

flicted them with nameless terror, "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

With clang of doom the verse recurs, "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart," "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

In the beginning he was free to let the Israelites go. As the fearful experiment proceeded, he became powerless to recede from his obstinacy. And in the final chapters of the exodus he ceased to have will power of his own. Events had encrusted his obstinacy, had ossified his will. The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

In his terror he would have given anything to be rid of the curse; his agony impelled him to make any concession to escape the doom. Appeals from every side urged him to let them go, but he could not. God's logic bound him to the bitter struggle. He was helpless to avoid the catastrophe, as he was to flee when the wall of water in the Red sea swept down to engulf him and his chariots and his horses. His heart was hardened, and at the last, The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart.

Do you suppose Pharaoh was egregiously wicked, eminently cruel? He was probably no worse than the average potentate of his day, no prouder than the typical tyrant of every generation.

He was no more stupid than George III., whose fatuous stubbornness cost England the colonies and gave America its excuse for being. He was no worse blinded than the slave holders whose folly brought on the civil war and ended in emancipation of the blacks.

He was of the same mold as the Spaniard who could not let Cuba go its gait to work out its own salvation or fail in the supreme hazard. He was no worse; he was probably equally with these conscientious.

It is easy enough to sit here and make faces at Pharaoh. But he was made of ordinary human nature. Any other gentleman who succeeded to the despotic powers of fourteen generations of ancestors would also be a despot. That's in human nature. Pharaoh was undoubtedly a gentleman according to the standards of his time, a pious gentleman, no doubt, as pious as Baer.

Speaking of Baer, whose name has recently been uncommonly rich in execration, Baer is no worse than any tyrant. He has wielded despotic power. It has made him a despot. He has hardened his pious heart. And as events roll on his heart is hardened.

Shall we read the last clanging verse into it? That would be presumption. For the record is not complete and he may have saving graces that Pharaoh missed. There may be some lurking sense of humor in him to prevent the summit of folly.

So far as the record goes, at least, he is true to tradition, reflects the character which the bible unerringly portrays.

Read the chapter in Exodus and compare it with Baer's haughty insolence before the coal conference. Is it not Pharaoh word for word, Pharaoh's lineaments carved in the modern lord of the taskfolk, Pharaoh's traits graven in the twentieth century rebel against doom? Does it not stir in one something of the same indignation that rises over the record of that obstinacy thirty-five centuries ago?

It seems so silly, Baer's headstrong insistence on going to his ruin. He would rather lose everything than yield an inch. He can't help it. He is in the same fix that Pharaoh was.

It is wonderful how truly the great drama depicts the characters that move in it. Not a feature is missing. We marvel at Pharaoh's contumely. Yet here in contemporaneous records, we pick up the newspaper and follow the identical performance in its republican setting.

From pride, vainglory and hypocrisy—do you know why those three words are so linked in the liturgy—good Lord deliver us.—John Stone Pardee, in Red Wing (Minn.) Argus of October 9.

TOM JOHNSON TO THE FRONT.

An editorial, with the above title, which appeared in the New York Nation of September 11.

The Ohio Democratic state convention at Sandusky on September 3 must challenge the attention of politicians throughout the country. It revealed Tom L. Johnson as the absolute dictator of the Democratic organization this year, and apparently assured his nomination for governor by the party next year. Moreover, it has given him a position of such importance that his views regarding the proper policy for the Democratic party to pursue with reference to the campaign of 1904 will carry great weight.

Mr. Johnson's victory marked the application to the whole state of the power which he has wielded over the Democrats of Cleveland during the past 18 months. A year ago last April he ran for mayor of the city, and was elected by a great majority. In the following November he secured the

election to the legislature from Cleveland of several members who accepted all that he stood for. During the past few months he has been steadily extending his influence throughout the state, until at last he was strong enough to invade Hamilton county (Cincinnati), so long controlled by John R. McLean, and to beat that boss in his home. After that, all was plain sailing. Mr. Johnson controlled the whole organization of the convention, became its presiding officer and saw the platform which he had written accepted without the change of a word.

The man who has thus come to the front in Ohio Democracy is one of the most interesting and picturesque figures developed in our politics for a number of years. A poor boy, he made himself very rich by availing himself of all the advantages allowed by our laws, and then denounced the very laws by which he had so greatly profited. Thus, he enjoyed the undue protection granted the manufacturers of steel, and declared his conviction that free trade is the best policy for this nation. He dealt in street railroads charging five-cent fares, making vast sums by some of these operations, as in Brooklyn a few years ago, and then came out as a champion of three-cent fares. He improved every opportunity offered to such a man by our present system of taxation, and at the same time was the earnest supporter of Henry George and a vigorous advocate of the single tax. In short, he comes about as near as possible to standing on the platform that the methods which enabled him to acquire great wealth are wrong and ought to be abolished. He appears to have a wonderful hold upon laboring men, especially those who come within the range of his personal influence. The ordinary Democratic politicians who have aspired to the nomination for governor next year, and who went to Toledo to push their "claims," found themselves utterly neglected.

Mr. Johnson stands for radical principles regarding corporations. He would have all taxable property appraised by assessing boards at not less than its selling value. He would have the proceedings and deliberations of those boards open to the public, and a representative employed to present the interests of the public in all hearings. He would specifically provide that the property of steam railroads and other "public-service" corporations be assessed "at not less than their salable value as going concerns." He would require all "public-service" corporations to make sworn public re-

ports, and would give the power of visitation and examination over such corporations to the proper auditing officers, "to the end that the true value of the privileges had by such corporations may be made plain to the people." There are minor provisions, but here are quite enough to startle and alarm the average corporation man.

While Mr. Johnson urged that state issues should be pressed in the pending state campaign, he took pains to declare his position in regard to national politics. His platform expressly indorsed the Kansas City platform of 1900, and personally commended the candidate who stood upon that platform. Nor did he stop here. In his speech he served notice that nobody can be a good Democrat in 1902, 1903, or the first half of 1904 who is not ready to accept the platform of 1900 until that of the next presidential campaign shall be framed. The Democrats of Ohio, he declared, can identify themselves unmistakably with the Democratic party of the republic "only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions;" and, of course, the rule must apply everywhere. This means that the new leader of Ohio Democracy will oppose the "reorganizers" in the party who would put a stigma upon Bryan, and who would have Democratic state conventions ignore the Kansas City platform, as was done deliberately in Indiana a few weeks ago, in Michigan somewhat later, and in Wisconsin on Wednesday week. He stands with those Democrats in Missouri, Arkansas, North Carolina and other states in the south and west who have "reaffirmed" the Kansas City platform, and with that element in the Iowa Democracy which on September 3 fought for Bryanism on the convention floor, and cast 344 votes, as against 384 for omitting all mention of the Kansas City platform. This element is particularly strong in regions where the feeling against "the money power" is most pronounced; and many Democrats of this type openly say that they would rather have the Republicans carry the presidency again than support a so-called "conservative" Democrat who represents the "reorganizing" element in the party.

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

An article with the above title, by Bliss Carman, published in the Chicago Tribune of September 6.

As far as I am concerned I suppose I am not qualified to speak on the subject of labor (so called) at all. For

by "labor" one is popularly supposed to mean only physical work—work with the hands—while other kinds of work, however arduous, rejoice in the genteel title of professions. And one who is a journalist by trade is apt not to designate himself a laborer.

The truth is, however, that every man is a natural born laborer, and idleness is an unhappy disease. It is as natural and inevitable for man to work as it is for him to eat or sleep. In fact, the one is only the reflex action of the other; we receive constant nourishment and daily recuperation, and we live under an iron necessity to set free the accumulated energy which rest and food produce. It is inevitable that we should hate many kinds of work—work for which we are unfitted—but it is more inevitable that we should enjoy work of some kind.

If it were permitted to the professional mind to have opinions on practical matters I believe I should think of the strike (or of all strikes) somewhat as follows:

In the first place, the present strike, for all its wastefulness, is productive of one priceless good—it has shown people the absurdity and moral wrong in private ownership of natural monopolies. Is it not the limit of comic perversity? Here is the delightful spectacle of a great nation, with boundless resources in so necessary an article as coal, hampered and annoyed by the obstinate wrangling between an obstinate clique of powerful capitalists on one side and a band of discontented hirelings on the other. And while these two factions, each absolutely selfish, are holding their squabble week after week, the people must go in want of coal! The position is intolerable, and a poetic justice would send the delinquents quickly packing about their business and hand over the coal fields to state ownership.

Poetic justice, however, is slow, and is only wrought out through the tardy and difficult act of men as they gradually come to apprehend the finest demands of ethics and to shape their conduct accordingly.

The trouble is that the great industrial game of modern civilization is run on principles that are morally rotten. Why? Because it does not recognize right and wrong as absolute standards of conduct. Because it has superseded one false conception of life—the conception which said: "Might makes right"—and has set up in its place another equally false, the ideal which says: "Shrewdness makes right." But right and wrong are not matters that can be governed by shrewd and clever

self-interest, any more than they can be regulated by brute strength. They are matters of the heart; they always have been so, and always will be as long as the world lasts. And any form of civilization which is built on a moral judgment is bound to fall, as all its predecessors have failed before it. In our systems of ethics we have had the wit to perceive the significance of moral ideals and to declare them necessary and inviolable. In "practical life," however, as we fatuously call it, we have been content to maintain the old cutthroat system of ethics which we inherit from the beasts below us.

And yet one must always be careful not to rail against things as they are. Let us acknowledge they are bad and manfully attempt to right them. It seems to me that wealthy people are really quite as great sufferers from the social evils as the poor are, only their woes are not so apparent. The poor suffer from atrophy of the body; the rich suffer from atrophy of the soul.

Now, I think we all acknowledge that every man has a right to work. But he also has another right which custom does not recognize at all; that is, the right to own the fruit of his work. Under present conditions no matter how hard a workman may toil, no matter how eminently skillful he may be, he is only permitted to retain as much of the wealth he produces as will enable him to live and go on working. The landlord and the usurer get the rest.

This is true of all men who earn a living. The landlord and the capitalists are often, perhaps usually, workmen, too, and earn a good living, as they should. But they make more than they earn; and this is wrong, because it is made out of the earnings of other men—workmen—without the workmen's consent.

Now, the interests of labor and capital are not diverse; they are one. Both classes are bent on the production of wealth. Neither can do a thing without the assistance of the other. They must work by a compact. And yet the proceeds of their joint efforts are not divided according to any mutual agreement. For one party to the compact takes everything and allows the other party a starvation wage. To the simple hearted intelligence this seems a monstrous iniquity. I believe that it is so. Surely every man is entitled to his share of the wealth of the community in proportion to the value and difficulty of the service he renders to that community. Certainly the unintelligent workman cannot expect an equal share with his skillful fellow.