

abolish the conditions Hanna and his sort have put upon prosperity.

Those Hannaistic newspapers which assume to see so much of the sensational in Tom L. Johnson's use of a circus tent for public meetings, something in which Hanna has been obliged to imitate him, and in his use of an automobile for getting out among the people of Ohio in his campaigning, are missing an opportunity to expose the most unique and sensational feature of his campaign. While they waste space in lurid descriptions of such commonplace things as circus tents and automobiles, Johnson's really picturesque performance escapes their attention. This is nothing less than carrying on a State campaign, against the most magnificent campaign fund ever contributed by corporation rings for a State election, and in a State which has for years been debauched with campaign money by leaders in both parties, yet without the use of money. Johnson is actually trying the experiment of trusting to the voters instead of the grafters for success. Could anything more picturesque, unique and sensational be conceived? Yet the sensation hunters for the newspapers are missing it all.

If Johnson were a poor man, there would be nothing very remarkable about his cashless campaign. But he is a rich man. If he were a close-fisted man, his cashless campaign might be attributed to penuriousness. But he is notoriously a free spender and generous to a fault. So there is no way of accounting for his cashless campaign except as a new dodge in politics. And that is what it is. Johnson is making no fight for a season and then to retire. He is making no fight for the governorship nor for the presidency. His fight is for a principle—the equal rights of men; and he is in the fight for life. What may happen this Fall, or next, these are only incidents. The important thing is to arouse the people themselves to a realization

of their condition and an understanding of what they must do; and that cannot be accomplished with campaign funds. So Johnson leaves campaign-fund politics to his adversaries. His appeals are to the conscience of the voters. Until he gets at that, the campaign fund will beat him, if it is big enough and judiciously distributed. But when he gets at that, campaign funds will be so much money wasted. This new kind of politics has won in Cleveland. It has yet to win in Ohio. Perhaps it will win in Ohio this year. If not, may be next year. If not then, there are other years to follow. Meanwhile Johnson has the satisfaction of knowing that his adversaries must keep their campaign funds up to the standard at every election, or be routed by their own indignant heelers at the first sign of shrinkage. The Ohio campaign is a contest between clean politics under Johnson's leadership, and boodle politics under Hanna, Foraker, Cox and McLean.

At the request of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, Edward W. Bemis and Carl H. Nau, the latter a public accountant and both of them experts in statistical analysis, have prepared a detailed statement of the amount of tax dodging by railroads in Ohio, for the perpetuation of which Senator Hanna is now appealing to the people of that State. It is a valuable document. If the people of Ohio were aware of the condition it exposes, Johnson would be the next governor without another speech, and a great change would come over the political complexion of the legislature. It appears from this report that the railroads of Ohio are appraised for taxation at only 20 per cent. of their true value, whereas other kinds of property are taxed on 60 per cent., thus causing an aggregate loss to the various counties of \$4,484,416 in railroad taxes. Other taxpayers consequently pay 10 per cent. more than they ought to. The extra favors which Senator Hanna's followers give to railroads may be inferred from

the fact that those roads which pass through both Ohio and Indiana are taxed hardly half as much per mile in the former as in the latter State.

When it is considered that in the estimation of the plutocratic press the free silver question has long been regarded as a dead issue and Mr. Bryan as a leader without a following, the dust it is kicking up over Mr. Bryan's reported abandonment of the free silver idea is decidedly entertaining. The report is absurd to any one at all familiar with Mr. Bryan's position on the money question. Yet his published denial was necessary, perhaps, to neutralize the effect upon public opinion of the jubilations of newspapers that are much more at home with diatribes, when they discuss Mr. Bryan, than with the financial doctrines they pretend to criticize.

A single tax man of Baltimore, Mr. John Salmon, expresses no little surprise that Senator Hanna's candidate for governor of Ohio supposes that the single tax has been a disastrous failure wherever tried. Of Mr. Herrick and his notion Mr. Salmon writes:

This stamps him as being a twisted thinker and a loose observer. The single tax is in operation all over the United States, flowing into the pockets of private individuals, which is what single taxers object to. Here in Baltimore more than in any other section of the country, it is strongly apparent. We have the ground rent system in operation, 90 per cent. of the real estate being held on leaseholds. The custom is an old English one grafted on the Maryland colonies by Lord Baltimore and his English compeers, and it has grown and flourished like a green bay tree. When one buys a home here it is in nine cases out of ten subject to a ground rent. These ground rents are dealt in as a form of investment the same as a mortgage or any other form of investment; but the point to observe is that they are a single tax, pure and simple, the price paid for the use of the ground per se and for ground only.

Our last assessment separated the value of land from the value of improvements, and it is done every day in our community. Baltimore has more houses per capita than any city in the country, due to the ground rent system; and a house costing \$1,200 to build is very often sold for \$800 or \$900 in order to

create a ground rent ranging from three dollars a front foot to \$20 and \$40 a front foot. To explain more fully: Bonus buildings are run up on plats of ground split up into lots 15x90, and a ground rent say of \$6 per front foot is put on the lot, making \$90 a year ground rent, which the buyer agrees to pay, and in his ground rent is a clause that he will also pay all taxes. This \$90 is essentially a single tax. The agreement to pay it is exactly the same kind of a contract that is in vogue in Fairhope, Ala. With this extremely important exception, that whereas we in Baltimore bind ourselves to pay all the taxes, in Fairhope the company or lessor, agrees to pay all taxes. Talk of its being a disastrous failure! Not on your life. Ground rents are as scarce as hens' teeth, and can only be bought on a 3 per cent. basis. They command as good a price as government bonds, and it is estimated that \$14,000,000 at least is raised in Baltimore alone from this source—nearly twice as much as the city and State taxes amount to. And what is this tax of \$14,000,000 paid for? Why, merely for the privilege of living in the city of Baltimore. That's all the payers get for it. And the only kick we've got coming is that private individuals get that money instead of the city and State.

In comparison with the terrible brutality which distinguishes the heroisms of war, how inspiring is this simple newspaper report from New York on the 18th of one of the heroisms of peace:

While fire was destroying two floors of the tenement at 105 Division street to-day, six children and Rabbi Solomon Levin climbed through windows and stood on the fire escape. Extension ladders that quickly were raised fell six feet short of the imperiled group. Firemen stationed themselves on the top rounds below and then the Rabbi took the children and lifting them over the railing dropped them one by one to the firemen, who caught them and passed them on down. So intent upon the rescue and so thrilled by its heroism had been the crowd that it was not until the threatened children were safe that the wallings of a panic-stricken woman became intelligible. Her husband, Jacob Frank, she said, and her little daughter were on the top floor. Louis C. Beyer, a fireman, with his head covered with wet cloths, ran into the building to the top floor, described by Mrs. Frank. He stumbled into the place and falling to the floor for the little air left, crawled through one room after another until he came upon the prostrate form of a man. A comrade who had been waiting on the ladder took the unconscious man from Beyer and carried him to the street.

Courage like that, if devoted to

taking human lives instead of saving them, would make every telegraph wire to vibrate and the headline types of the great newspapers to dance with delight, while the heroes would be flattered and promoted. If a neat bit of spying and a trifling flavor of forgery were mixed in with the heroism, it might win for the hero even a brigadier's shoulder straps and pay. But who are the denizens of a tenement house that firemen should be thought of as heroes for saving their lives? It was the fireman's business, anyhow; and no very noble business, either, as compared with killing men and other animals.

Now comes Senator Dubois, of Idaho, with a proposition to disfranchise the Mormons, not because they practice polygamy, but because of "their growing strength and political ambitions." It's the same old story. We try to make ourselves believe that we disfranchise people because they are inferior in race, as with Negroes in the South and Chinamen on the Pacific coast; or because they are immoral, as with the Mormons when they were polygamists. But the universal reason at bottom is that we want to govern them. It is our political ambition against theirs.

That such institutions as the Mormon church and Dowie's "Zion" are dangerous to free institutions is true. This might be true also of race influences such as prevail among the Negroes at the South and among Chinamen on the Coast. When races vote together as such, they are a menace to free institutions. So, when ecclesiastical organizations enter as such into politics, teaching their members that they must vote under ecclesiastical orders, they also are a menace to free institutions. But nothing of this kind is so great a menace to free institutions as disfranchisement. Let the ballot be general, and race animosities will die away. Let the ballot be general, and the most autocratic ecclesiastical organization will lose its influence in the

political arena. But let any considerable body of people, linked by ties of race or religion, be held in subjection as ballotless people, and free institutions are not merely menaced, they are gone.

The Chicago city council has taken one important step in the direction of municipal ownership of railways. It has agreed unambiguously to bring the acceptance of the Mueller act to popular vote at the city election in April. So much the municipal ownership advocates have accomplished. One thing more remains to be done. They must see to it that no traction franchise passes the city council, either absolutely or subject to submission to popular vote, until after the popular vote on the acceptance of the Mueller law. If they succeed in this, municipal ownership of the Chicago street car system will be but a few months farther off.

When the Rev. Dr. Henson describes John Alexander Dowie as a reincarnation of Balaam, he pays Dowie a compliment which he could not have intended and which apparently is not deserved. Balaam was a prophet who remained true to his high calling and delivered his message straight, though sorely tempted by the most seductive kind of bribery.

#### EX-PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S CHICAGO SPEECH.

If the purpose of bringing Mr. Cleveland to Chicago to make a speech that might as well have been made in New York city or Princeton, New Jersey, was to start a presidential boom for him in the West (and, really, any other purpose is invisible to the naked eye), then his visit was a failure.

An easier approach to the few score rich men who honored him with the banquet at which he spoke, may have been established conveniently against the day for raising campaign funds; but rich men cannot make presidential booms, however potent they may be in marring them.

Some satisfaction may have been derived, moreover, from the popular reception at which 2,000