June 10, 1905

The Public

men without pay"—and they laugh in his face!

We think we know why the people of two millenniums ago rejected this philosophy; but do we know why the people of to-day reject it also?

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CLEVELAND.

Cleveland, June 4.-Mayor Johnson's low-fare and municipal-ownership "outing" yesterday has proved to be a more effective factor in promoting the municipal-ownership movement than its organizers had hoped for. Their hopes had been raised to a pretty high pitch by the expectation of a joint meeting of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, and Mayor Dunne, of Chirago, as representatives of the two cities in which that movement has taken most advanced shape. This expectation was chilled by the inability of Mayor Dunne to leave Chicago in time to keep his appointment. But Mayor Dunne's guest, Mr. Dalrymple, the manager of the municipal traction system of Glasgow, who attended at Mayor Dunne's request, made two casual remarks in his speech which, owing to their fatuous exploitation by the local traction interests, have furnished the low-fare and municipalownership advocates with some of their best material.

Quite in a casual way, Mr. Dalrymple remarked that less than five-cent fare would be quite impossible with universal transfers. This incidental remark was taken up, after the usual manner of American newspapers, and made much of, as if it had been the central point of Mr. Dalrymple's speech. All the changes were rung upon it, by means of labored editorials, interviews with beneficiaries of traction privileges, etc., to make it appear that this visiting expert was opposed to Mayor Johnson on the subject of low fares.

Also in a casual way Mr. Dalrymple said that municipal ownership in order to succeed must be divorced from politics; and this remark was exploited as the judgment of a municipal ownership expert against municipal ownership where city government is influenced by politics.

In order to emphasize the importance of these remarks, great stress was laid upon Mr. Dalrymple's transcendent qualities as an expert in the management of the municipally owned traction lines of Glasgow. Consequently, the fact is more widely advertised in Cleveland to-day than anything else could have advertised it, that Glasgow has a municipally owned traction system, and that it has long been in successful operation—in every way superior to the privately owned systems of the same country.

On the face of it Mr. Dalrymple's two statements noted above seem to the unthinking to be adverse to the lowfare and municipal-ownership movement.

Had this been otherwise, they would not have been exploited. and the occasion would have been allowed to pass as an ordinary political picnic. But that neither of them is in reality at all embarrassing a moment's thought will show.

That spoils politics must be kept out of municipal business is universally insisted upon by municipal ownership advocates. One of the prime arguments for municipal ownership and operation of traction service is that it is necessary to drive politics out of that service. The greatest political corruption of our cities to-day is directly traceable to the hand which municipal service corporations take in city politics. Mr. Dalrymple's statement on this point is therefore a welcome admonition to us, to get rid of political corruption in municipal government by getting rid of public service corporations.

On the subject of low fares, it is not remarkable that so good a traction expert as Mr. Dalrymple should make the mistake of supposing that universal transfers would necessitate five-cent fares, for he has no expert knowledge regarding transfers, transfers not being in use with him. He is opposed to transfers, as is every intelligent traction expert; for they operate to give some patrons more than their money's worth and others less. But he neither knows nor pretends to know, from experience, that universal transfers would necessitate five-cent fares. On this point he is flatly contradicted by the action of the president of the Cleveland system, who offers universal transfers with a four-cent fare. If transfers are impossible on a five-cent basis how can the present company give them on a four-cent basis?

But whatever may be the worth of Mr. Dalrymple's testimony on a point regarding which he is not an expert and does not speak from experience, there is no doubt of its value on the regarding which he does points speak from experience. And the value of this testimony is enhanced by the good character and ability as an expert which the Cleveland traction interests have given him in order to throw a glamour about his incidental remarks which they interpret in their own favor.

The real substance of Mr. Dalrymple's speech here was a strong endorsement of municipal ownership and operation with low fares. On these points he spoke from experience. He said that the average cost perpassenger in Glasgow is less than onecent, and that the average fare per passenger is less than two cents. It is true that wages are lower in Glasgow, as are some other expenses. But all told these expenses are not 40 percent. less, and to offset that lesser cost the expense of furnishing a seat to every passenger must be considered. There are no "strap hangers" in Glasgow. Nevertheless, the average cost per passenger is less than onecent and the average fare is less than two cents.

So Mr. Dalrymple stated, and he isborne out by the official reports. By vouching for him as an expert, the traction interests save the other side all necessity for proving his competency as a witness, and the substance of his speech will live and agitate for low fares and municipal ownership long after his incidental remark about transfers—a remark not drawn from his experience but exploited by the traction interests, although their own management disproves it—has been forgotten.

Local politics are getting ready toboil. The gubernatorial campaign is on. Gov. Herrick has been renominated by the Republicans and the Democratic convention is to meet in a few days. Herrick has made himself very unpopular, even in his own party. Cox, of Cincinnati, has succeeded Hanna as State boss. Leading Democrats in different parts of the State are confident of defeating Herrick. This may be hoping for too much.

But the effect in Cleveland is marked. Johnson will doubtless be the-Democratic candidate for reelection as Mayor, and there is no observableindication of any possibility of his being defeated at the polls. Republicans. plutocratic Democrats, the agents of corporations, all concede his reelection, and the democratic Democrats: are confident. When the Republicans abolished Spring elections they expected to sweep Johnson under by mixing the vote on State officers with that on local officers. But now they fear that the effect will be reversed. Instead of being swept under by a Republican avalanche for State officers, Johnson is likely to sweep the Republicans under by a Johnson avalanchefor city officers.

L. F. P.

NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, June 8;

Dissolution of the Swedish-Norwegian Union.

Norway has declared her union with Sweden dissolved, and re--

Digitized by Google



nounced her allegiance to King Oscar of Sweden. This act is the result of King Oscar's veto (p. 136) of the bill of the Norwegian parliament, called the Storthing, providing for a foreign consular service separate from that of Sweden.

Concurrently with dethroning the King of Sweden and Norway as King of Norway, the Norwegian parliament on the 7th empowered the State Council to exercise for the present the regal power, and adopted the following address to the King:

Your Majesty: Whereas. all the members of the Council of State have laid down their offices, and whereas. his majesty, the King, has declared himself unable to establish a new government for the country, and whereas, the constitutional regal power thus becomes inoperative, the Storthing authorizes the members of the Council of State who retired to-day to exercise until further notice as the Norwegian government the power appertaining to the king in accordance with Norway's constitution and existing laws with those changes which are necessitated by the fact that the union with Sweden under one king is dissolved in consequence of the King having ceased to act as a Norwegian king. The course of developments which have proved more powerful than the desire and will of individuals has led to this result. The union entered upon in 1814 has from the first hour been differently interpreted by the two nations both with regard to its spirit and letter. Efforts have been made on the Swedish side to extend the union and on the Norwegian side to confine it to the limit laid down by the act of union and otherwise to assert the independent power of both States in all matters not defined in that act as coming under the union. The difference of principle in the interpretation of the character of the union has provoked much misunderstanding between the two peoples and has caused much friction in the interpretation which during the recent negotiations between the two countries has been laid down by Sweden as against Norway. The Norwegian people were bound to perceive the injury to their constitutional right, their independence and their national honor. The union was justified so long as it could contribute to the welfare and happiness of both peoples while maintaining their independence as sovereign states. But above the union there stands for us Norwegians our Norwegian fatherland and for the Swedes their Swedish fatherland, while more valuable than the political union are the feelings of solidarity and voluntary cohesion of both peoples. The

union has become a danger to this feeling of solidarity of the Norwegian and Swedish peoples which should secure the happiness of both nations and constitute their strength abroad. If the union is now severed the Norwegian people have no loftier wish than to live in good harmony with all, and not least with the people of Sweden and the dynasty under the direction of which our country, despite many bitter disputes affecting the union, has attained such important intellectual and material development. As evidence of the fact that the work and struggle of the Norwegian people for the full independence of the fatherland has not been founded on any ill-feeling toward the royal house or the Swedish people and has not left behind any bitterness toward either of these, the Storthing respectfully solicits your Majesty's co-operation to the end that a prince of your Majesty's house may be permitted while relinauishing his right to succession to the throne of Sweden to accept election as king of Norway. The day on which the Norwegian people elect their own king to ascend the ancient throne of Norway will open up an era of more tranguil conditions in Norway, of good and cordial relations with the Swedish people, and of peace. concord and loyal co-operation in the north for the protection and culture of the people and their fredom and independence. Convinced of this. the Storthing ventures to express the confident hope that as what has now been done will turn out to be for the good of all as well as of your Majesty, for whose person the Norwegian people will retain their high respect and devotion.

King Oscar immediately telegraphed to the Norwegian Council of State the following reply:

Have received the communication of the Council of State. Record the most decided protest against the method and action of the government.

The Russian Japanese War.

Later accounts of the Russian-Japanese sea battle of the 27th and 28th (p. 135), call for no important alterations of last week's report. Nor is there anything to add except that on the 2d the Japanese authorities at Tokio reported the Japanese loss to have been 113 killed and 424 wounded. From the same source had come on the 1st estimates of the Russian loss. placing it at from 7,000 to 9,000 killed and wounded and 4,000 prisoners.

Three Russian cruisers which were disabled in this battle, came into the harbor at Manila on the

3d. Upon being notified of this, President Roosevelt summoned his cabinet to discuss the matter. and on the 5th it was publicly announced that the President had ordered the vessels to leave American waters by noon of the 6th or dismantle. He is reported to have thereby made a precedent, the Washington dispatches explaining it as follows: "Heretofore the principles of international law regarding neutrality have been interpreted to mean that warships of a belligerent nation calling at neutral ports could stop only twenty. four hours, unless they were in need of supplies, in which case they were to be allowed coal and provisions to take them to their nearest home port, without regard to the time it took to load the stores, except that there must be no unnecessary delay. But the President directs that the twentyfour hour limit must be strictly enforced, and necessary supplies and coal must be taken on within that time, because the Russian ships were suffering from damages due to battle, the American policy being to restrict all operations of belligerents at neutral ports by allowing no time for repair of damages suffered in battle." The vessels have since been ordered by the Russian government to remain at Manila under the terms exacted by the American government.

The Domestic Situation in Russia.

The popular excitement in Russia (p. 136) caused by the naval defeat has not subsided. It appears to be extensive throughout the Empire, and to penetrate even into the Czar's council, the burden of the demand being that the war shall not be kept up without the consent of the people represented in a parliament. At Moscow this sentiment is most outspoken. Twenty-two members of the Moscowmunicipal council were reported on the 6th as having signed the following declaration:

Our hearts are aching. Neither reason, equity nor sense of responsibility to the national conscience can admit that this most disastrous and bloody war of history, the causes of which are incomprehensible to this tortured country, should continue without the consent of the Russian people. Moscow should courageously raise her voice in this year of pain and say that any fur-