

come the special representative of oligarchy and privilege. The attempt to perpetuate and enthrone the system of slavery in the United States was made by aristocrats in the interest of oppression and monopoly. Although out of that baneful school many pupils emerged into the light of freedom and justice when the true nature of slavery revealed itself, there is no record to show that Mr. Olney was among the number.

Very different is the case of Tom L. Johnson. Born in a slaveholding state and in a family actively identified with the Confederate cause, he has emancipated himself from his early influences and stands unflinchingly for universal rights, regardless of race, sex, color or condition. A disciple and close friend of Henry George, the greatest exponent of democracy since Jefferson, he has grasped the fundamental principle upon which alone self-government can rest. Although no rhetorician, he has exceptional clearness of thought and the rare ability of brief and direct statement, scorning evasion and not afraid of a logical conclusion. To this moral and intellectual quality is added an unexcelled experience in the realm of practical affairs. He is not a closet dreamer, and declines to pose as a reformer or idealist, although in the best sense he shares the qualities of both. He understands the road he is traveling and knows that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. His genius leads him to use political methods for the accomplishment of his ideas, and how clean his methods are may be judged from his disdain of unworthy ones. He professes no fealty to civil service reform, but shames civil service reformers by his disregard of party or machine in the choice of officials, to the dismay and chagrin of many of his own supporters. It is doubtful if he is hated as much by his Republican opponents as by the Democratic spoilsmen of Ohio.

Indeed, were it not for Republican votes, this new leader never would have gained a seat in Congress nor been elected mayor of Cleveland. In every case where he has asked the suffrages of his fellow-citizens, he has wrung Democratic majorities from Republican districts. Instead of calling together faithful partisans to listen to perfunctory speeches in his campaigns, he appeals directly to his Republican hearers. Republicans help crowd his meetings and fill his

spacious tents. He makes no set speeches, but invites interruptions, and begs for questions or controversial statements. He never dodges an inquiry nor tries to silence his questioner with sarcasm. Patiently and respectfully he endeavors to find out what is in his objector's mind, and then with unfailing good humor and courtesy does his best to explain the matter at issue as he sees it.

Should Tom Johnson be nominated for the presidency, there would be an educational campaign without a parallel. It is the writer's conviction that it is this opportunity of spreading the light, and not the bauble of the presidential office for which he is ambitious. And what a refreshing change from current campaign methods, one truly befitting democracy, where stump speakers would be obliged to face their political adversaries and run the gauntlet of searching questions!

It is natural that Tom L. Johnson should be misunderstood and distrusted by men who assume that politics must be essentially crooked. This straightforward politician confounds them. His very sincerity and frankness is held to conceal some nefarious plan and the cry of "demagogue" is raised against him. Mr. Hanna's perplexity was pathetically amusing when he conceived the idea of personally visiting the wealthy wards of Cleveland, and by a house to house appeal to persuade the inmates no longer to uphold this dangerous mayor. That a politician can be influenced by other than material considerations is undreamed of in the Hanna philosophy. It may well seem strange when a candidate for office deliberately defies the money power of the country and places his reliance on the reason and good sense of the common people. Yet that is democracy.

Mr. Nelson seems to misapprehend the single tax philosophy, of which Tom Johnson is at present the most prominent living exponent, when he intimates that "there may be some doubt as to his (Johnson's) democracy, for he favors municipal ownership of street railroads, and in other respects has drifted away from the individualism which in the coming politics of the country must be the basic principle of one of the parties." An individualist party that favored the private ownership of natural monopolies like street franchises would have a fraudulent name.

Whether municipalities assume the direct management of such industries or accomplish the same purpose through taxation, the prime object is the preservation of individual rights. No taint of state socialism attaches to such action. If any man in this country clearly understands the rights of property, those of the individual, as distinguished from those of the community, it is Tom L. Johnson. Let him who fears the specter of socialism press this point upon Mr. Johnson in his daily tent meetings. He will get not only a courteous answer but a lesson in political economy as well. He will learn that while socialism would generalize privilege, Johnsonian democracy would abolish it.

The interesting movement now attracting attention in Ohio marks an acute stage of the conflict between monopoly and self-government. It is no fight between capital and labor. Rather it is a fight in behalf of both against special privilege. Privilege has its grip upon both parties absolutely indifferent to the name, while it controls and dictates legislation. It would cheerfully be satisfied with Mr. Olney in the presidential chair. Tom Johnson would affright it, but capital and labor would have no need to tremble, for he is their champion, and represents the safest conservatism, and the only policy that can avert future industrial wars and financial disasters.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.
Wlanno, Mass., Sept. 10, 1902.

WHAT WORKINGMEN SHOULD DEMAND.

* An address delivered by Edward Osgood Brown, of Chicago, at the picnic of the Trades and Labor Assemblies of Kane County, Ill., on Labor Day, Sept. 1, 1902.

I appreciate the honor you have done me in asking me to address you. I appreciate it the more because I know you asked me from no desire to hear patriotic platitudes, or commonplace truisms about the dignity of labor and the right of organization and combination among working men.

We will all of us take the deluge for granted. There is no need anywhere to talk much of the abstract dignity of labor or indefinitely of the rights of laboring men, for in the last analysis everyone who has the intellectual capacity to think clearly and the moral rectitude to wish to do so, knows that there are no other dignities and no other rights than those of workingmen. By workingmen I do not mean alone the artisans or the

tillers of the soil, nor even those who in their daily toil have some admixture at least of manual labor, although they are of all laborers by far the most important, as they are the most numerous; but I include every man who renders service for service—the very vital and essential principle in all our social and moral life—the man who by honest work whether in the factory or the field, the workshop or the study, the office or the store, by spade or pick, knife or thread, plane, pen or brush, puts himself into the class of those whom nature alone intends should live and thrive. The rest of mankind—those who are not in this sense workingmen—must be beggars or thieves.

This was the sense in which I learned to understand the words labor and laborers, and work and workingmen, from that great man and that great teacher, Henry George. It is, I am sure, because I was known to hold to his beliefs and to try when I could to uphold and spread the ideas and ideals to which he gave his life, that I was invited here to-day at all; and I may therefore fitly say, as he would say to-day were he here, as he did say on the day before his death, as he stood before the people of New York in the political campaign which cost him his life: "Do not speak of me as on the side of the poor man, or the laborer. Do not say I stand for the rights of workingmen! I am for the rights of men!"

But while you and the people whom your associations represent are not the only workingmen, or the only men whose voices are to be heard and considered on these matters, you and your brothers in the labor unions do represent—although far and away beyond the mere confines of your Federation—that great band and mass of men whose voice under our fortunate political institutions is omnipotent in public affairs; that great band and mass in whose hands, therefore, lie the future destinies of this great country, that some of us have fondly hoped was to be the flowering of all civilization—the great example to the world that personal liberty, even-handed justice and equality of opportunity were the best assurances of advance in the arts and refinements of life, as well as in the higher domains of character and conduct.

It is to you, therefore, that most of all and most urgently, it seems to me, on occasions like this when you have the opportunity to listen to them and consider them best, there should be

said those things which seem most important as to those tendencies in our political, in our social, and in our economic life, which justify criticism if not alarm. Therefore I desire briefly to call your attention to what I deem such tendencies to-day.

After all that may be said in criticism, we are to-day the freest people of the world, and as far as we are from the ideal state (and God knows I realize how far that is!) yet we approach nearer to equality of opportunity among the people than any other country. But even to keep that which we have of good in these things, not to speak of that advance towards purer democracy, higher ideals of justice and nobler laws, our eternal vigilance is necessary; and our watchfulness and attention must center upon that which is and must be the very kernel and essence of our political and social welfare—the so-called labor problem. And what is the labor problem? Nothing else but this: How best to make wages high; how best to keep them so? I do not mean by wages, the mere nominal amount you may receive in cash each day or week. The question is, How much of other men's service that we need, can we each receive for an honest day's service of our own? How much, not only of the mere material necessities, but of the pleasures and comforts and luxuries of life as well, can we and our families obtain year by year, if we in our turn by reasonable and conscientious service for others contribute to their necessities, comforts and pleasures? "To make wages high, and to keep them so," when we use the word "wages" in this sense, means, then, that all well-deserving men shall advance together along the paths of material and moral progress, and that is the end and aim of all political and social economy.

What militates against it now and here? That which, although it may be resolved into several different forms, and expresses and develops itself in several different ways, is comprised in the one word "plutocracy"—the reign or rule of those of the very rich, who are at the same time grasping and selfish, supported by those not rich themselves, but who are the mere sycophants and parasites of those who are.

And at the outset of what I have to say about the evils in which the tendency to plutocracy has enveloped or may envelope us, I would say we should not despair in the fight against them, nor take a hopeless or disheartened view. How vastly you outnumber the very rich and their mere dependents and creatures, who would so frame and

administer the laws as to exploit your labor, and deny you the fair return for your work that they may thrive and fatten upon it, you must fully realize. In this country where each man who will, can vote, and the ballot is secret; where each can therefore help to make the laws and institutions and social customs under which and in accordance with which he must live, why, should the people who are in vast numerical majority be either misled or intimidated to their own injury? They need but to be definite in their ideas of what causes the evils of which they complain, and definite and persistent in seeking their remedy through political action, to accomplish all they can desire.

What then are definitely the evils of to-day which threaten the integrity of your wages as they now are, and which militate against the advance of those wages with the march of invention and material progress, to what they should be?

There is, first, Unequal Taxation. Our present laws for collecting the necessary expenses of the government, municipal, county, state, and national, are not worthy of a great, enlightened, progressive democracy, where the welfare of all the people is supposed to be an object of concern. They are borrowed, and developed from, and framed upon those of states and countries where the object of those who made the plan was to save the rich, powerful and idle from the necessity of contributing at all to public expenses, and to make those who toiled the hardest pay the most. They were framed so as to pluck the goose with the least squawking—so that the workingmen, who paid all the taxes, should not know how and when they paid them, but be deceived into supposing that the payment was made by those from whom they bought the necessities and simple luxuries of their life.

By this system of taxing those things from which the tax can be and is at once shifted to the price paid by the consumer—taxing, that is, houses, barns, tools, machines, groceries, clothes, all the good things which everybody must have and which must be made by wearisome labor, instead of taxing ground rents or land values belonging to the landlords and monopolists to whom society gives the privilege of monopoly without return of work or service, and from which things alone, a tax cannot be shifted—the expenses of

government are deftly extorted from those least able to pay them. They are taken from them, not in proportion to what they get from the government, not even in proportion to their consumption. Do you realize what this means? It means that, by this system of taxation, you are taxed for being married, taxed for having a child, taxed more for having more than one, taxed additionally for each new one you have, and taxed for keeping those children at home and educating them, instead of launching them too young into the world to shift for themselves; taxed for being generous, hospitable and charitable; relieved from taxation if you are miserly, penurious and hardhearted!

It has been said that the system of taxation makes little difference, so that it is administered justly and equally, because in the end labor must pay it all. This is a false and pernicious doctrine. Of course, labor in some form must pay all the expenses of the government, as it must pay everything else. There is nothing good and hardly anything bad to be had in this world except by forming it by labor. But to say that the system by which this burden is ultimately to be borne by the laborers, is of no consequence to them, is no more sensible than to say it makes no difference to a horse if he have to carry a ton weight, whether you tie it to his tail and let him drag it through the mud, pack it on his back and let him lug it that way, or put it in a cart on wheels and let him draw it so.

But even this miserable system, which no administration, however well intentioned, could make anything but oppressive to the toiler, is never and nowhere equally or justly administered.

I have no time to stop to refer you to the proofs of this. It is needless, however. You have them before you all the time. On one thing, politicians, political economists, statisticians, judges, clergymen, college professors and plain common sense men of the people seem to agree. They all unite on the declaration that the administration of our taxing laws is bad, unjust and unequal. You all know that the poor cottage of the workingman is taxed out of all proportion to the magnificent holdings of the land speculator; that his tools and his cows and his work horses and wagons, if he have them, pay the taxes which automobiles and wine cellars ought to bear.

Of all the approved devices for making the rich too rich, and keeping the poor always poor, our bad system of

taxation, badly administered, is the most powerful and efficacious. It is the most deadly weapon of plutocracy and the greatest cause of the inequalities from which have sprung those swollen and abnormal fortunes, which in their turn have given rise to that portentous phenomenon of the present day, The Industrial Trust.

Do not misunderstand me. I am far from believing that all combinations of capital and all combinations among producing and manufacturing enterprises by which undoubtedly the cost of such production to the consumer may be lessened and the processes improved, are evil things, either to the employee of the business, or to the customer for the product. But bearing in mind the truth that the whole labor problem and the whole problem of our material civilization lies in making wages high and keeping them so, and that wages in truth consist of all the things that we want that we can procure by our day's work, we can easily see how gigantic combinations like the anthracite coal trust must result in reduced wages and in retrogression, instead of progress for the workingman.

The main purpose of the coal trust is to make a necessary of life to all of you dearer. That lessens your wages, because it lessens the purchasing power of your daily pay. Another purpose is to increase the profit of its members by reducing the amount paid for labor in production—that is, the wages of the laborer. The very principle of your organization is that such an injury to one class of workmen is an injury to all. But to accomplish the results for which they aim, the men who control these combinations must have, and they procure, all sorts of legislatively and judicially-made special privilege. They buttress themselves with it and entrench themselves behind it. They buy the enactment of tariff laws which shut out foreign competition with the trust-made product; they secure from bribed legislators and courts corrupted, not by money, but by love of power, laws and decrees which give them the monopoly of means of transportation; which suspend in their favor, laws against immigration enforced against others; and they employ against labor and against laborers who but demand their rights, two most formidable weapons, one new and the other old, the new-fangled device of Government by Injunction, and the old resort of tyrants of every name, Military Organization and the Military Spirit.

It is not the old writ of injunction in

itself, which is the subject of my criticism, or of that of workingmen anywhere, however much sophistical lawyers and judges would like so to make it appear. It is a use of it which if not entirely new was so unusual in times past as never to have excited the necessity of comment and criticism until it began to be made in labor troubles by the great combinations and monopolies to prohibit in terms always vague and general, acts which either amount to a crime, and should therefore be subject to indictment and to trial before a jury of one's peers, or acts which are legal and innocent, and should neither be interfered with nor punished. The object is always the same. It is to break by intimidation the power of the workingman to combine, and his influence in combination. By making the terms of the injunction purposely vague, and the trial of its violation summary—before a judge without right of appeal instead of before a jury likely to sympathize with the accused—the trial by one's country for alleged crime is abolished. The cause of the whole system is the feeling of hostility to trial by jury which the privileged and powerful have always felt. The remedy is in your own hands.

But to sustain their fight for unjust privilege and the exploitation of labor, to aid themselves not only against the workingmen at home, but against the native toilers of countries across the sea, these men, are busy in encouraging the military spirit; in prating loudly of the "Honor of the Army;" in demanding greater navies and greater arrays of soldiers; in fostering the spirit of war under all sorts of fallacious names; in educating in the school-room and in the playground, your children and mine to love the gaudy trappings of parade, and the discipline which makes men unthinking machines.

For what is this spirit used? To encourage ten thousand miles away attempts—for the benefit of a few seekers for government monopolies and privileges, for public franchises in other words—to subjugate a whole foreign population striving for liberty; and at home to intimidate and overawe workingmen wherever their numbers in combination make them formidable to the pecuniary interests of these grasping, greedy plutocrats.

It cannot be that you do not realize this. It cannot be that you have forgotten the lessons which every great strike of the last twenty years

should have taught you, of the dangers in military interference. You must remember Pittsburg and Chicago and the Coeur D'Alene! But above all you must all know—some of you doubtless from personal experience—how the bitterest evils from which the workingmen suffer in the older countries in Europe, spring from militarism. Each workman there, it has well been said, carries a soldier on his back.

Let no workingman in this country be misled, as too many of his brethren in France have been, to deem it the part of patriotism to echo silly cries about the dignity and honor of the army! The truth is that the dignity and honor of the army is the so-called dignity of an economically idle and useless class. It is not that kind of dignity which belongs to the toiler in the arts of peace. The soldier among us too often lives in an unreal atmosphere, where everything that is really useful and honorable seems cheap and insignificant compared with his own trade of war—a sad inversion of the truth. He is puffed up with an utterly unjustifiable sense of his own importance in the scale of things, and the higher he gets in rank the more absurd and arrogant and offensive his pretensions become.

God forbid that I should undervalue courage and fidelity to duty! But these gentlemen of the army and navy are strangely at fault in apparently thinking that they have almost a monopoly of them, whereas in truth they are in them far behind the more honorable and useful people who practice the arts of peace. I prefer to the courage of the soldier on the battlefield, the courage of workingmen risking their lives for one another in the simple discharge of their every-day duties in hazardous employments, of the engineer faithful at his post in the face of imminent death, of the physician and the priest in the plague-stricken city, of the fireman amid a thousand dangers imperiling his life to save our property. These men, with none of the circumstance and false glory of war about them, are to my mind nobler and more honorable than the epauletted heroes for whom our admiration is sought. An army can be at the best but a necessary evil. I believe it to be to-day an unnecessary evil. I would be glad to see that old jealousy of a standing army which distinguished the earlier days of the republic, revived with a thousandfold intensity. It

makes me fairly shudder to think how cheerfully the workingmen of this free country pay taxes to support an aristocratic, nonproducing class, whose trade is slaughter!

Let me sum up briefly. Against freedom and equality of opportunity, against high wages and the consequent prosperity of the workingmen—these things militate:

First, unjust and unequal taxation, which breeds a plutocracy! Then, harmful combinations to destroy free competition and individual opportunity, which that plutocracy once established encourages and sustains by bestowing upon them special privileges and franchises. Then comes the wresting for the behoof of that plutocracy of old legal remedies and procedure, to new methods of repressing the individual liberty of the workingman. And lastly and most insidious, if not most dangerous of all, militarism, which not only at the best of times increases the burdens, already too heavy, of the industrious worker, but may be turned most dangerously and suddenly at any moment into a weapon which the workingmen cannot successfully resist.

Do not forget that it is still true that in America the people rule, and that you here to-day are fairly representative of the people of America who can successfully resist all these tendencies. But it will not do to sleep on your power, nor to hesitate and compromise when you have recognized the proper channels in which to use it. By united effort and efficient organization you are able to wield an influence which experience has shown no political party or body and no legislature or executive can withstand. Demand, then, and demand in precise terms and irrespectively of all partisan politics, that unjust and unequal taxation be destroyed, and an equitable system established in its place. On study of this subject you will, I believe, come to see that the system which Henry George so clearly expounded is the only scientific and workable one. I am not here to-day to explain it to you, but I pray you to interest yourselves in it. Look into the whole subject of taxation more seriously and thoroughly—each one of you—than you have hitherto done. Recognize its tremendous importance to your fortunes, and see to it that the people you place in legislative and administrative positions recognize it too.

As to the trusts, determine that at least they shall not be buttressed and

made omnipotent by special privilege in the shape of tariff duties! Should you demand from your representative in Congress—should your fellows in almost any District in the United States demand of theirs—that trust made or trust controlled articles should be put on the free list, which is a simple, definite proposition, you would find but few congressmen who would dare refuse to obey the instruction. On that day the worst and most dangerous power of the trust would be over.

As to government by injunction, it is of no use to spend your time in denouncing individual judges. As long as courts exist, you may be sure there will be judges improperly influenced by wealth and social position, and led astray by the love of power. But you need not fear this new tool of privilege, if you but insist on legislation from congress and state legislatures—(Remember, you make congressmen and legislators)—which shall provide for trial by jury of all contempts which are violations of injunctions.

And, finally, fight with all your might the spirit of militarism. Hold fast to the good old doctrine that a standing army is a menace to a free people; that the occupation of the farmer, the carpenter, the smith, the machinist, the shoemaker, the tailor and the watchmaker, are all more honorable than that of the professional soldier; that industry and simplicity and honesty of life rank far above the bombast of military glory!

Thus will you tend to fulfill in the end, the grand ideal of the Federation of Labor: the expansion of organized industry into the dream of the poet—The Parliament of Man, The Federation of The World!

The patience of fishermen who really love the sport is the theme of many stories. One is told by a man who, traveling on foot through part of England, came upon a solitary fisherman, who looked as if time and the world might pass away without disturbing his content.

"Have you fished long in this stream?" asked the traveler.

"Eighteen year," was the calm response.

"Get many bites?" was the next question.

The fisherman scarcely turned his gaze from the rod in his hands.

"Five year ago in this very spot I had a fine bite," he answered, hopefully.—Youth's Companion.