

pression among outsiders that factory workmen were unanimously for Hanna's candidate, and among the workmen themselves that they had better be for him or jobs in their shop would grow scarce. But Hanna had counted without Johnson. Immediately after this kind of campaigning began, Mr. Johnson wrote courteous letters to the proprietors of each establishment in which Hanna's candidate had spoken or was announced to speak, demanding, in the name of common fairness, that he be given similar authority and facilities for presenting his cause. The first factory owners to receive Johnson's letter were thrown into a panic, and referred the matter to Senator Hanna's committee for advice. Of course, only one kind of advice could be safely given. The committee dared not sanction openly so marked an exposure of attempted coercion as a refusal to allow Johnson to speak at factories where Hanna's candidate had spoken would have been. So Johnson had his innings. And he made such good use of them in his speeches that the Hanna combination quickly gave up that kind of campaigning.

THE "PROTECTIVE SPIRIT."

The cleverest part of Buckle's "History of Civilization" is that in which he points out and combats the idea of the Protective spirit. To see what he means by this term, and then to determine where one stands with reference to its doctrine, is the most vital exercise to which the modern mind can apply itself. To fix one's self definitely on one side or the other—at least so far as one's ideals are concerned—is absolutely necessary as a basis for clear judgment of social, political and economic problems.

We pass over the religious phase of the question, except merely to call attention to the fact that the thought runs into this realm as well. Is religion something external to yourself, managed for you by authority, by the church? is it a government, dictatorial and "protective"? Or is it

within yourself, a play of your own free spirit? is it, so far as any other man whatsoever is concerned, independent and democratic? Right in these questions we have the determination of the kind of religion one believes in and lives by. Right in these questions we have the great dividing line between the two religious attitudes of men—a dividing line far deeper than that between the various denominations.

So in the political and economic world the great dividing line is to be found in the attitude of men with reference to this same question. Do you believe that men are to be governed from without, to have things done for them from without; in other words, are to be protected and cared for by some external authority, apart from and superior to themselves? Whoever believes this believes in the Protective spirit. It is the antithesis of the Democratic spirit, whose ideal is the equality of men, and not that some are so much better than others that they are called upon to think for them and protect them in paternal fashion.

The Protective spirit in government begins by believing in absolute monarchy with a favored aristocracy. If it must descend a little from this ideal, it comes next to a limited monarchy with a somewhat extended aristocracy, the two constituting a superior oligarchy. If it must descend still lower and accommodate itself to a republican form, it believes in a restricted suffrage, which cuts out the poor and ignorant—and women, of course.

On the economic side the Protective spirit believes in lords of the manor, in great landed estates, in large proprietors, in great fortunes. It believes that great landlords can manage better for the tenants than the tenants themselves, that great capitalists can distribute wealth for the people better than the people themselves.

The Protective spirit believes that the good of most people, the development of most people, must come from without. It does not believe that the great majority can develop themselves even if they have equal

opportunity and a fair show. This lack of belief in the capability of people to develop themselves is the benevolent basis of all landlordism and special privilege.

The Protective spirit is rampant in American life to-day. It has taken on subtler forms than in ruder days, but it seems to be enjoying renewed life in a modern reaction. It is far more potent than it was fifty years ago, if we except the one feature of actual slavery, which was, of course, the acme of the Protective spirit. There is not to-day the enthusiasm for democracy and republicanism that there was when Kossuth came over here, and when all America glowed in sympathy for the revolutions of '48. There is not the same spirit of independence in business and determination to be one's own employer. Concentration under a great manager is rather the prevailing tendency. Even in practical politics, even in the centers of urban democracy, the spirit of managing and being managed has manifested itself in a queer way. The modern boss represents essentially the protective idea. He directs our voting; it is he that nominates our candidates. Whichever way we turn, in business, in educational matters, in economics, in politics, there is a lack of the freedom and independence and individual initiative which belong to real democracy.

During a good part of the nineteenth century we thought we had got emancipated. Alas, we find that the work was but half done. The people are still servile, still subject to this same Protective spirit of which Buckle wrote.

There were tremendous strides in political freedom and intellectual enlightenment in the century beginning with the last quarter of the eighteenth. The American revolution and the French revolution, each in its kind, were great steps forward, and their influence pulsed onward, in spite of conservative forces, into ever widening circles of political and individual freedom. But in this material world, as we are just now beginning to see, there cannot be substantial freedom of thought and ac-

tion without a further freedom, namely, economic freedom. Unless men are made equal in their economic rights, it is idle to prate about maintaining political freedom and the spirit of individual independence.

The emancipation of man from the lordship of special privilege and from the whole spirit of Protection, depends upon the enacting of actual human laws which shall embody this fact. This means, in largest terms, that we must acknowledge the equal right of every human being to the common gifts of God. This alone will make each man free among his fellows. To educate the people to this thought, to fire them with enthusiasm for this truth, is the next great work in the evolution of human freedom.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Apr. 9.

After one of the most strenuous campaigns (vol. v, pp. 778, 790, 791, 796, 813, 817, 824) that any American city has ever experienced—in which Senator Marcus A. Hanna, Republican, and Mayor Tom L. Johnson, Democrat, were the opposing leaders,—Mayor Johnson won a signal victory on the 6th in the city of Cleveland. It is conceded to have placed him, beyond challenge, at the head of his party in Ohio, and in the front rank of national leadership. Besides this, it gives him what the State legislature had sought to divest him of—a free hand in the administration of the city which has again elected him to its principal office.

The principal specific issues in the campaign were—(1) 3-cent fares on street cars; (2) municipal ownership of street car lines; and, (3) just taxation. Mayor Johnson headed his party ticket as candidate for reelection, and the remainder of the ticket was composed of men who were publicly pledged to his municipal policies and most of whom had been tested regarding them. The Republican ticket was headed by Harvey D. Goulder, as candidate for mayor. His associate as candidate for vice-mayor and president of the city council was Sol Sontheimer, recently a Democrat,

who had been selected by the Republicans for this nomination because he is president of the central labor federation of the city and had committed himself and endeavored to commit his labor organization to opposition to 3-cent fares (vol. v., pp. 701, 722, 787). Mr. Sontheimer was defeated for vice mayor and president of the council by a plurality of 10,436. Mayor Johnson was reelected mayor by a plurality of 5,985. The reported vote is as follows:

Mayor—Johnson (Dem.).....	36,164
Goulder (Rep.).....	30,179
Johnson's plurality	6,985
Vice-Mayor—Lapp (Dem.).....	37,581
Sontheimer (Rep.).....	27,145
Lapp's plurality	10,436
Auditor—Madigan (Dem.).....	35,791
Townsend (Rep.).....	29,134
Madigan's plurality	6,657
Treasurer—Coffinberry (Dem.).....	36,974
Smith (Rep.).....	28,750
Coffinberry's plurality	7,224
Solicitor—Baker (Dem.).....	35,019
Mooney (Rep.).....	29,268
Baker's plurality	5,751
Public Service Board:	
Cooley (Dem.).....	35,048
Springborn (Dem.).....	35,798
Leslie (Dem.).....	35,010
Slatmeyer (Rep.).....	31,295
Towson (Rep.).....	30,545
Knight (Rep.).....	31,333

For councilmen at large there are three Democrats and three Republicans for the long term, and three of each party for the short term.

Besides scoring this victory on the general ticket, Mayor Johnson has secured a city council which represents his policies overwhelmingly. The legislature had designed to cripple his administration by providing in the new municipal code that mayoral appointments must be confirmed by two-thirds of the council, the appointments to be made by the governor if more than one-third of the council refuses to confirm. But the Cleveland election frustrates that design. The new council is distributed as follows: Democrats, 23; Republicans, 9. As the Democratic members are publicly pledged (vol. v, p. 303) to support Mayor Johnson's 3-cent fare and related policies, there is little danger of the gubernatorial interference for which the municipal code provides.

The general character and scope of Mayor Johnson's victory may be inferred from the following special dispatch to the Chicago Chronicle, a paper of Johnson's party, but hostile to him:

Cleveland, O., April 7.—The victory of Mayor Tom L. Johnson yesterday brings with it much power. By virtue of the "ripper" legislation affecting the form of the city government, instigated by his enemies for the purpose of crushing him completely, he finds himself in absolute possession of the

entire executive and legislative departments of the city. He "owns" 23 offices in the new form of city government which takes effect May 4, and is a political dictator. His victory also favors his gubernatorial aspirations and will place him in control of the Democratic State committee.

"Tom L. Johnson," said Mr. Ingalls, of the Big Four, the defeated Democratic candidate for mayor of Cincinnati, "is the logical Democratic nominee for governor of Ohio, and I am for him."

The defeat of Harvey D. Goulder is said to show the weakness of Senator Hanna at home. With this new evidence of Senator Hanna's weakness the adherents of Gen. Charles Dick have begun to reassert the claims of their candidate for the nomination for governor on the Republican ticket. Cox, of Cincinnati, has declared openly that he would be only too happy to work for Gen. Dick against Myron T. Herrick, whom Senator Hanna has designated as the accepted candidate for the party.

In an interview published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 8th Mayor Johnson gave his own views of the situation and outlined his plans in these words:

The campaign was fought entirely upon local issues. National issues did not figure in the campaign, and the result has no significance outside of Cleveland. It was merely a demonstration of the fact that the people of this city have attained a high degree of good citizenship in that they have studied municipal questions and have learned to think independently. Senator Hanna brought great energy to the campaign, and by his able management secured an organization of merit. He also secured more harmony than has been known within his party for some time. But through it all Mr. Hanna made no effort to conceal the fact that he was endeavoring to make use of his party merely for the furtherance of his private interests. The people knew this, and its bad effect more than counterbalanced Mr. Hanna's energy and his skill as an organizer. As soon as the Supreme Court injunction expires, on May 4, we purpose at once to push forward the plan of asking for new bids for a three-cent fare street railroad. We intend to do everything possible to secure the payment of whatever back taxes are owed by the street railroads and other public service corporations. We shall try to find a plan to carry on an investigation of other inequalities in taxation. Next fall we expect to agitate all over the State the right of home rule and we shall endeavor to free the hands of each community so that equal taxation may be achieved. Of course these are legislative measures, and, in order to