

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1903.

Number 283.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

The action of the Ohio Democrats at Columbus, under the leadership of Tom L. Johnson (pp. 320-24-26), has thrown the Republican and the reactionary Democratic press of the country into a comical complication of hysterical spasms.

They denounce Johnson as a boss. But what could be more absurd, from such a source? Bossism in politics supplies the very breath of their journalistic nostrils. Hypocrites! It is not because Johnson is a boss that they denounce him, but because he has knocked over bosses of the kind that feed them; and they twitter as ravenously and discordantly as a nest of hungry young robins.

In fact, Johnson is not a boss—not in their sense. He uses no boodle, he depends upon no official patronage, he coddles no newspapers with public advertising, he makes no dark-room bargains, he neither adopts nor submits to underhand methods, he does none of the things in politics which bosses like Coxe and Bernard, of Cincinnati, and Hanna and Farley, of Cleveland, resort to. His political bargains are open-and-above board and with the people themselves. Their confidence in him and his fidelity to them constitute his strength in politics. To the extent that Johnson is a boss, he is a boss of the people's own choice—a public servant, not a public parasite.

In a way it is true that he is a

boss. When an appointive office holder discloses incompetency or neglect, Johnson bosses him out of the office. When an elected office holder proves corrupt, Johnson bosses him out of a reelection. When a Democratic boss sells out his party to the Republican boss, Johnson bosses the Democratic boss out of his boss-ship. But how does he do this bossing? It is simple enough. No cooking up of primaries or packing of conventions is either adopted or necessary. Johnson merely says to the rascals who seek his support before the people: "I shall not support you, and if you do any wire pulling I will take your case before the people." What honest man would have him do otherwise?

Usually this is enough. In only one instance recently has Johnson's notification to recalcitrant office holders that he will appeal to the people been defied (p. 113); and in that instance—the case of a Democratic legislator who joined the corporation gang at Columbus in violation of his pledges to the people who elected him—Johnson went before the people of the legislative district at the Democratic primaries and secured a popular vote against the candidate for renomination. This is Johnson's way of bossing politics, and it is a way most excellent. Such bosses are badly needed in American politics. They are not bosses in any objectionable sense, but leaders—leaders in thought, leaders in speech, leaders in action, leaders of the common people against the privileged financial interests that are served by corrupt bosses and buttressed by a corrupt press. Johnson is leading the people of Ohio, as he has already led those of Cleveland, out of a boss-ridden

Democracy and away from a boss-ridden Republican machine.

It has been telegraphed all over the country that he gained control of the Democratic machinery of Ohio by unseating opposing delegations to the State convention. That is very like pleading the baby act, when it is considered that the accusation emanates from the bosses who have habitually manipulated Democratic politics in Ohio by precisely such methods. But what are the plain facts? They are reported in the news columns of the very papers that weep and wail over Johnson's wickedness in having "stolen" the Democratic machine of Cincinnati from the political firm of Coxe and Bernard—one a Republican boss and the other his Democraticheeler,—and deprived the reactionary Mr. Zimmerman of the gubernatorial nomination which Democratic "reorganizers" and Republican bosses were so exceedingly anxious he should get. According to these reports, and the fact is the same, Johnson would have had a majority of the convention if every contest had been decided against him.

One of the contests, that from Cuyahoga, was a confessed "fake," paid for by Senator Hanna's political managers (pp. 324-25), for the purpose of helping Zimmerman, by making an appearance of opposition to Johnson in his own county. Throwing out that "fake" contest, Johnson would have had a majority of more than 81. How much more it is impossible to say, for the only test vote taken in the convention was on a question regarding which the Zimmerman delegates were united and the Johnson delegates were divided. The only other contests involved

in the aggregate no more than 72 delegates all told, and of these 42 were from the Cincinnati county—Hamilton. In that county Zimmerman was defeated at the primaries by 35 to 7. But Bernard, the Cincinnati boss, managed to get a "dark horse" into the chair as presiding officer of the county convention. This chairman falsely declared carried a motion to appoint a committee of five to select delegates, and refused to allow either a reconsideration of the vote or an appeal from his decision. Thereupon a majority of the delegates to the convention withdrew to another hall and ratified the vote of the primaries, while Bernard's committee of five selected State delegates without regard to the vote of the primaries. Upon these facts the Bernard delegates were denied seats and the other delegation was seated. The other contests were similar. And this is what the reactionary papers and their Republican allies refer to when they charge Johnson with "stealing" the State convention. The truth is that Mr. Zimmerman and every man interested in his campaign knew that the convention was overwhelmingly for Johnson without reference to the contests. Zimmerman's own workers were heard to confess, two days before the contests were presented, that Zimmerman was hopelessly in the minority and had no other object than "to muddy up the waters." The returns from the primaries as published on the 24th, showed, with every contest counted in Zimmerman's favor, not more than 230 delegates for Zimmerman and not less than 460 for Johnson.

But the fabrications on the part of the plutocratic press are not the most interesting evidence of plutocratic discomfiture over Johnson's crusade against the interests they are retained to defend. Bewilderment and futile anger are the only words that fairly describe the state of mind of the editors behind the pen. Johnson has ruined his chances by throwing over the silver question, and he has ruined them by clinging to the silver question. He has courted defeat by tying up to Bryan, while Bryan has insured his defeat by refus-

ing to speak for him, and insured it over again by not refusing to speak for him. He has lost the silver vote by nominating Clarke, who voted against Bryan in 1896, and the gold vote by nominating Clarke, who voted for Bryan in 1900. And so the discordant chorus runs. To read the hysterical special correspondence and editorials of the plutocratic press is to get a strong impression that the plutocrats of both parties are badly scared by Tom L. Johnson. Instead of calmly smiling at him, with a confidence born of the 90,000 adverse plurality he must overcome, and of which they boast, they are most significantly hysterical. Why? They make no such to do over Iowa. Yet the Democrats of Iowa are confronted with an adverse plurality of only 79,000. Why, we repeat, why are the plutocrats so stirred up over Ohio with its 90,000 Republican plurality, and so self-satisfied over Iowa with its 79,000 Republican plurality? On the face of things this is very queer.

There is something remarkable about the obtuseness that is displayed with reference to Bryan's hostility to Democratic "reorganizers." Because John H. Clarke, who voted against Bryan in 1896 and is not a silver man now, was nominated by the Democrats of Ohio for United States Senator, the obtuse fellow citizen infers that this nomination must be objectionable to Bryan. In many instances, no doubt, the wish is father to the thought. Yet there is nothing to warrant it in anything Bryan has ever said, written or done. Hostile newspapers have proclaimed that Bryan narrowly objects to political affiliation with Democrats who bolted the party in 1896 and with Democrats who are not bimetallicists. He neither does nor has done anything of the kind. What he has objected to, and does object to, and ought to object to, is the movement to restore to power in the Democratic party the bolters who went out in 1896, who refuse to come back except as bosses, and who demand that the party return to the service of plutocracy. Tom L. Johnson is not a silver man, but Bryan has had no political quarrel with him. They

differ on an economic question, and that is all. Shepard is not a silver man, and he voted against Bryan in 1896; yet Bryan has no political quarrel with him, though he may distrust the influence of his business environment. Similar instances are abundant to show that Bryan has not made the silver question the test of orthodox Democracy, that he has demanded no punishment for past party disloyalty, and that the only hard and fast line he has drawn is between assistant Republicans wearing the Democratic label and democratic Democrats. By this test there was no reason why Mr. Bryan should have objected to Clarke's nomination in Ohio, when Clarke's political record since 1896 is considered. That Bryan should have been suspected of any inclination to object, argues a very misty conception of his position and a low estimate of his judgment. Plutocracy and democracy—that is the fundamental issue,—the privileged classes against the common people; and Mr. Bryan has never proposed any other test of democracy. His speech at Versailles and his statement from Columbus (see News department) are in perfect harmony with his record, both as to political tactics and political principle.

In view of the virtually uniform success the Liberals have had in recent bye-elections in England, together with the success of third party labor candidates at two such elections, militarism would seem to have run its course among our British friends. Chamberlain, with his protection issue, seems to have strengthened the current of opposition to toryism instead of stemming the tide. This is encouraging in the United States. Our own toryism having risen along with that of Great Britain, may possibly recede as that does.

In Rhode Island a man now lies in jail at Pawtucket, his offense being neglect to pay a poll tax. Unless he pays the tax, plus the costs and plus his board while in jail, his imprisonment will continue and his debt grow bigger. The probabilities of life imprisonment are supposed to be before him. This is civilization. At

least it is supposed to be civilization. While some people in Rhode Island are allowed to appropriate public revenues as if they were their own, others must go to jail for not paying a poll tax. And what is the poll tax? It is a tax for permission to live—to live, that is, outside of jail. It is twin sister to the business license tax. One is a tax for existing; the other is a tax for working. Wouldn't it be much more sensible to make valuable monopolies the source of public revenues, and allow the right to live and the right to work to go untaxed?

The military outing along the coast of Maine, where a war game for "points" has been in progress, is properly condemned by the Universal Peace Union as farcical and expensive. This game is another imitation of the sports of the war lords of Europe, and about as useful for military purposes as baseball in a back lot or chess in a back room.

The price of candy has been raised in England. This is due to the abolition of the sugar bounties. Heretofore German sugar producers have furnished the Scottish confectioners with sugar at less than cost. They were able to do so because the German government has paid a bounty for sugar exports. Consequently British children got cheap candy at the expense of German taxpayers. Thus did Germany "invade" the British sugar market. It was quite a sensible arrangement, don't you think?

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN OHIO

To understand the present political situation in Ohio it is necessary to go back in thought almost three years, to the time when Tom L. Johnson publicly announced his intention (vol. iii, p. 658) of devoting the remainder of his life to the service of radical democracy. This occasion marked the beginning of a new order of things in the politics of the Buckeye State.

I.

Prior to that time Johnson had taken an interest in politics, not unlike the interest of most rich men who turn to politics instead

of yachting or horse racing for their recreation. The resemblance, however, was only superficial. Johnson had a higher purpose than recreation and a deeper interest than excitement.

As far back as 1884 he became an enthusiastic disciple of Henry George; and since 1886 he has been a leader of wider than national fame in the great democratic movement that derived its impulse from George's work and which bears the label of "the single tax."

Along with Thomas G. Shearman, Johnson contributed nearly all the fund, above the penny collections at mass meetings, which made the George mayoralty campaign of 1886 in New York a possibility; and he participated both in person and with financial contributions in the George mayoralty campaign of 1897. He joined, moreover, with August Lewis, in providing means—without solicitation, as George says in his dedication to these two long-time friends of his—whereby George could devote himself to the writing of his last great book, "The Science of Political Economy."

In numerous other ways Johnson has, for nearly two decades, financially promoted the cause of which Henry George was leader, and rendered it even greater service by his words and work—for he is no perfunctory adherent of this cause. He is grounded in it thoroughly, and expounds it clearly and accurately.

It was at George's urgent request that Johnson plunged into the democratic politics of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Ohio in 1888. As the Democratic candidate for Congress that year he contested this Congressional seat without the slightest effort at concealment of his radical economic views. Not only did he not conceal; he publicly avowed. A single taxer, he was, of course, a free trader; and his campaign was made upon absolute free trade grounds.

He was opposed not alone by Republican leaders and Republican campaign touters, but also by the moss-backs and soreheads and spoilsmen of the local Democratic machine whom he had defeated at the Democratic primaries. They seized upon his

avowed free trade and single tax principles, and professing to be protectionists, or tariff reformers with incidental protection, or society savers, they united with the Republican machine to defeat him at the polls. This was his first fight, and the protection sentiment in his district—represented at the preceding term by a protection Democrat—was too strong for a radical and candid free trader immediately to overcome. It was the year also of President Cleveland's defeat for a second term of the presidency.

But Johnson has never been a "quitter," either in business projects or political conflicts. In 1890 he went again before the Democratic primaries; and, again defeating the unprincipled elements of his own party, he was for the second time nominated as the Democratic candidate for Congress.

It was in this campaign that his adversaries learned the wisdom of shunning invitations to debate with him. He accepted the challenge of his opponent, a distinguished public speaker, and though he used none of the arts and scrupulously avoided all the bitternesses of debate, depending entirely upon a plain and sensible presentation of his cause, his triumph in the debate was not only claimed by his friends but acknowledged by his adversaries.

He has never since been challenged by Republican adversaries, and in none of his subsequent campaigns has he been able to secure an acceptance of his challenges to them.

In this contest, also, Johnson went before the people with the same candor that has characterized all his campaigning, and which the uncandid find it so difficult to understand. He was elected by a vote of 17,646 to 14,256—a plurality of 3,390 and a clear majority over all of 2,953.

At the next Congressional election Johnson was reelected, under circumstances quite similar, though by a slightly reduced plurality. Owing to a larger side party vote, his majority over all was considerably reduced. His vote was 17,389 and his Republican adversary's 14,165, the side

party vote being in the aggregate 1,019.

His third campaign was notable for the same candor he had shown in the others. It was characterized, also, both at the primaries and at the polls, by the same opposition of Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoilsmen which he had met in 1888 and 1890.

Johnson's record of four years in Congress was of the highest order.

He delivered from the floor two or three speeches of the first class. He secured the adoption of George's "Protection or Free Trade" as a public document of the United States. He voted with five others for the single tax bill. He maintained a steady and intelligent opposition to the Gorman ring in their emasculation of the Wilson bill in the interest of the Sugar Trust. He stood out against both the Sugar Trust and the Steel Trust. And he placed upon record, from the committee on the District of Columbia, in which an unsympathetic Speaker had tried to smother him, a report on taxation which is a model of fiscal investigation and cannot fail to serve a most useful purpose at no distant time.

Among Johnson's acts in Congress to which attention should be specially recalled, was his refusal to play the demagogue by voting, against his free trade convictions, for a tariff on cloaks, to please a labor union of his city which demanded it. Instead of complying, he responded in a statesmanlike letter,—not in the usual paternal spirit of such letters to workingmen, but as man to man—plainly expressing his own convictions and freely explaining to the cloak union the injury to themselves and their fellow laborers which tariff protection invariably produces.

On the money question, while he refused to vote in favor of digging up silver from a hole in the ground in the Rocky Mountains only to bury it in a hole in the ground at Washington, Johnson consistently opposed money monopoly. He was the author and supporter of the bill for supplying an elastic currency by making interest-bearing bonds readily in-

terchangeable with non-interest-bearing notes. His position on the money question, therefore, was more like that of a green-backer than that of a bimetallist. In other words, while he did not regard bimetallism as the best safeguard against money monopoly, he opposed money monopoly none the less strenuously, as well as monopoly of every other kind.

Perhaps the most striking incident in Johnson's Congressional career was his famous reply, in debate on the floor, to a Republican protectionist member who especially represented the Steel Trust. Johnson was opposing the tariff on steel, a large product of his own private business, when this member accused him of inconsistency for taking profits of the steel tariff as a business man while voting against the steel tariff as a member of Congress. Johnson's reply was a sharp declaration of his own invincible position and a startling indictment of the trust attorneys in Congress. "As a business man," he exclaimed, "I will take advantage of all the bad laws that you put upon the statute books; but as a member of Congress I will not defend them, and I will repeal them if I can."

Milk-sop moralists criticise that position. With a peculiar notion of civic morals they seem to think a public man ought either, in private life, to keep out of all businesses upon which the law confers unjust privileges, or else, in public life, to stand loyally by the bad laws and plundering policies that support his unjust privileges. It appears to be their idea that beneficiaries of monopolies are entitled to good moral standing only as they, as citizens, vote for the servants of monopolists, and, as legislators, support monopoly laws. Johnson's morality is not of this "hog wash" order. He believes that it is as voters and public servants, and not as business men (excepting business men who bribe or otherwise improperly influence voters and public servants) that citizens are responsible for monopoly laws.

There is virility in civic morals of that type. Out of the other kind comes nothing but that peculiarly repulsive respectability

which analyzes into Sunday piety and week-day plundering.

Johnson's fourth campaign for Congress was as candidly conducted as the others had been. This time also he successfully opposed the Democratic moss-backs, soreheads, and spoilsmen at the primaries, and met their treachery at the polls. But he never flinched in his principles.

A few extracts from one of his campaign documents will illustrate the candor of his campaigning methods:

The foreign goods that compete with the goods of our manufacturers and trusts are heavily taxed at the custom house, but foreign laborers are admitted free of duty.

The present hard times have been felt all over the world, in countries of low tariffs and high tariffs; countries with little money and those with plenty of money; in monarchies and in republics. The real cause cannot be tariffs, or money, or form of government; it is something that we find everywhere—the monopoly of land, the source of all production.

Tariffs only make monopolists richer. Free trade will lead to the single tax. The single tax will abolish all monopoly.

Protection is not a theory; it is a swindle.

Free trade—real free trade—means free production, for trade is but a branch of production. Free trade in its true sense means free access to land, the source of all production. How shall we make land accessible to all? By taxing out the dogs in the manger who hold building lots vacant, mines, factory sites, and millions of acres of lumber lands, and farming sites, and prevent others from using them.

The candor of these declarations furnished Johnson's adversaries an opportunity, of course, to arouse ignorant prejudice. Not so good a one, however, as his single tax ideas may afford them this year, when the prejudices of the farmer can be played upon; for Johnson's Congressional district was in a city crowded with object lessons in land monopoly—crowded much more with such object lessons than with buildings.

Johnson's compact and conclusive answer to the demagogical appeal of his adversaries to farmers, will be found farther on in this editorial. Our present concern is with the Congressional election of 1894.

Though defeated at the polls

in this his fourth campaign, Johnson was clearly not at fault. Neither he nor his cause was weak. He polled 13,260 votes to 17,968 for his principal adversary, who had a plurality of 4,708, but a clear majority of only 2,275—698 less than Johnson's of four years before.

The cause of Johnson's defeat was evidently the unpopularity, all over the country, of Cleveland's administration. For this reason the Democratic vote everywhere, as well as in Johnson's district, had collapsed (vol. v, p. 177; vol. vi, p. 65), the Democratic representatives in Congress being reduced from 219 to 93, and a Democratic majority of 41 in the House being wiped out by a Republican majority of 74. Ohio was lost to the Democrats that year by a Republican majority of 137,000. Johnson went down with his party.

From that time until three years ago Johnson was neither a candidate nor a leader in politics. He went as a delegate to the Democratic national convention in 1896, as he had in 1892. He voted for Bryan in the Ohio delegation, but the unit rule nullified his vote in the convention. In the campaign he supported Bryan because in Bryan he saw a national leader against financial monopoly, a pronounced free trader, and the popular exponent in our time, as Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln had been in theirs, of radical democracy. In these views and this course of conduct Johnson was in full accord with Henry George.

For the same reason he supported Bryan in 1900, both at the convention and in the campaign. The issue of imperialism then bound him even closer than before to Bryan's democratic leadership.

But the tidal wave against President Cleveland's administration, which had gathered force in 1894, was resistless in Ohio. The Republican plurality in the whole State rose from only 1,072 in the presidential year of 1892, to 80,995 for governor in 1893 and 137,087 for secretary of state in 1894. In 1895 it fell again, but only to 92,622; and in 1896 Bryan reduced it to 47,497. Under the influence

of the Bryan wave of sentiment it dropped to 28,165 for governor in 1897, but rose for secretary of state in 1898 to 61,139, and dropped back as far as 49,023 in the vote for governor in 1899. In the presidential year of 1900 it went up to 69,036, and fell only to 67,567 for governor in 1901.

A similar collapse of Democratic strength had taken place in Johnson's Congressional district; and Cuyahoga county became more hopelessly Republican than ever; while in the city of Cleveland both political parties were controlled by spoilsmen who were mortgaged to the public service corporations.

The city was normally a Republican stronghold. But a faction fight between the Republicans let into the mayor's office in 1899 the Farly administration, nominally Democratic, but really an ally of the Hanna Republicans and a creature and tool of the public corporations. Democracy of the Jeffersonian type was dead in Cleveland and the corporations were enthroned.

Such was the condition of Ohio politics in the early winter of 1900-1, when, as stated above, Tom L. Johnson announced his intention of devoting the remainder of his life to the service of radical democracy.

II.

The announcement was made in a speech at the Jackson day banquet in Cleveland. Johnson had succeeded in relieving himself of all business responsibilities, and in so securing his fortune that the trust magnates could not cripple his powers as a public man by playing pitch and toss with his property interests in the great game in Wall street. Freed of anxiety over the conspiracies of political and private enemies, and of the necessity for devoting his energies to private affairs, he entered at once upon a campaign for lower street car fares in Cleveland, with ultimate municipal ownership and operation. When the municipal campaign was about to begin in the Spring of 1901, Johnson was solicited by a large representation of local democratic Democrats to allow the use of his name as the Democratic candidate for mayor. The rest is pretty well known, and

need be only briefly referred to here.

In a Republican city; opposed by both Republican factions; opposed as usual by the moss-backs and spoilsmen of his own party, who were intrenched in the city hall and in control of the Democratic city committee; and without the use of "boodle," but by the same kind of direct and candid appeals to the people which had characterized his Congressional campaigns of ten years before, he was elected mayor of Cleveland by 6,000 majority.

Then began a fight against the privileges of public corporations, defended by spoilsmen of both parties. This fight came so near to success that nothing availed to check it, but the overturning of the city charter by the Supreme Court, which was done upon the application of the attorney general with whom Senator Hanna had displaced Attorney General Monett. Mr. Monett had proved faithful to the State, though tempted by a rich bribe from the Standard Oil Trust, and was therefore unavailable for renomination by the Republican machine. With the Cleveland charter smashed, Mayor Johnson could proceed no further against the privileges of the Cleveland public service corporations without the consent of the Supreme Court of the State, and that body insisted upon the status quo.

It was the same way with Mayor Johnson's crusade for the equalization of taxes. The big corporations and rich real estate owners were shielded at the expense of the small home owners and farmers, and Johnson's efforts to expose them were held in check.

When the Republican legislature, controlled by Senator Hanna, of Cleveland, and Boss Coxe, of Cincinnati, who were aided and abetted by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoilsmen—when this body had made a new charter for Cleveland, its work turned out to have been constructed especially in the interest of the privileged corporations, with reference both to street franchises and to taxes. But if Johnson could not yet overcome the ring of corporations and "graft-er" politicians, he could get the

ear of the people of Cleveland. His success in this respect is phenomenal, and the spoils politicians are amazed by it.

Six months after his election as mayor in 1901, he had elected a delegation to the legislature from Cuyahoga county, which was composed of men of exceptional ability and integrity, as the event proved. All of them were democratic-Democrats. So with the county officers. For the first time since the civil war Cuyahoga county went Democratic. Some difficulty had been experienced because two or three of the candidates had voted for Palmer and Buckner in 1896, and were, therefore, persona non grata to many of Johnson's own supporters. But Johnson knew his men and the genuineness of their democracy is not to-day distrusted by a genuine Bryan Democrat in Cuyahoga county.

In the following Spring, 1902, Johnson won his second victory in Cleveland against the Republican machine combined with or treacherously served by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoilsmen. He won his second election in the county in the following Fall—one year ago. Even the State ticket carried the county in this year of 1902.

It was the first year in which Johnson had begun to play a leading hand in State politics. With Herbert S. Bigelow, the candidate for secretary of state, he campaigned the State as well as time permitted. In the northern counties, where he was best known and had been able to reach the people, the Democratic vote was increased by 10,000. But in the Cincinnati region the machinery of the party was wholly against Johnson. It was controlled by Bernard, the Democratic "boss," and used in the interest of Coxe, the Republican "boss." The consequent increased Republican pluralities in that region were enough in themselves to raise the Republican plurality in the State from 67,567 to 90,465—about 10,000 higher than in 1893 though nearly 50,000 lower than in 1894. Measured superficially in figures, this campaign was as a whole a failure. But properly understood, it has made an excel-

lent starting point for the campaign of the present year.

By the time Johnson had finished his local campaigns of 1902, with two splendid victories to his credit, the once favorite cry against him that "Tom Johnson ain't sincere!" had worn itself out. Not only had Johnson won the Republican county of Cuyahoga and its Republican city of Cleveland completely over to democratic-Democracy, but he had proved faithful to every pledge; and the people had acquired such confidence in his candor and fidelity that they were now inclined to look with suspicion upon any man in Cleveland who said, "Tom Johnson ain't sincere." The question at once occurred, as it still does when any man proclaims now that "Tom Johnson ain't sincere,"—this very significant question, "What graft of that man's has Tom L. Johnson spoilt?"

So strong was the popular feeling of confidence in Johnson last Spring that Senator Hanna's candidate for mayor, regarded as one of Cleveland's ablest lawyers, especially great as a maritime practitioner, was defeated by Johnson by 6,000 majority. Yet Hanna's candidate had the support of a united Republican party machine, of an energetic lot of "labor skates," of a collection of Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and disappointed spoilsmen, and of all the privileged corporations, with their ramifications of influence throughout the State and the country and even into the heart of Wall street. In the Fall it had been said that Johnson was snowed under; but in the Spring the snow melted.

The conflict which democratic-Democracy has thus for nearly three years waged successfully in Cuyahoga county, under Johnson's leadership, now extends over the State of Ohio. The battlefield is enlarged, but the leaders and what they fight for are the same.

III.

In this Ohio struggle, upon which the attention of the country is centered, the combination of privileged corporations and local Republican leadership is di-

rected by Marcus A. Hanna, of Cleveland.

Himself the nominated candidate for United States senator, Senator Hanna has chosen for his gubernatorial candidate Myron T. Herrick, also of Cleveland. Both are deeply concerned in the profits of privileged monopolies; and both believe so firmly in the sanctity of privilege, that they are committed to the perpetuation of the laws that take from the many to give to the few. They are monopolists in their business connections, and conservators of monopoly in their political principles and conduct.

Opposed to Herrick with reference to candidacy, but to Hanna with reference to leadership, is Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland. He is supported by John H. Clarke, as Mr. Hanna's candidatorial adversary; and Mr. Clarke also is of Cleveland. Though a monopolist in property interests, Johnson has for nearly twenty years demonstrated by the severest tests his hostility as a citizen and public official to the principle of monopoly and to all monopoly laws. Clarke stands upon the same platform. It has been said of him that he is a lawyer for a railroad. That is hardly a good reason for rejecting him in favor of Hanna. But Clarke holds his democracy in higher esteem than his job, which is an excellent reason for rejecting Hanna in favor of Clarke.

Thus equipped with Cleveland candidates, the democratic-Democracy and the corporation Republicanism of Ohio go forth from Cleveland to carry the warfare of democracy versus plutocracy over the State.

In five tremendous contests in Cleveland, corporation Republicanism has gone down in overwhelming defeat before the democratic-Democracy under the leadership of Mayor Johnson. If this experience may be regarded as furnishing a guide to prophecy, it indicates that Johnson will defeat Senator Hanna as disastrously in the State as he has repeatedly defeated him at home.

IV.

In considering the possibilities of such an outcome, the great Republican majority in the State seems like an impassable barrier

to Johnson's advance. With a plurality in 1902 of 90,465 against the Democratic candidate for secretary of state, and 67,567 in 1901 against the Democratic candidate for governor, the outlook for complete success is discouraging. A change of 4½ per cent. in the vote for governor in 1901 and of 6 per cent. in that for secretary of state in 1902 is necessary to elect Johnson governor. Yet such changes in percentage, when there is a revolution in sentiment, are possible.

In his State campaign Johnson will be opposed by the Democratic reactionaries because he supports Bryan. But he was opposed by them in Cleveland, and he has won there.

He will be opposed by some silver men because, when a thorough-going Bryan man disappointed him at the last minute as candidate for Senator, he threw his influence to one of his ablest and most faithful lieutenants in Cleveland, a democratic-Democrat who had voted against Bryan in 1896 but for him in 1900, and who stands upon the unmistakably democratic platform of the Ohio convention. But Johnson was opposed by some silver men in Cleveland for practically the same reason and under practically the same circumstances. Yet he won.

He will be opposed by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads, disappointed candidates and hopeless spoilsmen, and the Republican press will exploit their opposition. But he has won in Cleveland in spite of the same kind of opposition there.

Will the discarded Bernard ruin Johnson's chances in Hamilton county? Possibly. But Bernard's facilities as an outcast from the Hamilton county Democratic organization this year, will be much narrower than they were when he was at the head of the organization a year ago.

Let it be remembered, however, that these are not the only considerations. Johnson and Clarke, and their Democratic coadjutors throughout the State are preparing to campaign the State as they have campaigned the city of Cleveland and the county of Cuyahoga.

They will go to well-meaning Republican voters and well-meaning Democrats alike, presenting the cause they stand for and doing it as man to man. They will show that Herrick and Hanna are the candidates of privileged corporations, while Johnson and Clarke stand for the abolition of all legal privileges. They will go to the people in village and hamlet and highway, instead of waiting for the people to come to them in opera houses or door yards and at the end of a palace car. And they will challenge their adversaries to debate, and courteously answer questions from the people.

Two months of such campaigning will be apt to "take the tucker out" of the campaign for corporate privileges which the Republican machine is to make in Ohio under the mask of a national campaign when no national issues are at stake.

Of course Johnson's plan of campaign will expose him to nagging questions in agricultural districts about his belief in the single tax, which is supposed to be very objectionable to farmers.

But Johnson has met that kind of demagoguery already, and most effectively. In one of his Cuyahoga county campaigns a year or two ago it was resorted to when he spoke in the farming regions bordering upon Cleveland. His answer never failed to command the attention and secure the sympathy of his farmer audiences. We give it as reported on one of these occasions.

After Mayor Johnson had spoken on this occasion on State and county issues, a venerable farmer said: "I have a suspicion, from what I read in the papers, that Mayor Johnson desires to place all taxes on land. Is this correct?" Some one else in the audience then called out: "Tell us about the single tax." Replying to his elderly questioner, Mayor Johnson answered:

Most emphatically, No! But if you mean that I have a desire to place all taxes on land values, I answer most decidedly, Yes!

If you want to hear about the single tax, I will stay with you and let my tent meeting in the city wait, while I say that if it were not for this idea, called single tax, I would not be here to-night. This is the rea-

son that I am making the fight which we are now in.

A tax on land would be an unjust and iniquitous system, but a tax on land values would be the best and fairest system that the world has ever known. Laws which would bring about the taxation of land values would be of more service to humanity than any legislation ever yet enacted.

Farmers are large owners of land, but not of land values. We have land in our city that sells at the rate of \$5,000,000 per acre; have any of you farmers land as valuable as that? In New York city there is land that sells for \$15,000,000 per acre; is there any land in this neighborhood at that price?

To answer my friend's question, I will relate a little talk I had one day with Congressman Pierson, of Tuscarawas county, when we were in Washington together. Pierson was a farmer and he said to me one day:

"Tom, I can't go your single tax. It would be a hardship on the farmers, and they already have more than their share of the burden of taxation."

I replied: "Look here, Pierson, if I thought the single tax would increase the farmers' burden, I would not stand for it for one minute. If I did not know it would be the greatest blessing to the farmers and to the workingmen in the city as well, I never would advocate it again. But I can show you that the single tax will lighten the farmers' burden as compared with the present method. Let me ask you some questions, to see if we can get at the facts in the matter. How much, Mr. Pierson, of the present tax burden do you think the farmers bear?"

"Well," he answered, "the farmers constitute over half the population of the United States, and I should say that they pay at least 60 per cent. of all taxes."

"Very well, let's call it 50 per cent. to be safe."

"No, no," said Pierson, "that's too low. They pay more than 60 per cent., rather than less."

"All right, but to be safe, let's call it 50 per cent. Now, Mr. Pierson, I want you to tell me how much of the value of land the farmers have in the United States? Please take into consideration all the valuable coal lands, the iron, silver, gold, copper and other valuable mines—the water power privileges, the railroad rights of way and terminals, including street railroads, telephones and telegraphs, for these are built on the most valuable lands; all the gas and electric lighting rights of way, built on land of great value; all the city lots, some of which are worth more than a whole county of farming land. I want you to take all these into consideration, and then tell me how much of these values in the United States the farmers have."

Mr. Pierson replied: "Well, I

should say, less than five per cent."

I said: "Call it ten per cent. to be safe."

"Oh, no, no; that's entirely too high; that's double."

"Well, we will call it ten per cent. anyway. Now, don't you see, if the farmers are paying 50 per cent., that if all the taxes were raised by a single tax on land values the farmers, since they have but ten per cent. of these values—you say five per cent.—would pay less; that their taxes would be reduced five times? Instead of paying one-half as now, they would, under that plan, pay but one-tenth?"

"I declare, Tom," said Pierson, "I never looked at it in that light, and I guess you have got me."

So, I say to you farmers here tonight, that this single tax, of which I am proud to be an advocate, would be to the overburdened farmers and workingmen the greatest boon, the greatest blessing, the greatest God-send that any country ever knew.

With all the rest, it must not be forgotten, either, that Johnson is not making a campaign for himself. He begins with the assumption that no Democratic governor can be elected in Ohio this year. His campaign is not for Johnson, but for the legislature.

Nor is it for the sake of the United States senatorship that he is trying to elect a Democratic legislature. That is a very minor consideration. Whatever the result, the senatorship can neither help nor hurt the Republican party, nor any faction of the Democratic party. Whether the next senator from Ohio is a Republican or a gold Democrat, can make no difference. The Republicans are so largely in the majority in the United States Senate that one senator less for them, or one more for the Democrats, is of no earthly consequence, except to gratify personal ambition and vanity.

Johnson's object in making a campaign especially for a legislature of Democrats pledged to the anti-monopoly platform adopted at Columbus, is to turn the Ohio corporations out of power. This accomplished, his work for the present is also accomplished.

The combination of Republican leaders and privileged corporations understand that as well as Johnson does, and will do all in their power, by hook and by crook, by misrepresentation and by pious pretenses, by raising up ani-

mosities toward Johnson among men who have been accounted his supporters, by the lavish use of corrupt and corrupting money, by all the artifices of spoils-hunting politics, to secure another legislature of Ohio which can be controlled by the corporations for the corporations.

Upon this their plunder depends. Against this, Johnson fights. That is the present issue in Ohio.

With the corporations, victory will be a temporary advantage; defeat a permanent disaster. With Johnson, victory will be a step forward, and defeat but a temporary check; for Johnson is enlisted not for one campaign alone but for life. Whether in office or out of office, in leadership or out of leadership, he cares not, except as it may promote the cause to which for two decades he has been devoted and to the service of which he three years ago pledged the remainder of his life and all his powers.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 3.

Immediately after the adjournment of the Ohio Democratic convention on the 26th (p. 326), Tom L. Johnson, the candidate for governor, went to Caldwell, the county seat of Noble county (a strong Republican county), where he addressed an audience on the 27th, which was estimated by the press dispatches as numbering 8,000 people. He dwelt especially upon the issues of home rule and just taxation. On the 29th he spoke at Akron, county seat of Summit county (also strongly Republican), to an audience which the press dispatches report as numbering 12,000. The latter meeting was a farmers' picnic to which both candidates for governor had been invited, but Myron T. Herrick, the Republican candidate, failed to appear. Mr. Johnson spoke upon three points—for home rule, against the municipal code, and for just taxation,—and the dispatches report that he was repeatedly and loudly applauded. His next meeting was at Oak Harbor, Ottawa

county (Democratic), where he and F. B. Niles, the candidate for lieutenant governor, addressed an audience in the afternoon of the 31st, which is described by the dispatches as numbering 1,500. At Toledo, Lucas county (Republican), in the evening of the same day, he and Mr. Niles were welcomed by an audience that comfortably filled the Memorial Hall, which seats 2,000. One of the speakers here was Mayor Jones, who was enthusiastically received as he introduced himself as "a Democratic-Republican-American." He explained his presence by saying:

My friend and comrade, Tom Johnson, invited me here; and if my friend Herrick asks me to a meeting of his, I'll come. I have no party; I belong to the whole push. This Democratic ticket comes as near being non-partisan as anything that ever came out of a convention.

The significance of Mayor Jones's reference to the non-partisanship of the Democratic ticket may be better understood from the following signed statement of his which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 28th:

I think the ticket is the most democratic of any we have had since Campbell's election. Being a man without a party, I make no pledges to support any convention-made ticket. I will support and speak for the Lucas county Independent ticket, and I think we have a mighty good chance to elect a legislative delegation. I see in the Democratic ticket a hopeful sign of the destruction of partyism. Johnson, an avowed single taxer; Niles, a Jeffersonian Democrat; Monett, a Republican, whose convictions took him out of his party; and Clarke, who has shown the courage of his convictions. I believe all those men are honestly following the voice of their consciences.

Mr. Bryan had been billed to speak with Johnson and Niles at Oak Harbor and Toledo, but a telegram canceling the engagement was received from him. It was read at the Toledo meeting, as follows:

"Hon. F. B. Niles, Toledo, O.: Regret exceedingly cannot reach Toledo for to-morrow's meeting; will come in October. (Signed) W. J. Bryan."

This telegram of regret was one incident in a complicated situation of which Johnson's adversaries have made much through the newspaper dispatches. The

situation grew out of the nomination (p. 326) of John H. Clarke for United States senator, the circumstances of which may be briefly told.

For several weeks prior to the convention Johnson had been assured that John W. Bookwalter, a silver Democrat, would be a candidate before the convention for the senatorship, and had announced that he would support him. This was known throughout the State during the primary elections, and it was accordingly understood that Johnson and Bookwalter would be the leading candidates of the radical, or Johnson, wing of the party. The Johnson campaign at the primaries was made upon this avowed understanding. But three days before the convention Mr. Bookwalter intimated his unwillingness, for personal reasons, to go into the senatorial contest before the people. Johnson at once sought an interview with him, and endeavored to dissuade him from withdrawing. But Bookwalter was firm. The only possible candidates left were M. E. Ingalls, president of the "Big Four" railroad; Gaylord W. Saltzgaber, John J. Lentz, and John H. Clarke. Ingalls was out of the question from the point of view of the Johnson men. Not only had he opposed the national party in 1896 and 1900, but he had recently cast in his lot with the John R. McLean "reorganizers" of Cincinnati. Mr. Saltzgaber was looked upon as a man without sufficient popular strength to make an effective campaign over the State. Mr. Lentz had declared his inability to bear the expense and the sacrifice of professional engagements that proper devotion to the requirements of the campaign would entail. Mr. Clarke had voted against Bryan in 1896 and was still opposed to bimetalism; but he had voted for Bryan in 1900, and had ever since been one of Johnson's strongest supporters in his radical democratic campaigns. He was regarded, also, as an impressive public speaker without a superior in the State. This was the situation at the close of the Johnson-Bookwalter interview of the 23d, when it was conceded that if a nomination for

senator were to be made Clarke should be preferred. Accordingly Johnson conferred with Clarke, secured his consent, and from that time forward supported his candidacy.

At the convention on the 26th, the "reorganizers" opposed the making of any senatorial nomination. Mr. Lentz resisted them in this. Mr. Saltzgaber took no part in the debate. Mr. Ingalls had retired with the unseated delegation from Cincinnati. The "reorganizers" were defeated by an immense majority, and three candidates for senator were proposed. Clarke was nominated by 395 votes to 205 for Lentz and 95 for Saltzgaber. As Mr. Lentz refused, upon his defeat, to offer the customary motion with reference to Clarke's nomination, that it be made unanimous, he was reported by the dispatches as preparing to bolt the convention. These reports were followed by others announcing that he had induced Bryan to refuse to accept the invitation of the convention (p. 327) to participate in the campaign unless Clarke were withdrawn, and that he and Bookwalter had joined in sending an ultimatum to Johnson demanding that Clarke be withdrawn. Bryan's brief telegram to Toledo, quoted above, was interpreted as canceling his Ohio dates and as confirmatory therefore of these disruptive reports. Even when Bryan explained in an interview from Lincoln that his telegram had been misunderstood, that he had not canceled any dates in Ohio but that business matters at home had prevented his reaching Toledo in time for his appointment, and that he would fill all Ohio dates in October, his explanation was treated by the dispatches as if he had "relented to a certain extent." Neither did the announcement of the 31st from Lincoln that he had left home to speak at Versailles, Ohio, on the 1st, quiet the reports that he had been induced by Lentz's protests to refuse to speak in Ohio while Clarke remained on the Democratic ticket. It took an actual speech by Bryan, with Johnson and Clarke, to do that.

Bryan made this speech at Versailles, Darke county, (a Demo-

cratic county), on the 1st. The press dispatches regarding this event are much more brief than were those regarding the expected refusal of Bryan to assist in the campaign. Still, the facts reported are sufficient to show that for those expectations there was never any reasonable basis. We give the Associated Press report of the Versailles meeting in full:

Verailles, O., Sept. 1.—The Ohio Democratic State campaign was formally opened here to-night with a large meeting. Excursion trains were run from the surrounding country and brought thousands to the meeting. The chief speakers were: W. J. Bryan, Tom L. Johnson, Democratic candidate for governor, and John H. Clarke, candidate for United States senator to succeed Senator Hanna. Bryan in his speech spoke enthusiastically of the ticket nominated by the Democratic State convention, and predicted victory for the ticket. He also indorsed Clarke for United States senator.

On the 2d Mr. Bryan emphasized his position with a signed statement issued from Columbus, where he had delivered a non-partisan lecture at the State fair grounds. As reported by the dispatches, this statement, after recounting Mr. Clarke's good qualities at length and showing that he is in accord with the last national Democratic platform on all issues but the silver question, concludes as follows:

While we might prefer some other Democrat to Mr. Clarke, we certainly must prefer him to a Republican who is against us on all questions, especially when the legislature that will elect him will also give the people home rule, cheaper railroad fares and more equitable taxation. To oppose him because of his action in 1896, in spite of the fact that he helped us heartily in 1900, in spite of the fact that he has supported Johnson in all his reforms, in spite of the fact that he is now helping us on everything except one phase of one question, and in spite of the fact that on that question I believe his sympathies will lead him to our side when he thoroughly understands the subject—to oppose him, I say, in spite of these things, would be unreasonable and unjust.

The Republican campaign in Ohio is to open at Chillicothe on the 19th. The speakers are to be Senators Hanna and Foraker, and the nominees for governor and lieutenant governor—Myron T. Herrick and Warren G. Harding.

In the midst of his State campaign Mayor Johnson leads a movement in Cleveland for a municipal lighting plant (pp. 283, 288), upon which a popular election is set for the 8th. The fight began in July, when Johnson caused an ordinance to be introduced in the city council providing for the sale of \$200,000 in bonds for the erection of the lighting plant. Under the State law a two-thirds vote of the council was necessary, and the ordinance was defeated. Although a full two-thirds of the membership, all Democrats, had pledged themselves, when candidates, to this kind of legislation, three voted in the negative—Stanton, Roche and Gunn. With all the Republican councilmen also opposed to the ordinance, this Democratic defection defeated it.

At the subsequent meeting of the council, August 9, a member who supported Johnson moved a suspension of the rules to adopt propositions for submitting the question, with others, to the people on the 8th of September. This motion required a three-fourths vote. But the three recalcitrant Democrats did not oppose it, although they voted against reconsidering the ordinance they had voted against the week before, and one Republican was won over. So the rules were suspended and the propositions adopted. They are six in number, as follows:

For purchasing and condemning land and improving land already acquired for boulevard purposes, \$600,000.

For completing park improvements already started, \$100,000.

For building a high level bridge to connect the East and West Sides, \$500,000.

For building a bridge across the Cuyahoga valley between Clark avenue and East Clark avenue, \$200,000.

For street openings, \$100,000.

For municipal electric plant, \$400,000.

The vote to suspend the rules was 23 Democrats and 1 Republican in the affirmative, and 8 Republicans in the negative; but the vote upon the resolution, after the rules had been suspended, was unanimous. Johnson's object in securing a suspension of the rules and passing the resolution at once, instead of allowing it to stand over for a week, was to prevent corrupt tampering with the

members by the electric lighting corporation.

Having passed the council by a two-thirds vote, the propositions recited above go to the people of Cleveland, who must support them by two-thirds of all who vote, and then they must be confirmed by two-thirds of the council before becoming a law. Whether the special election will come off on the 8th or not is now not quite certain; for news dispatches of the 1st from Columbus are to the effect that Attorney General Sheets has instituted proceedings before the Supreme Court of the State to secure an injunction. His proceedings are based upon the contention that the law under which the special election of the 8th is to be held, is unconstitutional.

Pennsylvania's political activity (p. 121) for the year has advanced a stage. The Democratic convention was held at Harrisburg on the 2d. The platform is devoted entirely to State issues, and Arthur G. De Walt was nominated for auditor general, the highest office to be voted for.

In Illinois the Republicans are experiencing a factional conflict in advance of their State convention of next year. Gov. Yates seeks renomination. He is opposed by a large part of the party, chiefly because his nomination three years ago is attributed to the dictation of Congressman Lorimer; and he is opposed by the Lorimer faction apparently because it fears the strength of the revolt. Partly in consequence of this internal disturbance, a conference of Republican delegations from three neighboring Congressional districts—the 11th, 12th and 13th—was held at Rockford on the 1st. Twelve out of the 16 counties of those districts were represented. They rejected a resolution approving of Gov. Yates. The principal business of the conference, however, was the appointment of a steering committee of five from each county of the three districts to see to it that at the State convention the votes of those districts are cast as a unit.

New York city is to elect a

mayor in the Fall to succeed Mayor Low, elected in 1901 (vol. iv, p. 487); and at a fusion conference held on the 1st the indications of Low's renomination were strong. This conference was composed of delegates from 11 distinct organizations, including the Republican committees for the four counties of Greater New York, the Greater New York Democracy, and the County Democracy. It unanimously resolved—

that the excellence of our city government, administered by officials chosen for capacity and character rather than party affiliations, has justified the non-partisan policy adopted by the parties to the fusion of 1901; therefore, we, the parties to the fusion of 1903, hereby reassert the pledges of the last municipal campaign, and declare our unalterable determination to deliver the city permanently from the scandalous misgovernment of Tammany hall.

The availability of candidates was discussed, and all the delegates except those from the two Democratic factions named above favored Low. The objectors did not say that they would oppose him if nominated, but they were of opinion that as New York is a Democratic city it would be wiser to nominate an anti-Tammany Democrat than a Republican.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Macedonian insurrection (p. 327) and its ominous possibilities continue to engross attention. Dispatches of the 28th from Sofia told of the destruction of all the Turkish forts along the frontier between Bulgaria and the vilayet, or Turkish province, of Adrianople, and of fighting within 20 miles of the city of Adrianople. According to the same dispatches Bulgarian reinforcements had been sent to the Turkish frontier, ostensibly to prevent the crossing of Bulgarian bands over into Macedonia. A small insurrectionist victory was reported as occurring on the 25th at Neveska. But this was offset by a severe reverse at Smilovo on the 28th, after a battle in which 1,000 insurgents out of a body of 3,000 were reported killed.

Civil war in northern Macedonia was proclaimed from Sofia on the 1st, by all the members of the insurgent general staff, with Gen. Zontchieff, presi-

dent of the Macedonian committee, at the head. Northern Macedonia comprises all the territory in the valley of the Struma river extending east and west from the base of the Rhodope mountain chain to the river Vardar, and northward to the Bulgarian frontier. War between Turkey and Bulgaria is now regarded as imminent.

American feeling with reference to Turkey was greatly heated on the 27th by an official dispatch from the American minister at Constantinople. It announced the assassination of the United States vice consul at Beirut, Syria, within the Sultan's Asiatic dominions. Immediately upon receipt of the dispatch President Roosevelt ordered Rear Admiral Cotton, who was at Nice, France, to proceed with his squadron immediately to the port nearest Beirut to enforce demands for reparation. Admiral Cotton sailed at once for Turkish waters with the cruisers Brooklyn and San Francisco and the gunboat Machias. On the following day, however, it leaked out that the vice consul had not been assassinated. He had been shot at in the streets of Beirut, but had not been injured. The report of his assassination was due to a mistranslation of the cipher dispatch. At Constantinople it was officially asserted that as soon as the Turkish governor of Beirut learned of the shooting he called at the American consulate and, expressing regret, gave assurances that no effort would be spared to capture and punish the assailant. President Roosevelt decided, however, not to countermand the order to Admiral Cotton.

NEWS NOTES.

- The national letter carriers' association met at Syracuse on the 1st.
- At New York the fourth annual convention of actuaries met on the 31st.
- Six of the Danville, Ill., rioters (p. 328) were convicted on the 29th.
- On the 31st the convention of the Army of the Philippines met at St. Paul.
- The Zionist Congress closed its sessions at Basle, Switzerland, on the 28th.
- On the 28th the American Blind People's Higher Educational association closed its session at Chicago.

—Henry George's 64th birthday was celebrated by the Manhattan Single Tax club at New York on the 2d.

—The national fraternal societies congress, which has been in session at Milwaukee, adjourned on the 28th.

—King Edward VII. is visiting in Austria. An enthusiastic reception was given him at Vienna on the 31st.

—Caleb Power was convicted on the 29th at Lexington, Ky., of the murder of Gov. Goebel (p. 71) and sentenced to be hanged.

—The Venezuelan arbitration at The Hague, which was to begin on the 1st (p. 327) failed to organize. Only one arbitrator appeared.

—John S. Crosby, of New York, the single tax orator, is to address the labor unions of Philadelphia and vicinity on Labor day—September 7.

—Frederick Law Olmsted, the famous landscape architect, who designed the World's Fair grounds at Chicago, died at Waverly, Mass., on the 28th, at the age of 82.

—On the 30th the Czar promoted his Liberal minister, Sergius de Witte, to the presidency of the committee of ministers, thus displacing the more conservative Von Plehwe.

—According to official announcement in Berlin on the 28th, the little republic of Altenberg or Moresnet (p. 328) was divided between Prussia and Belgium, and not sold to Belgium as reported last week.

—John Z. White begins a series of lectures on the single tax at Handel Hall, 40 Randolph street, Chicago, Sunday, September 6, at 3:30 p. m., under the auspices of the Henry George association.

—The British-American yacht race (p. 327) is not yet finished. On the 27th the race was declared off for lack of wind; on the 1st it was declared off for too much wind; on the 1st there was no attempt to race, there being no wind, and so on the 2d.

—At a British bye-election in Argyllshire on the 28th, the first one fought on the protection question raised by Mr. Chamberlain, the Liberal candidate, who stood for free trade, defeated the Unionist candidate, who stood for protection, by 1,586 majority. At the previous election the Unionist won by 600.

PRESS OPINIONS.

OHIO POLITICS.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Aug. 27—If any Democrat can carry Ohio this year for governor that man is Tom L. Johnson. Genuine democrats everywhere, who hope for the triumph of the people over corporation greed and corruption, will earnestly desire his success next November.

Cleveland Recorder (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 28—The fact is the campaign which is now on in the State is different from any other which has ever been waged here. The issues are different, the manner of campaigning is different, the orators are going to

make points which will rally people along new lines.

New Haven Union (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 28—Tom Johnson seems to be very much alive, and the influence of Mr. Bryan in his own State among the Democrats appears to be about as potent as ever. Johnson had it all his own way in the Ohio convention.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 27—Ohio is lost to plutocracy. Tom L. Johnson has the machinery of the State organization in his hands, and the people are at his back. With such a favorable conjuncture of affairs we can expect nothing but good from Ohio in the next Democratic national convention.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Aug. 27—The radical, or Bryan, element is in the saddle in Ohio, and the cause of the Democratic reorganizers has received a severe blow. The meaning of the Columbus nominations cannot be misunderstood. Mayor Johnson is an outspoken radical. Beside him Bryan is an old-fashioned and reactionary person.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Sept. 1—The reorganizers in the Democratic party, hostile to Mr. Bryan and his followers, join the New York "World" in the belief that should Tom Johnson be overwhelmed at the polls in Ohio that will be an end of Bryanism. This narrows the issues of what are called Bryanism. It means something more than free coinage of silver.

Dubuque (Ia.) Telegraph-Herald (dem.-Dem.), Aug. 28—Tom Johnson's triumph over the Zimmerman forces in the Ohio State convention is encouraging. . . . He triumphed over them because he is first of all conscientious in the right, secondly because the people have faith in him, and last, because he is an abler politician than the leader of the opposing faction.

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), Aug. 27—Johnson is the natural and logical candidate of the Ohio Democracy. His name furnishes a rallying signal; he is a man of energy and judgment and he represents the popular uprising against corrupt republican influences and corporation greed. Moreover, Mayor Johnson has to his credit brilliant political victories won for Democracy not only against heavy odds, but under conditions where to an ordinary leader, victory would have been impossible.

Chicago Inter-Ocean (Rep.), Aug. 28—It is clear that Mr. Johnson, through the employment of machine methods and by sharp practice, is in control of the organization once led by Thurman and Pendleton. It is clear also that Mr. Johnson, millionaire and socialist, free trader and Populist, Bryanite and radical, has defeated the Cleveland conservative or reorganized democrats in Ohio, and has driven them from the field of active Democratic politics. There is no question as to his triumph over the Cleveland Democrats, but what will it avail him?

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Aug. 27—To speak of Tom Johnson, of Ohio, as a mere spectacularist and grand stand player indicates a singular lack of perception or an intention to misrepresent facts. Mr. Johnson is an original personality, with methods of his own, but in view of his past career it is impossible to doubt his convictions and sincerity of purpose. . . . Tom Johnson's victory in Ohio is a victory for the Democratic party of the United States. It clearly indicates the trend of affairs. It is a distinct resistance to the effort of the re-organizers to recapture and prostitute the Democratic party.

Chicago Chronicle (pluto-Dem.), Aug. 28—Monnett, the Johnson nominee for attorney general, was once elected to the same office by the Republicans, and while in the office made a fight against the Standard Oil monopoly, and a successful one as far as he went. He was dropped by the Republicans presumably for that reason. He then wandered off into populism, affiliated with the socialistic contingent of the Dem-

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-

pointed though it was primarily to amend the system of relief, recommended also a series of preventive measures. It looks as if those measures, or most of them, had been shelved.

The conclusion of the article was that "the government of India will need all its energies, not to preach the gospel of thrift to indigent peasants, but to administer with justice and wisdom the revenues which they suffer so much to provide."—"India" of August 7.

TOM L. JOHNSON'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE.

When Tom L. Johnson was nominated for governor of Ohio by the Democratic convention at Columbus, August 26, 1903, he responded to the loud and continued calls of the delegates with the following extemporaneous speech, delivered in a manner so manifestly determined and sincere as to raise the audience to the highest pitch of enthusiasm:

Gentlemen of the Convention: It is an honor that any man might justly be proud of to be named for the highest office in the State of Ohio at the hands of a Democratic convention, but to have that nomination by acclamation is indeed a great honor. I appreciate it from the bottom of my heart. I hope at the close of our campaign that those who favored and those of you who opposed my nomination will join in saying that we have made the best battle, we have fought the best fight that could have been fought in the State of Ohio.

My friends, political parties are made by the union of men on various principles. We test the truth of a proposition by measuring it up to the rule of democracy. In this process we do not always agree. Divisions necessarily occur as new questions arise. Upon any great question the free opinions of men differ frequently. The men who agree unite, and that forms a party.

In the process some parts of the old party may slough off.

If we denounce what we know to be an evil, some of our political brethren, equally sincere, may go away from us. But that is necessary and perfectly right. If we attack corporate greed and rapacity, the men who represent corporations in one thing or another will go away from us, or hold back. But I say to you, my friends, that 99 per cent. of the men who complain of our attitude, as some men have complained on this platform to-day, are sincere and honest. Let us respect their right to free thought and their confidence in their own opinions. They believe that really we are wrong,

and we must have great respect for their honest dissent.

But while you lose such elements as these, you must remember that elections are carried by the mass of independent thinking people, and that they will come to you if your cause is right. [Great applause.]

I have been surprised to hear on this platform to-day words of justification for those who had, I thought, forfeited all right to be considered Democrats. I have heard some sarcastic remarks concerning the effect of "red devil," in ridding the party of treacherous candidates. I have only to say, in answer, that this year the campaign which was waged in Richland county against a renegade Democrat will be repeated wherever necessary all over the State, so help me God! [Cheers and prolonged applause.]

If great contests are to be won, my friends, the most important thing is getting rid of dead timber [cheers] and replacing it with live timber. Better elements than those that leave us will come from all sides, if welcomed into the party.

My friends, I have never asked a man to vote for me for an office, and I never expect to. But I have asked men not to vote for me. [Applause.] To-day I ask the men who don't believe in this platform which we have adopted, who don't believe it stands for democratic ideas, I ask them not to vote for me. [Great applause frequently renewed.]

Gentlemen, there are three principal questions in this campaign. First, there is the question of a system of just taxation. Second, there is the question of breaking up an unholy alliance between the managers of the Republican party and the owners of special privileges in the State. Third, there is the question of home rule for cities.

My friends, I say to you that no newspaper, no individual, could or would deny the justice of the principle of home rule. The same assertion can be made as to the taxation question. So two of our issues in the State are undebatable. It is no wonder our opponents want to discuss national questions. They are without an argument against us on these two democratic demands.

The other question is more debatable. Some men deny that there is a corrupt alliance between Republican leaders and the owners of special privileges in this State. Our hope is that we shall be able to make the people of all parties see that this corrupt and corrupting alliance does exist; and that the people, when they do see, will rise up in a mass and by their votes end the iniquity.

I don't know what the result of this

election will be. No man can say what it will be. But the principles we contend for I do know are true, and if the people can be made to understand them we can count upon victory at the end of the coming campaign. [Rounds of cheers and applause.] We will simply go before the people themselves, losing the men we must, but gaining those we can, to make the best fight possible, dealing with living questions and not with dead questions. I thank you. [Long continued cheers and applause, the delegates rising to their feet and standing upon chairs while swinging their hats and canes as they shouted and cheered.]

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

"Worse employment might be found for Secretary of State than tramping around the globe preaching the Empire's Imperial mission."—Joseph Chamberlain.

England of the centuries,
England, Mistress of the Seas,
Wilt thou change thy diadem
For the paste of Brummagem?
Wilt thou pawn thy crest or pride
To these Bagmen Glorified?

Wilt thou, Shakespeare's England, keep
Ships for this upon the deep?
Wilt thou, Milton's England, hold
Glory cheaper far than gold?
Cromwell's England, wilt thou see
Chamberlains make trade of Thee?

O thou British Babylon,
Throned beside the ship-choked Thames,
Decked with plundered gold and gems,
Haggard, full-fed, famine-wan,
Take thy harp whose strings should be
Rigging of thy thousand ships—
Sing the song of Infamy—
Sing the song of thine Eclipse.
All thy glory now is gone,
Babylon! O Babylon!
—Victor Daley, in Reynolds' Newspaper.

What practicable device would be better adapted to restrain the speed of automobiles in the country than the very simple one of anchoring out cattle along the road? Cattle used to graze habitually by the roadside. They were turned out of it in most villages and townships by local ordinance because they were a nuisance. Cows do not step lively, and no one can tell which way a cow will turn. No prudent scorcher will come at a cow on the run. If he does he may spoil the cow as a cow, but it will still be worth something as beef, and the chances are that the scorcher will be delayed plenty long enough for the owner of the cow to collect his damages.—Life.

The career of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood clearly exhibits the difference between merit and pull.

Pull is where a man is boosted by a politician; merit, where he is boosted by a statesman.

A statesman may be distinguished from a politician by his taking himself much more seriously.—Life.

BOOKS

POETS THE INTERPRETERS OF THEIR AGE.

The notion that poets are a mooning, impractical lot, is a queer contradiction of the real fact. There have been numberless mooning versifiers who may for a time have been taken for poets; but the real poet is a man every day in the year. True, the real poet is a seer, and as such is ahead of his day in seeing truth. True, that in stating the larger truth as he sees it he may appear to little souls to be a mere dreamer. But the very fact that he sees ahead enables him all the more truly to understand and interpret the relations of his own time both to the past and to the future.

In the literatures of the past—all that are known to us—the names that stand out as the best interpreters of their age are poets. To study these is to learn the intellectual and moral history of the world. Each of them has a burden to deliver, and their greatness and their value to us—let us remember in our reading—depends not upon this or that fine, oft-quoted passage, but upon our grasping the thought as a whole, the substance of the burden which each has to deliver.

This is the reason why books of extracts and compilations of "best literature" are usually so inadequate. The value of any great production lies in the underlying thought that is worked out in the whole, and this cannot often be got by taking any number of pieces less than the whole. There are whole dramas, for example, which are still incomplete, though they may have reached the conventional length. Faust, to take a definite instance, is quite incomplete as we see it on the stage, and as we generally read it. Goethe recognized this, and gave us the second part. The Greeks, as we know, frequently required three successive plays to work out the complete action; just as Wagner has shown, in our day, with the greatest of his music-dramas.

To go a step further in this thought, just as each production of one of these supreme poets is a complete whole wherein is worked out the poet's idea of some problem, so the whole body of the poet's work, when taken together, will disclose his attitude, as a whole, towards the problems of life as he saw them in his day.

This is just what we want with these great masters, and a book which holds our attention to this, that is, to the real value—what the man really thought and how he looked at life—such a book, we say, which holds our attention to, and helps us to grasp, the main issue of the poet's work, deserves our warmest welcome. Such a book is Anna Swanwick's "Poets the Interpreters of Their Age" (George Bell & Sons, London and New York, \$1.50).

Miss Swanwick, who is known to many as a gifted translator, has taken in this book the few greatest poets of the litera-

tures of the world, and has endeavored to show us how they interpreted the time in which they lived. She has taken, for example, from Greece: Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes and Plato (who, she claims, was a true poet); from Roman literature: Plautus, Ennius, Lucullus, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, Persius; from Italian literature, Dante, Petrarch, Aristo and Tasso, and so on.

It must be acknowledged that, considering a task so great and so varied, she has succeeded admirably, and no one will read her book without a grateful feeling that his knowledge of literature and its meaning has been increased.

As an example of her method, let us take this extract from her appreciation of Robert Burns: "It was Burns," she says, "himself a son of toil, who, through the medium of his verse, brought home to the hearts of his contemporaries the great truth that all the capacities and powers inherent in human nature are the heritage alike of high and low, of rich and poor, and that our primary passions and affections, our common sufferings and our common joys, irrespective of external circumstances, constitute the poet's highest theme. As recognizing the great principle of equality, Burns may be justly regarded as one of the earliest poets of democracy."

Or take this of Shelley. Doubtless to many her admirable account of the important contribution of this poet to social thought and of his thorough understanding of his times, will be a revelation. "In a selfish and reactionary age," she says, "he cherished unswerving faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom, justice, truth and love, and with a prophet's fervor proclaimed the future reign of righteousness and peace."

Without other instances, these may suffice to give some idea of her effort to sum up the essential value of a poet's work. And yet the book is not one of dry summaries. It is tonic; it whets the reader's appetite for reading or rereading the works of the masters of whom she writes. And here let it be said that one who wishes to study any of these great masters need not be deterred by ignorance of the language in which he wrote. Something, of course, will be missed from the delight of art and style; but for grasping and appreciating the essential thought and spirit of the writer, it is mere pedantry to hold that published translations do not suffice. There are, indeed, translations of most of the great classics which, like some of the translations of the author of this book, may be said themselves to have become classics.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"Republics versus Woman." Mrs. Woolsey. New York: The Grafton Press. To be reviewed.

—"The Monarch Billionaire." By Morrison I. Swift, author of "Imperialism and Liberty," "Is it Right to Rob Robbers?" etc., etc. New York: J. S. Oglivie Pub-

lishing Co., 57 Rose street. To be reviewed.

—"The Great Apostasy of the Twentieth Century." Rev. Dr. T. S. Bacon, Buckeystown, Md.

PERIODICALS.

Samuel E. Moffet's judicious and interesting appreciation of Mark Twain, in the September Pilgrim, will appeal to all admirers of the great American humorist, whether they like the democracy that is the life of his humor or not.

The July number of the Edinburgh Review has a long and learned article on English Deer Parks, with many details about the Deer family and how they are hunted. It seems that there are now in England about 400 parks with deer in them. The largest is over 4,000 acres, six are over 2,000 acres, and a large number over 1,000 acres. The King and the Duke of Devonshire have four parks each. Fifteen other persons have more than one. Thirty-odd millions have none—not even a cabbage patch! J. H. D.

Mrs. Eliza Stowe Twitchell, in the Nebraska Independent of August 13, replies in excellent spirit to certain questionings of Mr. J. S. Paton, in a previous number of the same periodical, about the single tax. As to his difficulty about "capital," in addition to the citations given, the new book by Lewis H. Berens, "Toward the Light," will doubtless interest Mr. Paton and others, in its discussion of that unhappy, ill-used and much-abused term. In this number of the Independent Mr. John S. Crosby also has a brief contribution on the single tax, dealing with its effect on wages. J. H. D.

Under the heading "Common Sense," Mr Leggett has for some time been contributing to the San Francisco Star a series of thoughtful and pithy essays on social problems. In a recent article, speaking of mistaken acts of philanthropy, he says: "The only true philanthropy is that which earnestly and intelligently seeks to conform our institutions to the demands of justice and righteousness, and to bring them into harmony with our increased knowledge." Strange to say, this ideal of true philanthropy is almost as little known in our midst as are the contents of the sacred books of Tibet. J. H. D.

No reader, especially if he is a citizen of a city, can afford to miss an article in McClure's for August entitled "Col. Lumpkin's Campaign," by John McAuley Palmer, with illustrations by Dan Beard. Many will guess who it is that Col. Lumpkin's general features resemble in real life, but no matter who he is, the colonel gives us practical instruction about the Westport Consolidated Traction company which each of us can translate into his own Westport. The story is told in the plainest possible terms, and it will be recognized as true, even to the conclusion, where we read that "the chief asset of these corporations is the stupidity of the public." J. H. D.

In an interview with Mr. James S. Zachary, a prominent citizen of New Orleans, the Picaune, of that city, recently gave the substance of an interesting conversation which this gentleman had with President Diaz. Among the subjects discussed was the desirability of extending land ownership among the peons. "The President is reported as saying: 'Yes, it is true, and that question will be gradually worked out satisfactorily, but the system of taxation would have to be changed, and in the course of time the question will be solved without trouble.' It would be interesting to know what changes in the system of taxation the President had in mind." J. H. D.

The Outlook of August 29, in an excellent editorial on Lord Salisbury, speaks of the "purity, privacy and beauty" of his married life. It is in this word privacy that we find one of the Statesman's highest distinctions. He utterly despised and regretted the increased loudness of modern society and the petty devices for popularity and notoriety. In the latter half of his life, as the writer says, his words were "markedly unjingoish and unbellicose." He was certainly not enthusiastic over the Boer war. "In that," says the Outlook,



A LOST "DEMOCRAT."

Grover—I wonder if this is the way to the Capitol!

"as in all the rest of the making of the British empire, the exclusive aristocrat had a truer conception of real progress than has Mr. Chamberlain, the 'pushful' democrat."
J. H. D.

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC
Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company
New Book of Kings (See Sept. 20, 1902) 50c
The Old Testament Bible Stories for the Young (see July 25, 1903)..... \$1.50
Order anything that has ever been reviewed in THE PUBLIC; will fill order promptly. All Economic Literature on sale.
PURDY PUBLISHING CO., McVicker's Building, CHICAGO

POST UP on the most important political question of the day, by reading **The Austin-Haas Debate**. Editor National Banker, Chicago, says of it: "It is one of the best books that has ever been brought to my attention." Special price for ten days 20c postpaid. Address A. C. Austin, Hudson, So. Dak.

"THE ART OF LIVING LONG"

Cornaro's celebrated treatise. In broken health at 40, he adopted the easy system herein set forth, **AND LIVED TO 103.**
"I have for 40 years carried out the idea of **Cornaro.**"—THOMAS ALVAH EDISON.
Illustrated, full cloth, gilt top, transportation prepaid, \$1.50. Sent upon receipt of price.
W. F. BUTLER, 56 University Bldg., MILWAUKEE
Write for circular.

The Henry George Association

Will Begin Its 5th Season of Sunday Afternoon Lectures at

HANDEL HALL, SEPT. 6th, at 3:30 p. m.

An Excellent Program Will Precede Each Lecture.

Mr. John Z. White will speak every Sunday afternoon during September and October. He will present the Single Tax from a different standpoint in each lecture, and will answer questions. Each lecture will be complete in itself. The Thursday night program, which embraces a number of the brightest and most progressive men and women in Chicago, is as follows:

- THURSDAY, SEPT. 3, LOUIS F. POST, "The Single Tax Movement."
- THURSDAY, SEPT. 10, MARGARET A. HALEY, "Democracy in Education."
- THURSDAY, SEPT. 17, RAYMOND ROBBINS, "The Social Spirit."
- THURSDAY, SEPT. 24, REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES, "Victor Hugo—The Apostle of Liberty."
- THURSDAY, OCT. 1, WALLACE RICE, "The Labor Movement in Recent Fiction."
- THURSDAY, OCT. 8, WESTERN STARR, "Government by Injunction."
- THURSDAY, OCT. 15, EDWARD M. WINSTON, "Social Influence as a Factor in Judicial Decisions."
- THURSDAY, OCT. 22, HON. FRANCIS W. PARKER, "Law Making and Law Makers."
- THURSDAY, OCT. 29, JANE ADDAMS, "The Moral Substitute for War."

The Public

Is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING Co. Subscribers wishing to change address should give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

CONTRACTORS.

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,
JERSEY CITY, N. J.
Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.
Trolley Roads Built and Financed.

Trade

The National Tea Bank

130-132 Water Street NEW YORK

Since 1874 we have been supplying Banks, Institutions and families in all parts of the Union with

Finest Teas and Coffees

We can supply YOU.
Samples sent on application.
Write for booklet, "What You Should Know About Coffee."

MAZZINI:

"The Prophet of the Religion of Humanity," with a Biographical Sketch, also Mazzini's Oration "To the Young Men of Italy."

By LOUIS J. ROSENBERG

(Author of "Sociological Studies," etc.)
Daintily printed and bound in cloth, blue and gold. Mailed to any address on receipt of 50 cents. Catalogue of sociological works free on application.

Charles H. Kerr & Company, 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago