

candidate for mayor of Cleveland (p. 440) boasted of his victory in debate with Mayor Johnson somewhat too soon. As the battle has gone on the Republican candidate has been unhorsed at every charge. Similar boasting had been done before and with similar results. Every time the boasters were sorely disappointed. Johnson's first public speaking was in debate with a distinguished orator who was his adversary for Congress, and the tradition of his victory has not died out in Cleveland yet. Mark Hanna was shrewd enough to do his debating with Johnson at long range; he never dared accept a challenge. But Hanna's candidate for the mayoralty in 1903 did accept, and his followers soon wished he hadn't. The Republican candidate this year has the debating mettle his friends claimed for him, but he has not measured up to Johnson, and his friends are evidently growing weary of the contest. It is believed that Johnson will be re-elected by an emphatic majority.

The following sensible observations about this debate are made by the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 13th:

Behind it, and through it, is the spirit of the city of Cleveland manifesting itself unmistakably as the political genius of a genuine municipal democracy. . . . The local campaign has concentrated itself in these debates between Mr. Johnson and Mr. Boyd. And there is a sharp line of demarcation between city issues on the one hand and State and national issues on the other. Cleveland is settling its own affairs for itself, and the champions of the two parties are focusing the attention of an intelligent citizenship on the real issues. The conduct of the debate is characteristic of a city that has been said to have a good administration because its citizens are good. The speeches are couched in a spirit of fairness, and the audiences insist on fairness. "It is not a campaign of personality, but of issues," say the candidates. It is not a noise of brass, but of brains, might be added. In a city where nomination on any ticket never insures election, where public opinion of any shade finds respectful hearing in the press, on the Public square—Cleveland's "Forum"—on the platform or in the pulpit, such a campaign occasions little comment. In Cincinnati

or Philadelphia, or even in Boston, it might arouse astonishment that any large city of the American democracy should be so oddly democratic.

That allusion to the "public square—Cleveland's forum,"—is especially significant. Cleveland's public square has been for years a place for public meeting and debate, where any orderly crowd could gather, and any peaceable orator could preach any doctrine. Frequent efforts to abolish this forum have been made, but all have failed. The result is the "odd democracy" of which the Plain Dealer justly boasts.

Ohio politics.

It is not impossible that Ohio (p. 200) next month will elect a Democratic governor. At any rate the conditions are unusually favorable. Gov. Herrick himself, Mr. Hanna's protege, has paved the way. Last winter the Anti-Saloon League sought restrictive saloon legislation through a bill known now as the Brannock law. The bill was bitterly fought by the Liquor Dealers' Association, and Gov. Herrick aided the latter by insisting upon destructive amendments. The Anti-Saloon League resent this attitude of the Governor, and are supported very largely in their revolt by church sentiment. This antagonism to Herrick's reelection is favored by the Democratic nomination of John M. Pattison, a temperance advocate. The depth of feeling in church circles may be inferred from the attitude of the Western Christian Advocate (Methodist), published at Cincinnati, which in its issue of September 13 took occasion to say editorially that—

there are scores of thousands of Republicans in Ohio who believe that the interest of their party and the interests of the State will be promoted by the election of Mr. Pattison, and they are publicly, as well as privately, announcing their intention to vote for him.

That feeling is deeply intensified by the fact that George B. Cox, the Republican boss of Cincinnati, whose power in the Democratic party Tom L. Johnson and Herbert S. Bigelow have been for four years trying to dislodge, has extended his dominion from Hamil-

ton county to the Republican party of the entire State. Of this factor the Advocate says, in the editorial already quoted from:

Mr. Cox was for many years a saloon-keeper, and owed his political power and prominence to that fact. For some years he has held Cincinnati in his grip like a vise. Since the death of Senator Hanna, he is reported to have become the political boss of the State. His methods and ideals are those of the saloon, and the million or more of Christian citizens of Ohio are unwilling to support politicians and public officials who are dominated by Mr. Cox. The revolt of the Republicans is a protest against Mr. Cox, as well as against Gov. Herrick.

Mr. Pattison, the Democratic candidate for governor, is reputed to be an advocate of Mayor Johnson's policy of taxing corporations equally with farmers and householders, and also to be not merely a party Democrat but one of democratic proclivities.

Herbert S. Bigelow's choice.

The probable uprooting of Coxism in Cincinnati began with the campaign of Herbert S. Bigelow (vol. v, pp. 323, 335, 343, 346, 349, 353, 361, 472, 482, 485, 497) for Secretary of State in 1902. Mr. Bigelow was, as he still is, the pastor of a historic Congregational church in Cincinnati, a man of strong convictions and of patient and courageous character. At the earnest solicitation of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland he accepted the Democratic nomination for secretary of state, tendered in spite of the opposition of the Democratic ring of Cincinnati which then did and doubtless still does cooperate with Cox, the Republican boss. Mayor Johnson urged this duty upon Mr. Bigelow, and the latter accepted, with a view of breaking up the domination of Cox. It was a hopeless, thankless fight, for the people had yet to be awakened. But the seed of that sowing is now bearing fruit. Just at this hopeful time Mr. Bigelow is invited to leave the scenes of a painful political struggle in Cincinnati for the comforts of a placid pulpit service in Minneapolis. The temptation was no doubt great, but here is his reply:

The civic independence of Minneapo-

lis and the progressive character of her people seemed alluring to me, especially after ten years of labor in a city which probably deserves its reputation of being the worst governed in the United States. What Lincoln J. Steffens said of us is the solemn truth. Coarse thieves fill our courthouse and city hall. The hired bosses of two political machines and newspapers, silenced by subsidies, have brought us to such depths of dishonor as you could hardly believe possible. This vulgar terrorism would not be tolerated—not yet, at least—in that fighting fair city of yours. The awakening of Philadelphia and other signs of a new civic spirit that are blazing forth in so many places encourage me to believe that the day of reckoning for Cincinnati is near at hand. Therefore I have determined to remain and see the fight through, hoping that there may soon be awakened here a civic pride and patriotism worthy of these generous people and their glorious hills.

A civil service problem.

The report for last year of the Chicago Civil Service Commission outlines what this Commission understands to be the legal principle under which it is required to act with reference to the removal of public employes. On that point the report reads:

A law providing for discharge without a hearing before a commission, or some other body created for that purpose, would presumably contain a provision that the head of the department shall have the right to discharge for cause. The question would therefore remain absolutely in his hands as to what constituted cause; or, if the courts in our State should do as those in New York have done, they might feel inclined to review every case to determine whether the cause had been sufficient. On the one hand we have the exercise of the power of discharge by the head of the department, who in that way is constituted both administrator of the work of his department and sole judge in the matter of discharge, or we may have the spectacle of a court far removed from the immediate and practical problems of administration, passing upon a case strictly and solely from the standpoint of the legal question involved. Does not the provision of our city law providing for the bringing of charges by the head of the department, and the approval of the Civil Service Commission in the matter of discharge, afford a most happy solution of the questions involved? Here is a body standing apart from the direct administration of the city's work, and yet, as it were, within the atmosphere of said work; sufficiently independent

to constitute a body for hearing the facts, and yet from its every day experience and from the duties imposed upon it under the law, sufficiently near to the questions of practical administration to understand what ought and what ought not to be done.

This seems to us to be the correct view regarding removals under the merit system (p. 195). If the regular courts review in cases of removals, they will incline to treat the office as a property right, and this is detrimental to the public service; if heads of departments remove, merit employes will feel, often correctly so, that their retention depends not upon official fidelity to their trust but upon political or other loyalty to their superior or some one with a "pull" upon him. But a commission within the atmosphere of administration but not of it, reviewing removals with reference neither to the personal wishes of heads of departments on the one hand, nor to proprietary interests in an office on the other, but solely with reference to the good of the service, would go as far as possible toward making the merit system effective. Should the Chicago Civil Service Commission distinguish itself by a faithful execution of the theory outlined in its last year's report, and quoted above, it would appear in pleasing contrast to the State administration with reference to merit as applied to spoils in the civil service, besides reflecting somewhat upon a national administration which has but recently abolished all barriers to arbitrary departmental removals.

An appropriate and deserved rebuke.

Thomas Dixon's play of "The Clansman"—Dixon of "Leopard's Spot" notoriety—was most justly and sensibly condemned by the Columbia, S. C., audience upon which he tried the play last week. The audience, a large one and composed almost exclusively of white people, roundly hissed the play, which was evidently an adaptation of Dixon's book of the same title. That book, though it professes, and honestly no doubt, to portray the white man's side of the race question in the Ku Klux

period, is a gross libel on Southern white men and women. Of course it is a libel on the Negro, also, but that is by intention. The libel on the whites is attributable to mental and moral obtuseness. Happily Southern white men generally are not constructed on Mr. Dixon's mental and moral lines. The resentment of a Richmond audience goes to show that the Columbia audience expressed a general Southern sentiment.

MAXIMUM SALARIES.

We have become accustomed of late years to the contemplation of enormous salaries.

The payment of such salaries is sanctioned upon the pretext of the equivalent value of the recipient's services. If a protest against the payment of a hundred thousand dollars a year to the president of a mutual insurance company is offered, the answer is made that the rare qualifications demanded in the manager of such an enormous and complex business not only justify but necessitate the payment of such a salary. "The office demands the highest ability, and a hundred thousand dollars is none too much for that."

Defenders of the high salary sometimes make comparisons between a particular salary in question and certain other salaries of equal value, or salaries somewhat less but attaching to positions of less responsibility, under the impression that such citations establish the equity of their cause. And what is of vastly greater and more portentous significance—the general public, though perhaps doubting, yet not knowing how to answer, suffers the case to go by default.

Yet to the clear thinking man who has a comprehensive knowledge of fundamental economic law, the question presents no difficulties, and the verdict will be promptly and emphatically adverse.

In the common field of wage labor, so called, the arbitrament of competition, though it does not indicate the absolute value of the service rendered, nevertheless does determine, with some approach to equity, the relative values.