

Johnson. Almost lone-handed, he went into the business of clearing the forests and swamps of a trust-ridden Democracy extended throughout the State. He had traitors in his army in every county. Those who had been Democrats for revenue only were all against him. With such a handicap as this the only wonder is that he was able to make as much of a showing as he did. At this time I am advised that he carried Cuyahoga county by 3,000. That makes the fourth time within the last 18 months that Tom L. Johnson has been vindicated and his public service ratified by the people who know him best, the people of his own county. I am not discouraged. Let us go on with our work, remembering that "Truth loses battles but wins wars," that "Truth lost a battle at Bunker Hill but won a war at Yorktown."

It was by about 2,500 instead of 3,000 that Johnson carried Cuyahoga county for Bigelow—an increase over last year of 2,400; and he carried Cleveland by 5,000, while in the few counties that were systematically canvassed he increased the Democratic vote by 10,000. It was the combination of the two bosses of Cincinnati—McLean, the Democrat, and Cox, the Republican—that increased the Republican plurality in the State. Had Hamilton county been entirely out of the count, Bigelow would have reduced the former State plurality by 20,000. Not the least of the advantages Johnson has won is the control of the county government of Cuyahoga. With this advantage secured, he will be able now to carry on his taxation fight as a county matter. The "ripping" of the city government in the interest of Hanna and the railroad companies may therefore be somewhat barren as a corporation victory. The Republican papers and their Democratic coadjutors anticipated too much when in shrieking head lines they proclaimed that Tom L. Johnson was now "a dead one."

Congressman Norton, of Ohio, Democrat so-called, complains that Tom L. Johnson's campaign defeated him for reelection. Perhaps that was the intention. Norton can't understand why Johnson, who made his money out of monopoly as a business man, should assail monopoly as a public man. Norton is therefore

weak in the moral part of his structure. He denounces Johnson as a socialist because he advocates the Henry George idea, which is like confusing east with west or the north pole with the south pole. Norton is therefore weak in his intellectuals. He whines because Johnson told the voters of his district that representatives of corporate interests are unfit to represent any district in Congress, he himself, the said Norton, being at the time a representative of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Norton is therefore silly enough to pay Johnson a high tribute without knowing it. True Democrats the country over will rejoice to learn that Johnson did defeat such a "Democrat" as Norton. His confession that Johnson did so is further testimony to the fact that Johnson made good headway in the recent campaign in Ohio. To rid the Democratic party of responsibility for monopoly agents in public places is part of the work that Johnson took in hand when he resolved to devote the remainder of his life to the public service.

Having "ripped" the city government of Cleveland so as to obstruct Mayor Johnson in his efforts to secure just taxation, the Republican ring of which Senator Hanna is the head center has further served the corporate interests of which he is chief beneficiary, by trying to head-off Johnson in his attempt to use the county taxing machinery to accomplish the same purpose. Just as Hanna's Republican henchmen go out of office to make way for their Democratic successors, they settle the county's tax claims against the public service corporations of Cleveland, amounting to \$1,000,000, for \$80,000. It is profitable to be the "boss" of a Republican ring when you own corporate franchises. Mr. Hanna finds it so. Of a verity he is not in politics for his health alone.

It is impossible yet to give definite news of the voting in Colorado on the Australasian tax amendment.

The result is not positively known even to the local leaders in the reform. They believe that the amendment was fairly carried, but are equally certain that no matter what the vote may have been it will be counted against the amendment. This certainly can be done. For the election machinery is in the hands of the Republican and the Democratic organizations, both of which were opposed to the amendment. They can count as they please, and the delay indicates that they may be doing so. At the same time it must be conceded that a large proportion of the voting population of Colorado had been "buncoed" by the real estate speculators and land-grant railroad interests. To the agents for those interests the farmer always "looks like a fellow you can fool," and the probability is that the Colorado farmer not only looked like such a fellow but in fact was one.

The truth is that the Democratic party of Colorado was not equal to the opportunity to make itself democratic. Had it endorsed and worked for the amendment, the amendment could have been carried and the party could have won the election. As it was, the Democratic masses neglected the amendment while its advocates voted against the Democratic party. Thus both went down together. Senator Teller also missed an opportunity to identify himself with genuine democracy, and as a result will probably lose his seat in the Senate. It is absurd for the Democrats and Mr. Teller to excuse themselves on the ground that they did not believe in the amendment. A public man who opposes home rule in taxation has no claim to the name of Democrat.

Senator Bucklin and his faithful supporters, defeated though they are, have done a great work in agitating the subject of home rule in taxation throughout the large and growing State of Colorado. The time will come, and it may not be far off, when the record of defeat under Bucklin

will be a stronger recommendation of those who suffered it to public confidence than any certificates which those who caused the defeat can give. When the people of Colorado realize the fraud that has been perpetrated upon them, Bucklin will be the recognized and probably triumphant leader of Democracy in that State. This is not a prophecy, it is only a recognition of a characteristic of human nature.

Clarence S. Darrow, who was elected to the Illinois legislature from Chicago as a candidate of the Public Ownership league, will be supported by John J. McManaman, a candidate of the same organization, who was reported at first to have been defeated but is now known to have been elected.

By a vote of 42 to 16 the Chicago city council has placed itself in opposition to low tolls for public service corporations and in favor of high tolls with a heavy city tax on gross receipts. That is what the monopoly corporations wish for. If they must pay for their privileges, they prefer the gross receipts tax. There are many reasons for this. For one thing, it offers excellent opportunities for cheating the city in the levying of the tax. For another, even if the tax were fully paid, it would leave a larger net toll to be collected of the person served than if the tax were remitted and the corporations required to render cheap service. Evidently the majority of the present council are good men to defeat next Spring. They are either voting consciously in the interest of the corporations or are doing so ignorantly. In either case they are unfit. Any man who believes that city taxes ought to be collected in car fares is unfit to legislate in the interest of the people. He belongs on the side of the corporations and the real estate speculators and should be "spotted" accordingly.

In Texas a movement is under way for restricting the suffrage to poll-

tax payers. At the coming session of the legislature a constitutional amendment will be submitted requiring the production of a poll-tax receipt as a condition of voting. The amendment is almost certain to be adopted both by the legislature and by the people, because its real purpose is to disfranchise Negroes. That is no reason, however, why its advocates should advocate it upon false grounds. Their argument that the poll-tax is the citizen's contribution to the State for protecting his person is very old, very plausible, and absolutely false. Every citizen who pays for the State's protection to his person does so when he pays his rent, or when he buys land for himself. The proof of this is simple and convincing. In a state where everybody's life was continually unsafe, rent would be low and land cheap. But let the State make life secure, and rents and land prices would instantly go up. Nobody cares to rent or buy land where life is constantly in peril. It is not the poor Negroes of Texas who pay nothing for personal protection except when they pay toll taxes. Their landlords collect of them in rents their contributions for that purpose. If in addition they pay a poll tax they are taxed twice for protection—once by the State and once by their landlords.

A curious reader of the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper though exceptionally independent of party dictation, has asked it to explain why the United States is short of gold notwithstanding our much-boasted favorable balances of trade. He doesn't understand why we should be borrowers if we are creditors. Neither does the Record-Herald, apparently; for while it furnishes its curious correspondent with much valuable information on the subject of international trade, it utterly fails to explain the paradox that excites his curiosity. The obvious explanation is, of course, that we have had no really favorable balances. Our enormous excess of exports is largely not a basis for credit against which

we may draw, but a drain upon our resources in the nature of tribute.

One of the stock objections to woman suffrage is the assumption that voting can be done only in places where it would not be nice for women to go. But experience knocks out this objection. In Colorado, where women are voters, their disinclination to going to cigar stores and barber shops is resulting not in their staying away from the polls but in their demanding better voting places and getting them. One of the finest homes in Denver was selected this year for the polling place of one of the voting precincts.

In affiliating with the Federation of Labor, the school teachers organization of Chicago may or may not have made a mistake. That is for the members to decide. But some of the criticisms upon their action are only calculated to excite contempt. One of these is the objection that teachers belong to a profession and ought not to affiliate with hod carriers. The man or woman who makes that objection is a snob. To object to the adoption of trade union methods raises a legitimate issue for discussion. But to object to the affiliation of teachers with the fathers of the children they teach and by whom their salaries are paid, when those fathers earn their incomes by manual work, is to argue the incapacity of the objector for the duties of a teacher.

On the question of the methods of trade unions, it is not fair to condemn them without consideration of the circumstances out of which they arise, as the president of Harvard, for instance, has done. In that attitude toward trades unionism there is a degree of imbecility which merits the scorn of thoughtful men. If laborers were at liberty to make free contracts, there would be force in the objection to organizations of labor unions for the purpose of coercing employers. But for the man who has nothing but his labor to bring to market there is no free contract. He