this year, the woman suffrage cause would be as helpless as a chippy bird in a cyclone.

## The Street Car Question in Cleveland.*

An editorial in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of October 11th, is significant of deceptive press bureau work from Cleveland in the interest of Big Business—for its effect, that is, outside of Cleveland. Says the Bulletin:

**The Cleveland street railway, which has been operating with a monthly deficit for some time under the three-cent fare experiment which originated with the late Tom Johnson, will probably reach its limit within a few months and return to five-cent fares.**

✤

To appreciate the animus of that statement, the actual facts must be considered. Under the provisions of the Cleveland ordinance, an "interest fund" of $500,000 was created. To this fund there is added from time to time the gross receipts from all sources, less operating and maintenance expenses; and out of it the company pays the interest on its bonds, and 6 per cent on its approved floating indebtedness and capital stock. The ordinance allowed the company in the beginning to exact three-cent fares and one cent for transfers, a rate which stands about midway in the schedule of variable rates prescribed. It provided also that if at any time the amount in the "interest fund" exceeds $500,000 by $200,000, the rate of fare enumerated in the schedule next lower to that then in use shall go into operation, and that, on the other hand, if at any time the amount in the "interest fund" falls short of $500,000 by as much as $200,000, the rate of fare shall be the next higher in the schedule to that then in use. Thus the rate of fare is automatically determined from time to time according to a certain increase or decrease of net profits. Bearing those provisions of the ordinance in mind, let the interested reader turn now to the history of the company under that ordinance. It took over the property on the 1st day of March, 1910, beginning operation with the required fare of 3 cents without transfer and 4 cents with transfer. Fifteen months later—on the 1st day of June, 1911—the "interest fund," less accrued charges against it, amounted to $780,208. As this exceeded $500,000 by more than $200,000, the next lower rate of fare came automatically into use. It was three cents with "rebate" of the transfer charge. That is, although one cent for transfer was still charged, it was returned to the passenger upon presentation to the conductor of the car transferred to. For the next three months, from June 1 to August 31, 1911, the operation at 3-cent fares with "rebated" transfers showed a decline in the "interest fund." It

*See current volume, pages 228, 444, 674, 697, 747.