pugnant feeling toward hangmen? Why should they be selected for our contempt? If their function is repulsive, why not recoil from the sentencing judge, who is as responsible as the hangman? Why, indeed, do we not recoil from ourselves for permitting it at all? The law does not hang anybody; it is a species of fetish worship to attribute such things to the law. But the participating officials of Vermont, and back of them every man and woman who approves of judicial murder, they hanged that Vermont woman. If they can justify the homicide, very well; but if they cannot justify it, they should at any rate have the grace to acknowledge the hangman as their associate in the act, and not cast upon him and consequently upon his innocent child the opprobrium which ought to attach as well to themselves if to anybody.

The democracy of Norway.

In Norway they are calling their new king "Mr. King," just as we say "Mr. President,"and there are other encouraging signs that royalty is to be tempered with democratic ways. "The accounts we get," says the Springfield Republican, "make it rather amazing that the Norwegians should have chosen a monarchy as the form of government rather than a republic." The full history of this event has not yet been written. Such men as Bjornsen must have been in some way convinced that the establishment of a republic would have brought trouble from their neighbors. Surely William of Germany would have looked askance at the new government.

TOM L. JOHNSON.*

For the third time Tom L. Johnson has now been inaugurated as mayor of Cleveland, an office in which he has proved himself to be, as Lincoln Steffens described him in McClure's**, "the best mayor of the best governed city in the United States."

This event is of more than local concern.

For our municipal problems, though local in their special applications, have come to be national and even international in the general influence they exert and the common interest they excite. It is in our cities, as Frederic C. Howe* so admirably shows, that the struggle for genuine democracy has begun to center. This struggle is becoming characteristic of them all, but in none has it been so fierce, in none has it been so ably led on both sides, and in none is substantial victory apparently so near at hand as in Cleveland.

These and other circumstances have combined to distinguish Mayor Johnson as a leader in municipal progress. He is preeminently the leader in the United States in the movement for that fundamental democracy which alone makes for good government, and that good government which can rest secure only upon fundamental democracy.

I

Mayor Johnson came up from the South in his boyhood to win fortune as a business man at the North.

As a child he had been reared in the luxurious surroundings of a cotton planter's home. The Civil War broke out, and at its close he looked upon the world from the threshold of youth, the penniless child of an impoverished Confederate officer. He began work in clerical employment, but plunging into the whirlpool of business while still in his teens, he had laid the foundations of his fortune before attaining his majority, and at thirty-five was ranked as a millionaire.

Johnson's lineage extends back through the history of Kentucky to its organization as a district of Virginia, and thence into the parent State itself. A family genealogy printed in the '80's shows him to be related by blood or connected by marriage with so many Kentuckians that almost anyone who is descended from the old Virginian families of Kentucky may fairly claim him as a cousin. Among these kinsmen of his are all the Kentucky Johnsons and some of the Johnstons, the Paynes and the Flournoys, the Bufords, the Colemans, the Popes and the Clays, as well as the Standefords and the Breckinridges. Not only in Kentucky but in other Southern States, in several Northern States, and in England does this Johnson cousinship persist. An English representative through marriage is Arthur J. Moxham, a British subject resident in Delaware, where he is connected responsibly with the Dupont powder works; he was chosen dictator of Johnstown when the flood of 1889 made that office a temporary necessity. In Virginia there are the Suggetts. The Illinois cousin of most distinction is Ben T. Cable, who sat with Mayor Johnson in the 52d Congress and was afterward chairman of the Western branch of the Democratic national committee in the Presidential campaign of 1892. Among the rest whom marriage has connected with Johnson is John C. Calhoun, a grandson of the eminent South Carolinian whose name he bears.

Tom L. Johnson's grandfather's great-grandfather, the American forerunner of the Kentucky Johnsons, came to Virginia when the future "Mother of Patriots and Presidents" was but a loyal British colony. His name was William. Of Welsh descent, he came from England in 1714 and settled on a plantation in that part of Madison county, Virginia, which was subsequently made a part of Orange county. He married a daughter of Benjamin Cave, a large Virginia landowner who sat in the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1756, and whose family, descended from early settlers in the colony, were among its distinguished and influential inhabitants.

The first child of the marriage of William Johnson and Elizabeth Cave was Robert Johnson, familiarly known as "Robin," who left his Virginia home to become a Kentucky pioneer.

He was born at the family homestead in what is now Orange county, Va., in 1745, and died in 1815 in Kentucky, where he had gone when about 30 years of age. Alike as a Kentucky member of the Virginia legislature, and afterwards as a delegate to the constitutional

---

* A faithful half-tone portrait of Mayor Johnson goes with this number of The Public as a supplement.

**McClure's Magaine for July, 1905.

* "The City the Hope of Democracy," by Frederick C. Howe. Sold by the Public Publishing Co.

Digitized by Google

convention in 1792, as well as a member of the Kentucky legislature after Statehood, he was in his day a distinguished public man.

One of his sons, Richard Mentor Johnson, whose regiment of mounted Kentuckians won the decisive battle of the Thames in the war of 1812, and who is historically credited with having in that battle slain the Indian chieftain Tecumseh, was a member of one or the other House of Congress from 1807 till 1837 without a break, and from 1837 till 1841 he was Vice President of the United States. A younger son was John T. Johnson, who placed conscience so far above preferment that he resigned the highest judicial honors of his State to become a Disciples evangelist, in response to what, as a student of the writings of Alexander Campbell, he considered a religious call. "Robin" Johnson's youngest son, Henry, who served with his brother Richard at the battle of the Thames, was the grandfather of Tom L. Johnson's wife; and his eldest, James, the lieutenant colonel of Richard's regiment at the battle of the Thames, was Tom L. Johnson's great-grandfather*

Lieut. Col. Johnson was born on the ancestral estate in what is now Orange county, Va., in 1774. While a mere child he was taken to Kentucky by his father. In 1808, the year after his brother Richard's first election to Congress, he was elected to the Kentucky legislature. Upon the breaking out of the war of 1812, he joined his brother's regiment of mounted Kentuckians and as its lieutenant-colonel served through the war. It was especially his indefatigable attention to military discipline that put the regiment into the state of efficiency which gave it its victory over Tecumseh.

After the war Lieut. Col. Johnson became a large contractor for army supplies on the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers. As a Presidential elector in 1821, he voted for James Monroe upon his second election. Elected to the lower House of Congress in 1825, he served until his death in 1826. He had the reputation of being the wealthiest man of his day in the Western country.

One of Lieut.-Col. Johnson's children, the grandfather of Tom L. Johnson, was Gen. William Johnson. He was born at the old Kentucky place at Great Crossings, Scott county, in 1799. His Uncle Richard appointed him to a cadetship at West Point and in due time he graduated from that institution. Almost continuously from 1830 to 1849, he sat in the Kentucky legislature.

Among Gen. Johnson's eight children were Jillson P. and Albert W., an uncle and the father respectively of Mayor Johnson.

Jillson P. Johnson moved from Kentucky to Arkansas, to become a cotton planter near Laconia. He was a member of the Arkansas legislature in 1860 and of the Arkansas secession convention of 1861. During the Civil War which followed he served in the inspector general's department of the Confederacy with the rank of lieutenant colonel. At one time he was proprietor of the Galt House at Louisville.

His brother, Albert W., the fourth son of Gen. William Johnson and the father of Mayor Johnson, was born at Great Crossings, Ky., August 21, 1830. In his youth he became a student at the military academy at Georgetown, Ky., with which James G. Blaine was at the time connected as an instructor. At the same time Miss Harriet Stanwood, afterwards the wife of Mr. Blaine, was a teacher in the Female Seminary at Georgetown, and one of her favorite pupils was Helen Loftin, whose maternal grandparents, Owen Edwards and Judith Morton, were descendants of Huguenot settlers in Virginia. Her father had moved to Tennessee and in Jackson of that State she was born, March 2, 1834. During her attendance as a pupil at the Georgetown seminary, Miss Loftin met Albert W. Johnson, Mr. Blaine's pupil at the military school, and on the 4th of August, 1853, they were married. They took up their home immediately at the Blue Spring, Kentucky, near Georgetown on a place which Vice President Johnson had owned and where in his later years he had set up an Indian school. On this place Tom Loftin Johnson was born, July 18, 1854.

II

In the late '50's Albert W. Johnson established himself as a cotton planter with over 100 slaves at Beaver Bayou, Arkansas, about 12 miles south of Helena, making this his winter and Blue Spring his summer home.

Throughout the Civil War he served in the Confederate army, first as the colonel of a regiment, then on the staff of Gen. John C. Breckinridge, and afterward on the staff of Gen. Jubal A. Early. Through all his military service his wife kept near him with their three boys—Tom L., William L., and Albert L. The close of the war found them all at Staunton, Va., absolutely penniless.

It was here and in these circumstances that Tom L. Johnson, then only 11 years old, discovered the powerful character of monopoly as a factor in business, and made it serve him.

In the disordered state of affairs in those early days of peace, only one railroad train a day ran into Staunton. Its conductor exercised pretty much the authority of a railroad president of to-day, and with him Col. Johnson's energetic and far-seeing boy established friendly relations. It was a profitable friendship, for upon the boy's going into the business of selling newspapers the conductor gave him a complete monopoly. He allowed no one else to bring papers into Staunton on his train. It was precisely such a monopoly as has made many a fortune since Mayor Johnson's boyhood. In principle it was not unlike the monopoly by means of which he afterward placed himself in the category of the rich. As Gen. Lee had just surrendered and news was in demand, the boy found his power to charge all the traffic would bear raised to a high level of prices. He got 15 cents each for daily papers and 25 cents for picture papers.

But his monopoly was short-lived. It lasted only five weeks. Yet it netted him $88 in silver money—the first sound money any of his family had seen in many a day.

With this windfall they managed to get to Louisville, Ky., and there Col. Johnson, though already heavily in debt, borrowed enough capital to operate his Ar-

---

*Pressure of space has necessitated the elimination of much of the interesting historical and personal detail of this genealogy, as well as of what follows. It will be restored in the pamphlet edition to be published by The Public Publishing Co. in its "Prophet Series."

Digitized by Google

kansas cotton plantation. But in consequence of disturbed economic conditions the venture failed. Col. Johnson then moved to Evansville, Ind., where he engaged in various business undertakings, but also without success. After a year in Evansville he tried farming upon a farm belonging to his brother Jillson, about 18 miles south of Louisville, Ky., and near the Gap-in-the-Knob.

Col. Johnson was extremely poor at this time. His family were deprived not only of comforts, but necessaries. They were so poor that when Mrs. Johnson determined to look for employment for Tom with a relative in Louisville, she was obliged to wait for a cold day to give her an excuse for wearing the crochetted hood of her more comfortable days.

The intervening time had been utilized in promoting the education of the children. At Evansville Tom attended school for the first time. He got one full year's schooling here, and a few months more while he lived upon his Uncle Jillson's farm. At Evansville he went through three grades, and what with this and the instruction he had received from his mother he was about ready to enter high school when the family moved back to Kentucky.

But his mother continued to tutor him, and in this she was assisted by his father, who, like his father before him, was skillful in mathematics and fond of astronomy. Tom cared nothing for literary studies. He was strongly inclined to neglect them altogether. But mathematics came easy to him. Like both his grandfather and his father his mind seemed to work almost instinctively in mathematical processes. In very great measure his power and his success are attributable to this aptitude, which he possesses in exceptional degree.

III

On a cold day in January, 1869, with her crochetted hood for a bonnet, Tom L. Johnson's mother made her way from the farm to Louisville. where she secured for Tom a place in a rolling mill. He began working there on the 1st of February, 1869.

Four months later the event which determined the boy's career occurred.

Biederman Du Pont, a connection of the Johnsons by marriage, and his brother, Alfred Du Pont, grandsons of Pierre Samuel Du Pont*, the famous associate in France of Turgot, Mirabeau, Quesnay and Condorcet, had bought "The Fourth and Walnut Street Lines," a little street railroad in Louisville, the smallest of the three in the city; and they offered office employment in connection with the road to Tom. So in June, 1869, at the age of fifteen, Tom L. Johnson entered upon a career which was destined to make him a street railroad magnate.

His first duties were in a way financial. He collected and counted the fares that had been dropped by passengers into the fare boxes of the old conductorless cars with which the road was operated, and made up packages of small money to enable drivers to accommodate passengers with change. His promotion was rapid, and in a few months he was secretary of the company.

About a year after his connection with this enterprise began, the Du Ponts brought Col. Johnson in from the farm and made him superintendent of the road, a position he held for several years. He left it to accept an appointment as chief of police of Louisville. The superintendency of the road was then taken by Tom, who held it until 1876, when he and two associates bought of William H. English, the Democratic candidate for Vice-President of the United States in 1880, the Indianapolis street car system.

Before this, however, young Johnson had invented a fare box, which was an improvement upon the fare boxes then in vogue and is still in use. He early learned that patents are not very effective in protecting inventors, and of this box and his patent on it he was accustomed to say that the patent wasn't very good but the box was. However sound either judgment may have been, the box or the patent, or both together, gave him first and last nearly $30,-000.

* Pierre Samuel Du Pont was one of the physiocratic economists of France to whom Henry George has inscribed one of his books. After narrowly escaping the guillotine during the Terror, Du Pont came to the United States. He settled on the Brandywine where he established the famous Du Pont powder works, now more than a century old. It was this institution that originated the American powder trust in the earliest days of trust development. It is now under the management of Biederman Du Pont's oldest son. Another son is A. B. Du Pont, a business man of Detroit, who has had large experience as a street car manager and is Mayor Dunne's expert in connection with the municipal ownership policy of Chicago.

IV.

But Mr. Johnson had not made all this money before going into his street car venture in Indianapolis. To buy that system he needed $30,000 in addition to his own resources. This sum was lent him by his friend and patron, Biederman Du Pont. Mr. Du Pont took no interest in the enterprise himself. He doubted the business ability of Johnson's associates. But he said he knew his money would be safe if Tom L. Johnson lived. So he made the venture as a personal loan.

Six months after going to Indianapolis, young Johnson sent for his father, who joined him in the venture and became president of the company. When asked if "he was president though Tom was principal owner, what office Tom held?" he used to reply: "Why, Tom is the board of directors!" This joke wasn't far from the truth, though Tom's office nominally was treasurer.

The Indianapolis system, a miserable affair when Johnson took hold of it, improved under his management and became very profitable. But he continued to operate without conductors and with mules for motive power. When he proposed modifying the system after electricity had come into use, some of his associates opposed the change. They were old friends and rather than offend them he sold out.

He had made money regularly since 1869, though slowly at first, and several of his patents as well as his fare box had been profitable; but the sale of the Indianapolis street car system yielded him by far the largest sum he had yet been able to call his own. His net profit was more than half a million dollars.

V.

Meanwhile, in 1880, Johnson had bought a small street car line in Cleveland, which he had built up by utilizing a discovery he had made in Indianapolis—the financial advantage of through lines and transfers.

Digitized by Google

There were seven or eight other street car companies in Cleveland at that time, but their managers did not appreciate the advantage of this innovation until after Johnson had used it successfully as a leverage to give his little road a start. As they were eventually forced to imitate him, he may be said to have revolutionized the street railway business in that city.

Johnson's great street railway war in Cleveland was with the late Senator Mark A. Hanna.

Hanna was a director in the company with which Johnson came first in conflict. The preliminary round was won by Johnson, and to prevent his getting a still stronger foothold Hanna bought a controlling interest in the company whose privileges Johnson was attacking. Hanna's object was to fight Johnson more effectively than he might be able to do with a minority interest. Before fighting, however, he proposed peace and a partnership. Johnson declined the offer and a conflict then began which lasted several years. A detailed account of this conflict would be as interesting as an economic or business novel, but it would require a volume. The war was the sensation of the time in Cleveland. It eventuated in a great reduction of fares, a policy in which Johnson always believed and which he has always furthered.

Sometimes one side won, and sometimes the other, but Johnson's road grew faster than Hanna's. After awhile Johnson succeeded in uniting several other companies, thereby forming the Cleveland Electric Railway Co., or "Big Consolidated." Hanna replied with a union of the cable roads, forming the Cleveland City Railway Co, known as the "Little Consolidated." These consolidations resulted in ending the fight, but it was an armed peace. Subsequently Johnson disposed of his interest in the Big Consolidated and that company united with Hanna's.

By this time Johnson with his brother Albert had acquired interests in the Detroit street car system and in the Nassau enterprise of Brooklyn. But in 1898, about the time the large combinations were forming, he withdrew altogether from the street car business.

While engaged in this business Johnson became interested naturally enough in the production of steel rails; and in connection with both businesses he cooperated with his associates, Biederman Du Pont, A. V. Du Pont and A. J. Moxham in making useful inventions and securing profitable patents. One of their steel plants, the Johnson Company, was at Johnstown, Pa., and another at Lorain, Ohio. In the depression of 1893-98 Johnson's financial interest in these establishments was very nearly swamped.

Two years before going to Indianapolis, Mr. Johnson married his fourth cousin, Margaret J. Johnson, a daughter of Col. Robert Adams Johnson, of the Confederate army, and a granddaughter of Capt. Henry Johnson, youngest brother of the Vice President. Henry Johnson had married a Flournoy, and settled in Mississippi, where his granddaughter, now the wife of Mayor Johnson, passed her girlhood. The living children of Mr. and Mrs. Johnson are Loftin Edwards Johnson and Elizabeth Flournoy Johnson.

V

Until the middle '80s, Tom L. Johnson had little if any interest in political problems and less if possible in political principles. He was simply a business man, a mere money maker; and this he would probably have remained but for a trivial incident big with possibilities.

While interested in street car systems, both in Cleveland and Indianapolis, Johnson frequently rode on the cars between those cities. On one of these trips a newsboy asked him to buy a book called "Social Problems." It was Henry George's second book on the industrial question, but Johnson supposed it to be a work on the social evil. Saying as much, and adding that he had no interest in that subject, he refused to buy the book. The train conductor, who happened to be within hearing, happened also to be familiar with George's teachings, and knowing Johnson well he told him he was mistaken in the character of the book. "It will interest you more," he assured him, "than any book you have ever read." Upon this assurance Johnson reluctantly invested half a dollar in the book and read it. A new world was revealed to him, and he promptly bought and read George's "Progress and Poverty." After reading this, he challenged his lawyer, L. A. Russell, of Cleveland, and his partner, Arthur J. Moxham, to show him any flaw in the argument. Unable to comply, they objected to the premises. But Johnson convinced them that the premises were sound. The final result of their controversy was the complete conversion of all three to George's views.

Mr. Johnson has since tried to find the conductor who turned him into this path which is more to him than personal riches; but he can not recall his name and has only been able to learn that the man is dead.

Soon after his conversion, Johnson sought out Henry George, and between these men a warm friendship and profound confidence took root in 1885 which lasted until George's death in 1897. The memory of this is an abiding inspiration to Johnson.

It was on Henry George's advice that Johnson entered politics. Johnson had gone to New York in 1886 to further the economic movement which has since come to be known as "the single tax," and of which George, as author of "Progress and Poverty," was the leader. He participated in August, 1886, at the house of Dr. Henna, in the deliberations of a voluntary committee called together to consider plans of promotion. Among the dozen or more present at that initial meeting were Henry George, Father McGlynn, Dr. Henna, William McCabe, Louis F. Post, Daniel De Leon (then a lecturer at Columbia College but now a prominent socialist), and Tom L. Johnson. Another meeting was held for the same purpose a little later at Father McGlynn's rectory.

Before specific plans had been formulated, a tremendous labor movement in politics broke suddenly upon the city, and George was called to the front to lead it. Its platform was pronounced in favor of George's single tax doctrines. During the unique and ex-

Digitized by Google

citing campaign that followed, in which the masses back of Henry George were arrayed against the classes back of Abram S. Hewitt —who united Tammany Hall and the equally malodorous County Democracy, in order, as he expressed it, to "save society,"—Johnson contributed liberally to the heavy expenses, and was personally active though without prominence in advising with reference to the conduct of the campaign. A year later, when Henry George was thrust forward against his will as a candidate of the United Labor party for Secretary of State of New York (the head of the ticket that year), Johnson again aided with money, advice and personal service.

Johnson had now become a thorough-going apostle of the George crusade, but not as a speaker. And when Henry George advised him, as he did about this time, to go actively into politics, Johnson protested that the impossibility of his being a public speaker would stand in the way of his rendering good political service. "But," said George, "you have never tried to speak; if you put your mind to it you can succeed at speaking as well as in business."

Johnson tried. It was at a large mass meeting in Cooper Union, New York, early in 1888. He spoke for possibly five minutes, timidly and crudely but with evident sincerity, and probably could not have spoken ten minutes more had his life been the forfeit. But he had broken the ice, and although he has not become an orator as Bryan is, he is now one of the most effective speakers in American public life. Sometimes he is eloquent; at all times he is convincing. His speeches are never artificial, and their most effective quality is their charming candor.

Convinced by Henry George that the cause to which they were both devoted demanded his personal service in the political activities which were then tending, through the tariff question, toward that complete free trade of which Cobden had dreamed and prophesied and to the realization of which George had surveyed the route, Johnson accepted the Democratic nomination for Congress.

His Congressional district was very strongly Republican and protection in sentiment; yet he made a free trade campaign without reserve. Of course he was defeated. But he had a purpose that was not to be balked by one defeat, and two years afterward he fought the same political fight with the same candor and won by a clear majority of 3,000.

Although Johnson had meanwhile done some public speaking he had not yet "found himself" as a speaker. It was not without perturbation, therefore, that he received a challenge from his Republican adversary, Theodore E. Burton, one of the most polished speakers of Ohio,—since distinguished in Congress,—to meet him in debate. He knew that he could not debate in the conventional way with an orator of Burton's skill. But if his experience in long measure oratory had been slight, his experience in talking briefly and to the point on business committees had been considerable, and he felt that if he could meet Mr. Burton on a business man's committee he could acquit himself with reasonable effectiveness. This gave him the idea he needed. "I accept the challenge," he responded, "and as the challenged party I demand the right to name the terms, which are that Mr. Burton and I shall take turnabout ten minutes each until the hour for closing the meeting."

Debates were accordingly arranged upon those terms, and Johnson came off victor not only at the polls on election day, but in the estimation of the audiences at the debates. He made committee meeting speeches of ten minutes or less, confining himself to a single point in each speech and making that point sharply; whereas Mr. Burton hardly once got his oratorical wings spread before time was called.

When he entered Congress Johnson found among his fellow members three who were in full accord with his single tax views—Jerry Simpson of Kansas, Judge McGuire, of California, and John DeWitt Warner of New York. With these three and two others —Harter of Ohio and Tracey of New York—Johnson subsequently voted for the first outright single tax bill ever acted upon in a parliamentary body. It had been drawn by and was under the management of Judge Maguire, who was later the Democratic candidate for governor of California.

Johnson's special efforts, however, were directed toward shaping single tax legislation through the committee on the District of Columbia. He had been "shelved," as the Speaker supposed, by appointment upon this local committee. But Johnson is not an easy man to "shelve," and the committee on the District of Columbia soon became one of the busiest in the House—much to the surprise of its other members and the consternation of the land monopoly tax dodgers of the District. In less than five months after taking his seat in Congress he had led the committee on to securing the passage by the House of a resolution* for a thorough investigation of the taxing methods of the District officials.

This resolution, after reciting the fact, which the committee under Johnson's spur had already unearthed, that the assessment on land values alone in the District was $76,000,000 when it should be more than $300,000,000, and that it was grossly discriminatory against small residence property and in favor of vacant lots, authorized a select committee of three to inquire into the method of assessing land values in the District. Johnson was appointed chairman of this committee, with Joseph E. Washington of Tennessee and James Wadsworth of New York for his colleagues.

Washington and Wadsworth, who were exceedingly conservative, objected to a recommendation for the taxation of land values alone, which Johnson proposed as a substitute for the usual District of Columbia appropriation clause. They recommended instead the taxation of improvements as well as land values. Their objection was not to the merits of Johnson's proposition, but because they thought it "at the present time too radical." If, however, the specific recommendation of his committee fell short of Johnson's wishes, the body of the report adopted unanimously by the committee** is a classic document on the principles of taxation practic-

*April 13, 1892.

**Made to the House May 24, 1892.

Digitized by Google

ally applied. A few excerpts will indicate the character and value of the report:

Analysis shows that the rental value of land does not arise from any expenditure of labor or investment of capital by the owner of the land. The value which the owner of land may create by the expenditure of labor and capital is a value which attaches to buildings or improvements. The value which attaches to the land itself comes from the growth of the whole community. It is this growth and improvement of the community itself which has given to land in certain parts of the Federal District a value amounting to over $3,000,000 an acre. If the owners of this land had left their land idle, if they had been absentees or idiots, this value would have attached to the land to the same extent and in the same manner. It comes from the growth of population and general improvement, and is primarily due to the fact that this particular place has been selected as the site of the national capital. Thus everyone who adds even temporarily to the population and business of Washington does something to add to the value of the land, something to increase a fund which may be taken to defray all the expenses of government without levying any tax on legitimate property or improvement, or which will in any way increase the cost of living. No matter how ne lives, so long as he lives here, every resident must directly or indirectly contribute to the rental value of land. In this way every resident, and, indeed, every sojourner, may be said in what he pays for the use of land, even though it be for a single night's lodging, to pay a just tax sufficient to provide for the legitimate expenses of the local government and to make the most ample public improvements. But if the individual land owners are permitted to put the proceeds of this tax in their pockets, and taxes are then levied that fall on use and consumption, the body of citizens are really twice taxed. . . . At ten per cent. annual increase, the minimum rate testified to by witnesses before the committee, there would be an increment to land values of $42,300,000 each year. This represents the annual profit of land owners, and when it is considered that improvements in the District are only $73,000,000, or one-fifth the total, it seems entirely just that taxes falling on the latter depreciating property, improvements, should be shifted to that part of the taxable value that receives such an enormous increase each year—land.

Johnson's investigation had stirred up the dry bones of a bad fiscal system badly administered, and some reforms in detail were made; but the landed interest in the District of Columbia was too powerful for the radical change approved in the body of the report. This report, however, has already served a highly useful purpose in educating public opinion, and the time will doubtless come when it will be referred to with deference as a land mark in fiscal progress.

In 1892 Johnson came up for reelection and was returned by a majority of 3,224. This was the year of Cleveland's second election to the Presidency, when the tariff question carried even Illinois and Wisconsin against protection. To this general tidal wave he had himself contributed in no inconsiderable degree by superintending the preparation and promoting the distribution of one of the most remarkable campaign documents in the history of American politics. The circumstances will bear narration.

Not long after coming into Congress Johnson noticed that Congressmen were accustomed to stringing out their speeches with statistics quotations from books, etc., under "leave to print." These matters, though never uttered on the floor of the House or the Senate at all, duly appeared in the Congressional Record as if uttered there, and having appeared in that publication they had full and free rights to the mails under any Congressman's frank. In that manner the political committees secured the right to distribute tons upon tons of campaign documents through the mails free. The Republican committees availed themselves of this device to frank protection arguments and figures broadcast.

Reflecting upon it all, Congressman Johnson concluded to make a Congressional document of Henry George's work on "Protection or Free Trade," and for that purpose he obtained Mr. George's assent. But, anticipating captious objections from protectionists if the book were added bodily to one speech, he thought of having different sympathetic members offer parts of the book in different speeches. Not quite sure of his ground, however, he consulted old war horses of the Democracy in the House. They advised against his plan as unprecedented. This advice checked him at first, but he considered that as he had made his own fortune by doing unprecedented things, an unprecedented thing if wisely done might possibly serve his party and his cause. He therefore decided the matter on its merits and not by precedent. Consulting six free traders who sat in the House that year, he obtained the assent of each to contribute, and at different times, from March 11 to April 8, 1892, they respectively made their promises good.

When all these passages had appeared in the Congressional Record, nothing was required but restoration to their original arrangement to reproduce the book, title page, table of contents, index, and all. This was done and the book thereby made (as it is to-day when reproduced from the Record) a frankable public document for free distribution through the mails. Washington was the only man to express regret, but he expressed it only to Johnson and then immediately withdrew it.

"Tom," he said, "I find that that book advocates the taxation of nothing but land values."

"What of it?" Johnson asked.

"Why, I come from a farming country and my constituents, would resent the policy of taxing farmers alone. They are taxed too much now."

"See here, Joe," said Johnson; "what proportion of the taxes do you suppose farmers pay?"

"Oh, I don't know; they tell me about 60 or 70 per cent."

"And what proportion of land values do you suppose farmers own?"

"Land values? Values? Why, they don't own ten per cent."

"Well, now," Johnson responded, "will you tell me how a tax on land values alone could injure a class that pays 60 per cent. of taxes and yet owns only ten per cent. of land values? Wouldn't it reduce their taxes?"

Washington reflected a moment, and then he thought it would. After that he was proud of his part in getting "Protection or Free Trade" into the Congressional Record.

Of this unique Congressional document, more than a million copies were judiciously placed in the political campaign of 1892. Their effect no one can calculate,

Digitized by Google

but it must have been considerable.

The isues fitted close that year to Johnson's principles and he expected much in the direction of free trade as a result. Great was his disappointment, therefore, when President Cleveland deferred consideration of the tariff question, on which the party was united and the people had voted, and thrust forward the money question, on which the people had not voted and the party was divided. It was this disappointment, intensified by the action of the Senate, that brought out from Johnson, on the floor of the House, August 13, 1894, his speech on "The Democratic Surrender," in which he explained his vote against the Wilson bill after its emasculation by the Senate. We have space only for an extract or two from this remarkable speech, which in the light of subsequent events seems almost prophetic. Mr. Wilson had moved to agree to the Senate amendments, and Johnson began his speech by saying:

> I protest in the House as I protested in caucus, against this ignominious surrender of principle, of duty, and of dignity; and even though I stand alone, my vote shall be recorded against it. I will not violate my pledges, I will not betray my party, I will not disgrace this House by tamely submitting to the arrogant dictation which tells us that we must take this Senate bill as our masters have prepared it for us, or let the McKinley act continue. If this be really the issue, let us face it; let us face it in the democratic spirit of "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute!" If the McKinley bill cannot be modified without sacrifice to the dignity of the House of Representatives, without sacrifice to the honor of the Democratic party, then let the McKinley bill continue. The McKinley bill is bad, but there are some things worse than the continuance of the McKinley bill. And the price that it is proposed by a Democratic caucus that we should pay for the repeal of the McKinley bill is one of them. The question before us is not a question of the concession of rates; it is a question of the concession of principles—of principles most fundamental and vital. . . . What are we Democrats to say to our constituents when, in a few days now, we return to them to render an account of our stewardship? They sent us here to repeal the McKinley bill. They sent us here to wipe out that system, miscalled protection, which we in our national platform declared a fraud and a robbery, and pledged ourselves to wipe out!

From this point on in his speech Mr. Johnson discussed the details of the surrender to protected monopolists, and toward its close declared:

> I am a free trader; I am a single taxer—that is to say, I am a Democrat of the Jeffersonian school, whose political creed is summed up in the phrase, "equal rights for all, and special privileges for none." But I am as well a practical man and a practical politician. I would accept half a loaf, much rather than have no bread, as I showed when I voted for the Wilson bill. In the same way I would vote for this surrender if I believed the Gorman bill a whit better than the McKinley bill, and if I believed, as is claimed, that it is the best bill that can be passed through the Senate. But I do not believe this. I think that the assertion that it is the best the Senate will do is but a gigantic bluff. I do not believe that the concessions made to robbery in over 600 amendments were really necessary to pass this bill through that body. I do not believe there is a single Democratic senator who would stand out to the last for a concession to the sugar trust or steel rail pool or to any one of the other great robbing combines, if forced to an open and decisive vote. . . . In the position of no surrender the House will have the support, not merely of the Democratic masses, but, with the exception of the trusts and their allies, of the whole people of the United States. . . Do not let us withdraw from this struggle by shameful surrender! Do not let us lower ourselves from the high plane we occupy to the level of the United States Senate! If we do, we will not have to wait long to feel the indignant repudiation of the people.

Nor did they have to wait long. Within three months of Johnson's speech his prediction came true. A House of Representatives of 219 Democrats and only 124 Republicans was at the Fall election of 1894 changed to a House of 244 Republicans and only 104 Democrats.

In this landslide of 1894 Johnson himself went down with his party.

Before his term expired Johnson made his speech on the fundamental principles of the currency question,* in the course of which, while advocating a bill of his own for a flexible currency,* he took occasion to expose the character of a prominent national bank bill then under consideration. Of this bill he said at one point in his speech:

> Your scheme is a failure, or it is a monopoly. You can work it either way you will. Now, if you want to be fair about it, if it is a monopoly, call it a monopoly, and let the title be so we can read it. Say that this is a bill to transfer to the present national banks of the United States the monopoly of issuing all the legal-tender money of the United States, and enabling them to make from $15,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year at the expense of the people. Put it in that shape, and at least we will know what you offer us. If it is free banking, and no monopoly, put that in the title. Say that it is "an act to enable bad banks to issue good money and loot the treasury without fear of law." Then you will at least be fair.

About the subject of monopoly Johnson took what seemed to men less frank a curious position. He was an avowed monopolist.

Once he came near being committed for contempt of court by insisting as a witness in answer to the question as to his occupation, that by occupation he was a monopolist. Yet he opposed monopoly.

That seemed inconsistent, and on one occasion in Congress a trust lawyer, a member of the House, said in debate that Johnson ought to vote for the measures he denounced as monopolies, because he was himself a monopolist. Johnson instantly retorted: "As a business man I am willing to take advantage of all the monopoly laws you pass; but as a member of Congress I will not help you to pass them and I will try to force you to repeal them."

It was long the custom of Johnson's monopolistic adversaries and their henchmen—a custom now seldom honored in the observance—to denounce Johnson as insincere in his opposition to monopoly. He answered the question himself by asking why the monopolists, if they really thought him insincere in opposing monopoly, were so strenuous in opposing him. The truth about it was, of course, that they did not doubt his sincerity. What really disturbed

*In the House of Representatives, January 8, 1895.

*Introduced January 8, 1895.

Digitized by Google

them was their confidence that he was in fact sincere. Insincere anti-monopolists never give monopolists a moment's uneasiness.

VI

The Presidential year of 1896 opened as hopeless for Democracy as the Congressional year of 1894 had closed, and Johnson was among the first to see the dawn of a new day with the advent of Bryan.

Being neither a silver man nor a gold man, as his Congressional bill for a flexible currency testifies, he was not enthusiastic over the coinage issue; but along with his friend Henry George he saw in the rise of Bryanism the coming of new and deeper issues and a more sincere political life. Free silver was to him only an accidental battle slogan of a more fundamental democracy. As with George, so with him, "the true spirit of democracy seemed at last rising in earnest to grapple with the spirit of privilege and oligarchy which threatened Republican institutions," and William J. Bryan was its spokesman. Accordingly he threw his influence to Bryan in the Chicago convention, of which he was a member, and supported him heartily in the campaign.

Four years later, again a member of the national convention, he supported Bryan's platform and candidacy among the delegates at the convention and later among the people in the following campaign.

And although his vote in the St. Louis convention of 1904 was cast for Bryan's nominee, Cockrell of Missouri, he supported Parker in the campaign—as well as circumstances permitted.

VII

Johnson's long experience in street railroad operation naturally made him a strong public ownership advocate early in his career as an apostle of Henry George's philosophy. For in public ownership of public utilities he saw a comparatively easy way to the establishment of the single tax policy.

On this question he believes that railways should be open highways, with a public dispatching office and competitive private operation; but that railway terminals and street car systems should be both owned and operated by the public.

In his ideals he goes further with reference to street car systems. He would collect no fares, but would support the systems out of the increase in land values which they produce. He likens a street car in a city to an elevator in an office building—the one running horizontally and the other perpendicularly; and as the elevator service is supported by the higher office rents which the building therefore commands, so he would support the street car system out of the higher ground rents which the city therefore produces, and which are now appropriated as private property by landlords.

In 1899 Johnson saw an opportunity to put this policy in operation in Detroit. Late in the previous year he had got his affairs into shape to enable him to devote his time altogether to the promotion of the single tax. He regarded this as a delegated duty from Henry George, at whose side he had worked, not only in the mayoralty campaign in New York in 1886, but again in the first single tax convention, held at Cooper Union, New York, in September, 1890, and finally in the mayoralty campaign of New York in 1897, and whose body he had helped bear to the grave as the latter campaign approached its climax. An occasion occurring early in 1899 to state this purpose definitely and publicly, he did so, and the statement, which was widely published, came to the attention of Gov. Pingree of Michigan, who had long been anxious to have Detroit own its own street railroad. Pingree solicited and received Johnson's cooperation. They planned to bring the Detroit street car system under public ownership and operation at once, upon fair terms both to the city and the companies, and ultimately to reduce fares or make a free railroad, charging the cost of operation against the land values of Detroit.

Work began at once. Within twenty days—March 3, 1899—the legislature of Michigan had passed, and on the 24th Gov. Pingree signed, a bill authorizing the purchase by the city of Detroit of the street railway system then in operation there. The bill provided for the appointment by the City Council of a street railway commission to acquire and operate the system, but was given no power to incur obligations except upon the property acquired. On the following 1st of April (vol. ii, No. 53, pp. 4, 10) the Detroit City Council appointed as commissioners Gov. Pingree, Elliot G. Stevenson and Carl E. Schmidt. The mayor vetoed the appointments; but the Council refused to receive the veto, claiming that they were acting in obedience to the mandate of a State law.

Negotiations then began. The city employed Edward W. Bemis to ascertain the value of the property. Terms were about agreed upon when the Supreme Court of the State (vol. ii, No. 66, p. 10) held the municipal ownership law to be unconstitutional. The reason for this decision was peculiar. It rested upon a clause of the State constitution forbidding the State to engage in carrying on any work of internal improvement. The question of the city's right to own and operate a street railway was expressly ignored.

Pingree and Johnson thereupon met the situation with a plan substantially like that proposed by Mayor Dunne, of Chicago, six years later and known in Chicago politics as the Dunne "contract plan." They secured from the Council (vol. ii, No. 68, pp. 1, 11) an ordinance granting to what was nominally a private company but really a trustee for the city—Gov. Pingree being at its head—a street car franchise for 30 years with privilege of renewal for 18 years longer, for the purpose of enabling the nominal beneficiaries of the 30-year franchise to mortgage it for the existing street car systems upon a purchase at (in round figures) $16,000,000.

A larger sum had been arrived at by Johnson and Bemis as a fair consideration for the unexpired franchises, the plant, and the money in bank; but Johnson reduced it. Nevertheless the proposition failed.

The failure was due to the opposition of influential business men interested in opposing all public ownership, reenforced by some influential municipal ownership and single tax advocates whose support instead of their opposition Johnson and Pingree had natural-

Digitized by Google

ly expected. The parallel in this respect with Mayor Dunne's experience in Chicago last Summer was remarkably close.

For grounds of objection, it was urged that the purchase price of $16,000,000 was grossly excessive, and that the ordinance would consequently result in a 30-year franchise to Pingree and his associates. In consequence of this opposition the principal owners broke off negotiations, and the Council reconsidered the ordinance and postponed it indefinitely.

But for the opposition noted above, Detroit would now own and operate a complete municipal street car system, of much greater value than its cost. The value of the property involved in the Pingree-Johnson negotiations is now, according to recent estimates by Prof. Bemis, at least $25,000,000—about $9,000,000 more than the price upon which Bemis and Johnson had agreed as fair.

VIII

Almost two years after the baffiement of Johnson and Pingree's plans for Detroit, the same kind of question in Cleveland turned public attention again toward Johnson in that city.

Mayor Farley, though elected in supposed opposition to the Cleveland street car ring, had thrown his pledge to the winds (vol. iii, p. 625), cynically explaining that campaign promises are only for campaign purposes, and was about to promote the immediate passage of a 25-year street car franchise, although the existing franchises still had several years to run.

Johnson immediately took measures to resist (vol. iii, p. 658), He circulated anti-franchise petitions and paid solicitors two cents a signature. When the horrified ring revolted at this, and accused Johnson of bribing voters, he retorted characteristically that "if the people are to be bribed for two cents a head, the ring had better buy them up than to buy up councilmen."

The issue grew in intensity, and on the 19th of February, 1901, Johnson was nominated for mayor at the Democratic primaries. He had made his own platform (vol. vii, p. 715) and it was a radical one. Promising as good a business administration as the laws would permit (a promise he is now conceded to have kept to the full), he advocated local option in taxation, home rule on all local questions, municipal ownership of street railroads, and the single tax.

His specific recommendations as to street railways, since Ohio laws do not permit public ownership, was that the franchise ordinance be put up at fair competition, and that under no circumstances should more than a three-cent fare be allowed.

The campaign was exciting. Johnson made no pretenses. He said candidly enough that he had made money out of monopoly as a business man, as other business men had, but as a citizen he was against monopoly. In this campaign he made a rule regarding the use of money which he has strictly adhered to in all the others. Being a rich man, he was expected to be "generous," as rich candidates usually are; but at one of his first great meetings he stunned some of his auditors by saying:

> I want to say right here that in this campaign I have no use for boodlers, and any man who thinks he can get money out of me might just as well stay away. I won't buy votes. If I can't be elected honestly, I don't want the office.

He has kept his word. Not only did he keep it in that campaign, but he has strictly kept it in all others.

At that election, April 1, 1901, in a vote of about 70,000, he was elected by a plurality (vol. iii, p. 824) of 6,033.

Johnson's entry into office (vol. iv, p. 2) was as meteoric as his election. During the incumbency of his predecessor, Mr. Farley, an arrangement had been made to turn over the lake front to a railroad corporation, and the ordinance for its consummation had passed the Council. But before Mayor Farley had signed this ordinance, as he intended to do, Johnson went into the courts and procured an injunction. This injunction remained in force until 11 o'clock on the morning of the 4th of April, 1901. Whether it would have been longer lived, depended upon the action of the court at that time and was problematical. So Johnson solved the problem for himself. Though it had been usual for newly elected mayors of Cleveland to go into office a week or more after election, there was in fact no legal limitation of that kind. The new mayor became mayor by law as soon as he qualified, a fact of which Johnson took advantage. On the morning of the 4th he demanded and received his certificate of election, took the oath of office, filed his official bond, and half an hour before the expiration of the injunction order, had taken the place of Mr. Farley as mayor. It is needless to add that the contemplated lake front grab has not been consummated.

One of Johnson's first acts upon coming into office was to establish a tax school under Peter Witt, now city clerk. He placed E. W. Bemis in charge of the water department with positive instructions, which have been strictly obeyed, to manage the department on business principles and regardless of politics. He took steps to equalize tax burdens, which the tax school had found to be grossly discriminatory against small owners. He proceeded against the railroads to raise their absurdly low taxation to the level of the taxes on houses and stores. He procured bidders for a three-cent fare street railroad and got them a franchise, subject to municipal ownership as soon as authority should be had from the legislature, and had them begin construction. He pardoned workhouse prisoners who were held only for nonpayment of fines. He closed the dives. He opened the parks to the people and made playgrounds for the children. He gave the city a business administration, free from "business" deals as well as politics, from corporation plunder as well as political spoils, and in a variety of other ways he carried out his pledges to the letter.

But he was disturbing vested interests in public plunder, and trouble began. Senator Hanna controlled the legislature, and Hanna's investments were in jeopardy. That was not Mr. Hanna's idea of good citizenship. "When I can't combine business and politics," said Mr. Hanna, "I will give up politics." And he combined business and politics, with the result that Mayor Johnson was soon tied up with a baker's dozen of corporation injunctions which are only now beginning to loosen, and

Digitized by Google

the city itself was "rippered" by the legislature so as to make Cleveland's mayor an impotent figurehead.

So completely was Johnson shackled that most men would have abandoned the struggle. But Johnson's good-natured optimism is in his blood. When he was a little fellow in frocks playing Noah's ark with his baby cousin, a grown-up accidentally swept over the array of animals they had set on the floor. The little cousin gave up in despair. But the future mayor of Cleveland caught sight of two undisturbed figures of their Noachian array. A smile broke through the tears that had come, and he exclaimed: "Oh, mamma, look! two of 'em are standing, and that's enough to begin over again!"

So when Cleveland was "rippered" Hanna and Cox had inadvertently left Johnson enough, little as it was, to begin over again, and he did.

He carried the fight into the State, against the "crooks" of both parties. It was a losing fight of course and he lost heavily; but it left impressions which made themselves felt in the Ohio elections of this year. He led the fight with Herbert S. Bigelow as Democratic candidate for Secretary of State. When the votes were counted the corporation satellites said that Johnson was dead and buried. But at the following city election, in the Spring of 1903, he was reelected (vol. vi, p. 5) with a plurality of 5,985 in a total of about 70,000. And with him were elected a cabinet of his own choice, principally the very men he had appointed before the legislature deprived him of the power of appointment by "rippering" the city charter under which he was first elected.

Mayor Johnson had not come lightly to the conclusion that good municipal government is impossible so long as the State government can control it and is itself controlled by corrupt and corrupting corporate interests. Notwithstanding, therefore, the Bigelow defeat of 1902, he determined in the Fall of 1903 to carry the fight against the corporations and for municipal freedom again into the State.

To do this it was necessary for him to take the gubernatorial nomination himself and he did so. He had no ambition for it. Defeat and apparently crushing defeat was inevitable. The Democratic spoilsmen under John R. McLean, as well as the Republican spoilsmen under Hanna, would be more firmly united against his candidacy than they were against Bigelow's a year before. But this particular fight had to be made and Johnson made it. He brought out his great circus tent with which he had campaigned many times, and pitched it in county after county as he had done the year before. Though a circus tent it covered no vaudeville performance. It was used not for trifling amusement but for political education. But the result was as he had expected. Although he increased the party vote largely where he spoke it fell off elsewhere; and once more he became, in the estimation of his enemies, a buried political corpse.

That he might not be again resurrected, Senator Hanna's legislature provided for abolishing Spring elections. This change forced Johnson to run for mayor at the Fall election of 1905, along with the candidates for governor. It was believed by his enemies and feared by his friends that party loyalty, and the various other considerations that interfere with independent voting at State elections would now insure his defeat. But all were fated to disappointment. At the election in November last, Johnson was reelected mayor (vol. viii, p. 526) by 12,169 plurality, and his chosen cabinet was elected with him.

Again Mayor Johnson is resurrected. But he is resurrected for devoted work for his cause, not for personal ambition. The notion that Tom L. Johnson is playing for high political stakes is a mistaken one. Had he been ambitious of personal honors, he could have served himself better and easier by doing as ambitious men always do—allying himself with the great financial interests and the powerful political agencies of his time. Instead of this he has challenged the financial interests by attacking their special privilege laws, and offended the political agencies by refusing to corrupt them with tribute. He has fought the people's fight with the people's weapon, an unpolluted ballot, and for the people's interests—equal rights and no privileges. And he has fought it as a municipal fight, in the conviction that the hope of genuine democracy is indeed in the city, and that in the city the principle of equal rights and no privileges will find its truest and clearest expression.

To promote this tendency and through it to redeem what he regards as his obligation to the memory of Henry George, is Johnson's overshadowing ambition.

And the recent election in Ohio indicates the possibility of this ambition being gratified, in part at least, at no distant day. Not only has Cleveland elected a city government in full sympathy with him, but the new Governor and the new legislature are well disposed to greatly widen, the home-rule rights of cities. Meanwhile Mayor Johnson has brought together the mayors of the State and induced them to organize what seems destined to be an historic league. It is organized for the purpose of securing home rule rights from the State government, and of promoting the best possible municipal government in every municipality—the best possible, not alone in honesty of administration, but also in equality of all civic benefits.

IX

One of the great difficulties in the way of summing up the career of "the best mayor of the best governed city in the United States," is the necessity for falling back upon voluminous detail. The pen has not yet been shaped which can fairly characterize Mayor Johnson in general terms without seeming to flatter him. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the audience has not yet been born which can appreciate a true characterization.

We are so familiar with the business man whose soul never rises above dollars; we are so familiar with the politician who plays the game of politics either for the winnings or for the excitement of the game; we are so familiar with the popular leader who is only a demagogue or a plutagogue; we are so accustomed to unexpected discoveries of selfish motives back of the best pretenses; and altogether we

Digitized by Google

seem to live in such an atmosphere of self-seeking and false pretense and to be so out of tune with the very virtues in public life that we pray for and think we hope for, that when a public man who rises above our horizon does what none but a just man would do and carves out the career that only an honest man would choose, our first impulse is to ask if he is sincere. And we are not satisfied with assurances in general terms. His case must be proved circumstantially and in minute detail.

For much the same reason it is not easy to indicate in the fullest and best sense what Johnson has done as mayor of Cleveland, without writing a detailed history of the city during his five years of administration. Even then the most important element would be missing, an element which the people of Cleveland perceive, and strangers coming within the atmosphere of the Cleveland government feel, but which only the persons who are sympathetically cooperating with Mayor Johnson in his work really understand. These persons he has inspired with a noble enthusiasm, and the public opinion of his city he has educated to a high level of civic principle. No political work could be better than this. Yet who could describe it so as to be understood by any but such as already understand?

One picture, if the pen were here to draw it, might reveal Mayor Johnson as he is, as those within whose vision that picture has come know him to be, and thereby suggest the secret of his leadership. It is a picture of a low green-leather lounge, faced and flanked with easy chairs and ottomans and rambling in front of a cheerful hearth fire in a room of mellowed light in the very center of Mayor Johnson's home. Here he keeps "open house." Not "open house" for drinking, for Johnson neither drinks nor invites drinking. Nor a politicians' den where wires are pulled and combinations made. It is the family living room of the mayor of an American city who takes his official responsibilities seriously. In the house of a rich man, this room is expensively as well as comfortably furnished; yet the social atmosphere is such that the poorest who join the circle there forget all distinctions of wealth. Around this fireside for the past five years the civic conditions of Cleveland have been discussed—academically to the roots and practically to the uttermost branches—by those who are responsible officially and by those who are interested only as citizens, and by visitors also from other places. Not formally, not in set speeches or according to cut and dried programmes, but as phases of general conversation in which all participate.

Out from this circle goes an influence for higher ideals of civic betterment which the whole city has felt and been thankful for, but without realizing that it originates at Mr. and Mrs. Johnson's fireside.

Among those who have been accustomed to bring inspiration into and to take inspiration away from this circle, are men who were unknown when Mayor Johnson called them to his side, but whose fame is growing and spreading as men worthy to be leaders of men in the rising struggle for the natural order of social justice. One of these is Peter Witt, the blacklisted mechanic whose unwavering devotion to principle in preference to policy has brought its natural reward of public confidence. Another is Harris R. Cooley, the Disciples preacher, whom Johnson took from the pulpit into his cabinet as head of the department of charities and corrections because he wanted "heart and gumption" in that office, even if the necessary business ability had to be hired, and who has proved that he possesses not only the two but all three qualities. Mr. Cooley is acquiring national reputation for his success in officially applying the policy of the "George Junior Republic" to his charities and corrective institutions. Along with him, as one of the fireside conferees, is Dean Williams of Trinity Cathedral, recently elected Episcopal Bishop of Michigan. Still another is Newton D. Baker, the young lawyer whom, for his integrity, his good judgment and his untiring industry, Johnson selected for city solicitor, and who, twice elected to that office since his first appointment, has been of inestimable service to the city. Frederic C. Howe, a Republican member of the Council when Johnson first came into office, and now leader of the Democratic delegation to the State senate and widely known as the author of "The City the Hope of Democracy," is another; and another is Robert C. Wright, the county auditor, whose excellent first administration gave him a reelection on the Democratic ticket in 1904 by 2,500 when his county went for Roosevelt by 34,000—a man who, full of Johnson's spirit and animated by the same purpose, has been spontaneously and intelligently responsive in the county to Johnson's city and State policy of securing equitable taxation. Among the rest is Edward W. Bemis, formerly a professor in the Chicago University and now at the head of the Cleveland water department, which he manages with an absolutely free hand in execution of the merit principle of civil service—a man of national distinction as an economist. And so the list might be indefinitely extended. These men have come, through their association with Mayor Johnson, to feel an enthusiasm for his leadership because they know the sincerity and appreciate the intelligence of his devotion to the cause which they have all espoused.

The spirit of those gatherings has animated the city administration since Mayor Johnson's accession five years ago. It has influenced more formal meetings at the mayor's office. It has shown itself in the many public meetings of various kind which Johnson and his associates have addressed. Even in the big campaign meetings, where "spell-binding" oratory is usually the rule, the speeches of the Johnson people, like Johnson's own speeches, have been addressed to the good sense and the good conscience and neither to the prejudice nor to the cupidity of audiences. Many who have come to these meetings to scoff and stayed to pray, have joined the already large and growing group of enthusiasts who look to Johnson for leadership in the municipal evolution of which his city is the shining example and he the conspicuous representative.

So pervasive is the fine civic spirit that emanates from this group, it has created a new and inspiring type of officialdom. Visitors accustomed to the official environments of less progressive

Digitized by Google

places, instantly remark it. They speak of being in an official atmosphere from which political poisons seem to have been eliminated. They realize what is the truth, that Mayor Johnson and his associates are not constructing a politicians' machine or serving selfish ambitions, but with singleness of purpose and contagious enthusiasm are building up a peoples' city.

NEWS NARRATIVE

How to use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives: Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue so until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 4.

The Russian revolution.

It seems now to be certain that the violent uprising in Moscow (p. 629) has been suppressed; but the dispatches have been so evidently censored or inspired by the Russian government that no news can be accepted with full confidence.

—

At the time of our last report, which brought the Moscow story down to the 27th (p. 629) we were obliged to infer, contrary to some of the dispatches, that the fighting had not ceased; and this inference was verified by subsequent dispatches. Fighting continued throughout the 28th, and on the evening of that day the revolutionists raided the center of the town. On the 29th the uprising had been crushed again; but on the 30th the revolutionaries were still in possession of six square miles of the city, comprising large manufacturing and workingmen's residential districts. On the 31st, however, this region had fallen into the hands of the troops, and the revolt was put down. This report appears now to have been true.

—

Moscow is described as having the grim appearance of a battlefield. All the members of the social revolutionary committee are reported to have been arrested. Before the revolt had been suppressed, a committee of revolutionists entered the lodgings of the chief of police at midnight on the 27th and, as the dispatches agree in reporting it—

> told him to bid an eternal farewell to his family, because he was condemned to die. Finding that it was no joke, the chief expostulated, but to no purpose. Realizing his awful position, he bade farewell to his family and was hurried into the street and shot. His body was left lying in a pool of blood.

The incident was much like the ordinary police visitations of the Russian government, though less cruel; and since the suppression of the revolt in Moscow it has been outdone in ferocity by off-hand military executions of squad after squad of persons seized as revolutionists.

—

Although the Moscow revolt has been put down, the revolution is evidently not at an end. On the 31st the Council of Workingmen, after an eight-hour session at St. Petersburg, adopted resolutions calling off the strike, "because the fight of the people against the government can no longer be limited to the disorganization of economic life," and deciding "to proceed immediately with warlike operations and the organization of an armed uprising." Meanwhile, reports from different parts of the Empire have been coming in which indicate the vast geographical scope of the revolution. The miners and metal workers of the Don district have seized several towns and an important railway depot. The bridge over the Volga at Syzran, in the province of Simbirsk, was blown up with a military train upon it, and besides the slaughter of soldiers and destruction of military supplies, railway communication with Trans-Siberia was thereby cut off. The town of Zlautaust, in the Ural moutnains, has been in the hands of the revolutionists for several days, and a local republican government, with the red flag flying over the government arms factory and the officials held as hostages, has been established. At Riga (p. 62) the situation remains practically unchanged; and in Warsaw (p. 613), although the revolutionists are not in possession they are strong enough to maintain freedom of agitation. Samova, near Nishni Novgorod, is reported to be held by an army of strikers; and on the 2d a St. Petersburg dispatch stated that Krassnoyar, Siberia, had been conquered by revolutionaries, who had shot the military garrison and hanged the chief of police.

—

Mr. Bryan in the Philippines.

In the course of his tour (pp. 458, 631) William J. Bryan was at Manila on the 28th. On that evening he was present at a banquet given in his honor by leading Filipinos, including Aguinaldo. The native speakers advocated independence, and the menu displayed an American flag supported by a banner of the Filipino republic. According to the press dispatches Mr. Bryan did not commit himself as to the American policy regarding the Philippines, and the natives were disappointed, while the Americans resident at Manila were pleased. Nothing authentic on the subject from Mr. Bryan has yet been published in this country.

—

The Chicago traction question.

The work of the municipal ownership coalition in Chicago (p. 614) began to take shape on the 28th in the appointment of the following general advisory committee:

A. M. Lawrence, Raymond Robins, Margaret A. Haley, H. M. Ashton, M. F. Doty, Francis J. Shulte, J. G. Grossberg, John Fitzpatrick, Leopold Neumann, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, C. A. Windle, John E. Traeger, Joseph Medill Patterson, David Rosenheim, E. N. Nockels, John J. Sonsteby, E. W. Ritter, Clarence S. Darrow, P. C. McArdle, W. A. Conover, T. P. Quinn, Howard S. Taylor, Thomas Rhodus, H. R. Eagle, William O'Connell, Daniel L. Cruice.

—

On the 1st, having satisfied itself that the City Council did not in good faith intend to submit the questions at issue to referendum vote, the advisory committee prepared and recommended the circulation of a petition for a referendum vote at the coming Spring election on the following question:

> Shall the City Council proceed without delay to secure municipal ownership and operation of all street railways in Chicago under the Mueller law, instead of passing the pending franchise ordinance or any other ordinance granting franchises to private companies?

As 110,000 signatures must be obtained by the 1st of February, the Hearst papers assumed the burden of pushing the work. Accordingly on the 2d the Examiner made this announcement:

> In order that a referendum may be had on the new franchise ordinances

Digitized by Google