

ocratic party. Now he finds himself on the same ticket with Tom Johnson, single taxer and presumable representative of Bryan and everything that Bryan stands for except free silver, and with the gold Democrat Clarke, who refused to support Bryan in 1896.

New York Times (pluto-Dem.), Aug. 28—The campaign in Ohio will be conducted under Johnson's personal orders and will be an exhibition, we doubt not, of "too much Johnson," which the assistance of Mr. Bryan as a speaker will not serve to change from a hasty procession to a fore-destined and overwhelming defeat, inflicted, in part, by Democrats who do not find Bryanism any more palatable served up a la Johnson than they do when it is offered with Tom Watson sauce. . . . As the Ohio platform is an exaggerated echo of the Bryanism of Chicago and Kansas City, so its substantial gains will be Bryan's, in so far as he may control for himself, or the Democrat he may deign to permit to receive it, the Ohio vote in the national convention

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (dem. Dem.), Aug. 27—There is no comfort for the plutocracy in the action of the Democracy of Ohio. There is no encouragement in it for reorganization. Reaction finds no sympathy in platform or nominations. . . . Mr. Johnson does not expect to win the election. He has said so frankly, and insaying it has confounded those "practical" politicians who believe that the first requisite of a leader is the art of lying. But while Mr. Johnson does not really hope for victory himself, he does hope to win a majority in the legislature, and with this majority he hopes, not merely to retire Mark Hanna, but, more important, to advance the reforms to which he is pledged and in behalf of which all his arduous work has been done.

Milwaukee Daily News (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 29—The result of the convention in Ohio will be greeted with pleasure by every Democrat who places principle above victory and who wants to see his party right as well as victorious. The anything-to-win Democrats, who shift with every breeze in the hope of making connection with public office, that graft may follow winning, are apt to deprecate the endorsement of the Kansas City platform, because the party has not won power and offices when fighting for the principles it embraces. But no party should have the power that does not prove by its steadfastness of purpose that it is worthy of it. . . . The Democrats of Ohio have shown by their action in convention that they have a substantial, meritorious purpose, and that they are not seeking power for the mere political plunder it offers.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind.), Aug. 28—The difference between the two parties in this campaign is clearly stated in one sentence of the Democratic platform, which says the people "are to determine whether the personal ambitions of one man for re-election to the Federal Senate, shall be gratified at the expense of placing the vast local interests of all the people at the mercy of a State government dominated by and in alliance with the privileged corporations." That is a succinct statement of the real issue involved. Its truth is shown by the subordination of State and local to national questions in the Republican platform, while the Democratic platform takes the reverse course. . . . There can be no doubt that, as in his local contests, there will be large accessions of independent voters to Mr. Johnson's standard, and these are likely to more than make up for Democratic defections, should there be any in the end.

Columbus (O.) Press (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 27—The Ohio Democratic platform of 1903 promises longer strides, and more of them, back to the principles of local self-government, home rule and individual liberty, as

advocated by Thomas Jefferson, than any platform adopted either in this State or any other State within the past generation. . . . The State ticket is good throughout, and deserves the support of the best men in the State. The aggressiveness of Mr. Johnson is one of his admirable qualities as a leader. It can be depended upon as a potent element in the campaign, and it will do much to carry the ticket through. The great mistake of the convention was the endorsement of John H. Clarke for U. S. senator, a Palmer and Buckner Democrat in 1896. Mr. Johnson unfortunately was a party to this mistake, and it is to be hoped that he was misled by bad advisors rather than governed by his own judgment.

MISCELLANY

ISRAEL.

"But there is no Israel."
—Prof. Richard Gottheil.

To-day there is no Israel—
No place they may call home,
But up and down through all the world
The patient people roam.
For them there is no Canaan land
Where milk and honey flow,
But still the promises they hold,
And wait the call to go.
They watch for the pillar of cloud by day
and pillar of fire by night
To lead their feet in the promised way to
the country of delight.

To-day there is no Israel—
No templed hills are hers,
But yet the songs that David sang
Thrill all the worshipers;
But yet the golden prophecies,
As in the days of old,
Are cherished for the tenderness
And truth of what they hold.
And still they turn to the barring sea with
hopefully trusting gaze
And wait and watch for the pathway free
that they walked in the other days.

To-day there is no Israel—
No land of corn and wine,
Long, long the desert sand has hid
The fig tree and the vine;
But still the chant is echoing
And full its cadence keeps:
"Lo, He that keepeth Israel,
He slumbers not nor sleeps."
They watch for the pillar of fire by night
and the pillar of cloud by day
To mark the road that will lead aright to
the end of the weary way.
—Chicago Tribune.

LOOKING FORWARD.

For The Public.

The friends of the trust magnate looked worried and shook their heads despondently when he advised them that he was endeavoring to get control of such an insignificant business as the needle industry.

"We hope," they said, "that his interest in such a petty plaything is not an indication of a failing mind."

But they slapped one another on the backs joyfully, and exclaimed in their relief that the old man still was able to know which side of his angel cake was buttered, when they heard subse-

quently, indirectly, of course, that his real object for controlling the trade was to be able to prohibit the manufacture of any needle with an eye so small as to be camel-proof.

G. T. E.

THE TABLES TURNED.

A Chicago automobile touring party received a big scare near Waukegan recently. Tables were turned for once. Instead of scaring an old horse, the horse scared the autoists and nearly ran them down with a hay rake. The party was bowling merrily along the River road with horns tooting. Just where the road bends at James Maniconi's farm William Brooks' old mare stood. The party saw the old horse and looked for fun. She did not scare at the auto, so the horn was tooted. Suddenly old Nance woke up, jumped on the fence, breaking it down, and rushed at the auto party with her ears laid back, mouth wide open and hay-rake rattling behind. This was a new experience to the autoists. They let the auto flee at full speed. The horse chased them for a long distance, until a rein caught in the wheel and stopped her.—Chicago Chronicle, of Aug. 24.

WAR AS SHE IS PRACTICED.

A case sad enough to bring constructive tears to the painted eyes of a wooden image is that which occurred during the heat and excitement one day last week in the mimic war along the coast of Maine. Rear Admiral Coghlan and a body of marines that landed in the morning and fought all day were just about to celebrate their great victory when a solitary horseman or a yellow telegram or some other channel of communication brought the sad news that this very command that had been fighting all day had been constructively killed just before it landed in the morning and that the umpires couldn't take into account the actions of dead men, so their afternoon's work was not to go into the school histories. Of course no one but an American marine would fight for ten hours after he was officially dead; and even he wouldn't do it if they had broken the news to him earlier in the game.—Chicago Daily News of Aug. 31.

THE LAND QUESTION IN INDIA.

In the San Francisco Star we find the following quotation from a little pamphlet entitled "England and India," by Mrs. Annie Besant. Mrs. Besant is describing the causes of the terrible Indian famines.

Another great cause of these famines is the way in which the land is now held. In the old days there was a common interest in the land between

princes and people. Now the nobles, the old class of zemindars, have been turned into landlords, and that is a very different thing from the old way of holding land. Then you have insisted on giving to the peasant the right to sell his land, the very last thing that he wants to do, the thing which takes away from him the certainty of food for himself and his children. No peasant in the old days had the right to sell his land, but only to cultivate it. If he needed to borrow at any time, he borrowed on the crop. Now, in order to free the people from debt, they are given the right to sell their mortgage holdings, and this means the throwing out of an agricultural people on the roads, making them landless, and the holding of the land by money lenders. The revolution in the land system of India is one of the causes of the recurring famines, the second, perhaps of the great causes. The natural result of it is that you put new power into the hands of the money lenders, and you take away from the peasant the shield that always protected him.

A PRINCIPLE, NOT A BELIEF.

An extract from a speech made by Mr. W. Trueman, of New Haven, Conn., at a public hearing of arguments relative to the question of municipalizing the city's gas supply, as reported in the New Haven Evening Leader of August 16.

The most insidious of all the arguments in this controversy is the one that assumes that this great public question is simply one of belief, just as Methodism or Presbyterianism, or that it can be taken up and laid down in the same way that we decide if we shall continue to be carnivorous or whether a purely vegetable diet is not best for human beings.

Gentlemen, I submit that this question of the public ownership of monopolies is not in this category at all, but is one of the most vital and fundamental character. It is a question of property rights, and as I am a firm believer in the sacredness of property, I stand ready to defend my own first, and my brother's next with all the force with which I have been endowed.

The right of property is founded upon the self evident statement that "to the producer belongs the product." It therefore necessarily follows that if we find persons in possession of that which they did not produce, and for which they rendered no equivalent to those who did produce it, then they are simply in possession of that which does not belong to them.

Now this is precisely the case with

this gas company. It, like other public service corporations, enjoys the privilege of doing an exclusive business with 108,000 people, for which it renders no return, but rather makes the public pay through their gas bills, a round tax on this privilege, as though it were something the company had produced or laid out capital for.

Gentlemen, there are three broad divisions in regard to property. There is Thine, Mine and Ours. To be able to clearly draw a line of demarkation between these, claiming for each that to which he is entitled, will in the future be the simple test of an able, honest man. Failure to do this from now on must be regarded as clear evidence of culpable ignorance or known dishonesty.

Taking this ground for an unassailable foundation, the advocates of public ownership of public property stand upon higher ground than that of expediency, knowing full well that unless a structure is raised on a sure foundation no amount of good management can keep it from falling, and no amount of municipal corruption can ever alter a principle.

THE TERRIBLE POVERTY OF INDIA.

The Manchester Guardian, in a leading article on the recently issued Blue-book on the "Moral and Material Progress" of India, sums up as follows the history of the past ten years in India:

Most people, it seems, have been quite wrong about the Indian peasant. What that much-misunderstood man really needs is to form habits of thrift. Such, at least, is the climax and moral of the Blue-book just issued from the India Office upon what is officially described as the "Moral and Material Progress" of India. In one sense, indeed, the truth of the remark is obvious. If a man's annual income is about 80 rupees or 40 shillings; if he has to pay a tax of many hundreds per cent, upon his salt; if he is hopelessly in debt already and yet has to borrow more to pay his landlord, the State; if, moreover, he and millions like him are under an obligation to maintain an extremely costly Government manned by a foreign race, and to train and keep a large army ready for use in India or elsewhere—then he must needs be thrifty. But probably this is not what Lord George Hamilton means. Always a sturdy optimist where his helpless clients, the taxpayers of India, are concerned, he has never made a more cheerful appearance than in this imposing volume, prepared under his instructions and issued from his office. Yet the temptation to moderate his cheerfulness must have been severe. The Blue-book deals with a period of ten years ending with the year 1901-2, a period which includes the closing years of Lord Lansdowne's, the whole of Lord Elgin's, and the early years of Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty. It has been a decade of war, pestilence and famine, of aggression beyond and repression within the borders of India. If

progress is the title of the Book, reaction is the story which it tells, or ought to tell.

The writers, the Guardian added, "show a nice discrimination. They have learned the arts of omission and of euphemism."

But the record as it stands is painful enough in all conscience—millions of much-needed wealth squandered in trans-frontier adventures, beginning with the retention of Chitral and the breaking of the promise given to the tribesmen in the name of the Government; two of the worst, if not the two worst, famines of the last century; the terrible and enduring scourge of bubonic plague; and, when the suffering people showed signs of restlessness under protective measures dictated more by zeal than by discretion, a series of repressive measures culminating in a new law of sedition and a new law of criminal procedure. Yet the authorities, surveying their work, report that it is very good. "Everywhere there are signs of commercial activity and industrial awakening, and if, as may reasonably be hoped, a cycle of seasons favorable for agriculture is now commencing there appears good ground for anticipating that India is on the threshold of a period of rapid material development."

"However rosy may be the anticipations of official optimists, it may be hoped," the writer continued, "that the public will not be blind to the actual facts. The famine of 1896-7 affected an area of 300,000 square miles, with a population of 63,000,000. The famine of 1899-1900, which has not even yet wholly disappeared, affected an area of 400,000 square miles, with a population of 60,000,000. Each famine in turn was described by the viceroy of the day—Lord Elgin in one case and Lord Curzon in the other—as a famine of unexampled intensity. The government, or in other words, the Indian taxpayers, spent more than £5,000,000 on relief in the first and more than £6,000,000 on relief in the second famine."

With regard to the recent famines, the Guardian emphasized the fact that they point to the poverty of the people:

The Blue-book does recognize that the famines were "money famines rather than food famines," and the compilers in their remarks on railways observe with pride that "nothing was more striking in the recent famines than the freedom with which grain passed from place to place in accordance with local requirements." Is it not at least equally striking that the peasants nevertheless died by tens of thousands? And what becomes of the theory that famine is due solely to a failure of the monsoon, when not only was there enough food in India, but India was actually exporting foodstuffs? Clearly we are thrown back upon the terrible poverty of the masses of the Indian people, and until the Government of India has ascertained and boldly grappled with the economic causes of that poverty it cannot be said to have discharged its duty. The last Famine Commission, ap-