

bute of respect to the last national standard bearer unless it wishes to be deliberately insulting. In taking this stand, Mr. Johnson and the Ohio convention over which he presided have set an example that all Democrats who sincerely wish for harmony on democratic principles will be glad to follow. The criticism of those who use "harmony" as a catch-word to promote plutocratic schemes can be easily endured.

On state issues the Ohio platform is bold and explicit, as was Chairman Johnson's speech. There is no false note or timid tone about it. Only knaves can misinterpret it; only fools can doubt its sincerity. On all the subjects that interest the people, not of Ohio alone but of every state in the Union, it has the sonorous ring of radical democracy. Its principles are summed up in the phrase with which the distinguished chairman characterized the issues of the campaign—"Home rule and just taxation."

Of the candidate whose name leads the Ohio ticket, for the office of secretary of state, but little need be said in these columns. To our readers the name of Herbert S. Bigelow is a household word. It has been objected that he is one of "Tom Johnson's preachers." But that sneer has lost its sneeriness. When Johnson became mayor of Cleveland, he appointed a clergyman to a place in his cabinet as director of charities and correction; and now the people of Cleveland unite in saying that the Rev. Harris R. Cooley is the best director of charities and correction the city ever had. When Johnson had become the acknowledged leader of Democratic politics in Cleveland, he suggested for the director of schools a graduate in theology whom the opposition dubbed "reverend," though he had not served in a pulpit. Nevertheless, the Rev. Starr Cadwallader was elected; and the good people of Cleveland now acknowledge that he is the best director of schools the city ever had. It may not be wise, then,

for Republicans of Ohio to say too much about the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow as "one of Tom Johnson's preachers." The good people might all want to try him and see if he wouldn't make the best secretary of state Ohio ever had.

Mr. Bigelow, a graduate of Adelbert college and Lane theological seminary, is the pastor of the Vine street church of Cincinnati, which has an enviable record as one of the underground railway stations through which escaping slaves used to pass from Kentucky to Canada, and which cherishes and exemplifies, under Bigelow as its pastor, the spirit of liberty in which it was born. It is a church that knows no distinctions of color or class, and in which the golden rule is taught without apology or modification—a church of the common people. Of Bigelow it is enough now to say, as of Johnson himself, that he is an able, eloquent and devoted advocate of Henry George's concrete application of the golden rule.

Another follower of Henry George—not a preacher this time, but a journeyman blacksmith—whom Johnson is credited with enlisting in the great combat between democracy and plutocracy already thickening, is Edmund H. Vail, whom the congressional convention of the Twenty-first Ohio district has called directly from his anvil to make a contest for Congressman Burton's seat. Mr. Burton is a difficult man to defeat. Not because he has rendered exceptional service to the country as a national legislator. No one would make that claim. But because he has rendered faithful service to the water front proprietors of Cleveland in connection with the river and harbor appropriations. In spite, however, of water front and kindred interests, the district can be carried by the workingmen if they unite; and if they cannot unite upon Vail it is hopeless to expect them to unite upon any one. He has made his way through

life as a journeyman blacksmith; has made him a little home; has educated his children in the schools; has educated himself in public affairs; and has done it all in the sweat of his own face and not in the sweat of somebody else's face. In Congress, Vail would not only want to vote right on public questions, and dare to do it; but what is equally important, he would know how.

If the people of Ohio are at all alert, the Democratic candidates will be elected this year by overwhelming majorities, so bold have the Republican leaders become in disclosing their devotion to private in preference to public interests. With them public office is anything but a public trust. Both United States senators—Foraker and Hanna,—who between them manage the state administration, are deeply interested in street car monopolies. These interests evidently come first in their consideration, and Hanna is candid enough to say so. In a newspaper interview at Columbus last week he declared:

"My street railway is my savings' bank. If I cannot look after my street railway interests and politics, too, I'll quit politics and look after my business alone."

This was said in connection with the use he is making at Columbus of his influence as a Republican senator and leader of his party in framing the new municipal code. He wants it framed in the interests of his street railroad, regardless of the interests of the people of the state or even the interests of his party.

Senator Hanna has become either so arrogant or so fatuous that he openly demands perpetual charters for street cars. Not indeterminate charters that can be terminated at any time by the cities, be it observed; but indeterminate charters which the cities can never terminate if the companies perform their agreement, and which they would be powerless to alter except at intervals of 10 or 15 years, and then only with the consent of the companies or by making a case upon which the courts could act.

Some idea of the indignation Mr. Hanna and his ring are awakening may be got from the following editorial extract from the Cleveland Press, an independent daily, having the largest circulation of any paper in northern Ohio, and being one of the Scripps' league of papers:

The corporation pirates of Ohio, led by that battle-scarred veteran of many a piratical cruise—Marcus A. Hanna—have raised their black flag of loot to the peak of their slippery decked craft, and, with guns shotted, are bearing down on the ship Ohio. "Perpetual street railway franchises" is the yell that floats across the waters from the pirate craft, as the bloodthirsty crew and captain brandish their knives and prepare for their devil's work. For years and years this ship, with its crew of corporation pirates, under the same captain, has cruised about, sinking a small craft here and looting another there, dividing the booty among its outlaw band. The craft has not always been recognizable. Sometimes it has been painted one color, sometimes another. Never before has it raised its black flag. Usually the stars and stripes have been prostituted for the purpose of deceiving the victim. But success after success has emboldened the pirates to a point of reckless disregard. No more deception! No more sailing under a false flag! No more stealing up on the doomed quarry under the cover of darkness. The big prize has been sighted by the lookout. Capt. Hanna takes his stand on the bridge. He orders the crew to man the guns. The black flag rises to the peak. "Full speed ahead!" jingles in the engine room. "Take that ship Ohio, loot her of all her treasure and give no quarter!" is the command that is carried from mouth to mouth along the deck. God help the ship Ohio and her crew and passengers unless they have listened to the many warnings and have prepared for this fight to the death.

As Mr. Roosevelt goes on, his sympathies with the trust magnates and monopoly interests generally becomes more obvious. Judging from his Fitchburg speech, ignorance of the subject is not improbably the mother of his sympathy; but whether from ignorance or design he certainly does not intend doing or suggesting anything that would interfere with these parasites. When he urged that it is "better that some people (the trusts)

should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough," he swapped good sense for a poor epigram. If the trusts do not prosper at other people's expense, it is nobody's business how much they prosper. The more the better. In that case, why is Mr. Roosevelt meddling with them at all? But if they do prosper at other people's expense it is absurd to say that it is better that they should prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough. Would Mr. Roosevelt say it is better for common thieves to prosper too much than that no one should prosper enough? We do him the justice of presuming he would not—not even if common thieves held the balance of power in his party. What Mr. Roosevelt ignores, thereby exposing his ignorance of the subject, is the point that the trust issue turns wholly upon the question of how the trusts get their wealth and not upon how much they get. If they get it without impoverishing other people, they should be encouraged. If they get it at the expense of other people, they should be condemned. Mr. Roosevelt's policy of trying to condemn them just enough to satisfy public feeling, but not enough to expose or weaken their plundering power, may be discreet but it isn't strenuous.

Sir Edmund Barton, the prime minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, who was in Washington last week, spoke freely of the coal strike and the trusts. To President Roosevelt, his words could not have been particularly grateful; for he said that the President could, if he would, end the coal strike and crush the trusts. Nor did this statesman from the antipodes have autocratic measures in mind, as might be suspected. On the contrary, he declared himself as opposed even to sending the military into the strike regions. This policy he regarded as pernicious, because it tends to lessen respect for civil authority. No more democratic view than that could be asked. It is his opinion that the English common law, as in force in

the United States, affords every needed opportunity for checking the aggressions of the coal trust, and that if the coal trust were checked the strike would end. But Sir Edmund Barton overlooks a point or two. In the first place, our Federal courts have no common law jurisdiction, except such as they have usurped to enable them to put down labor strikes; and in the second, President Roosevelt's attorney general and Candidate Roosevelt's friends in Wall street, upon whom he depends for campaign funds two years hence, don't want to crush the trusts. Mr. Roosevelt himself is as tender toward them as a schoolboy toward a nest of turtle's eggs which may possibly hatch out snakes.

The "Public Ownership Party" of Chicago, has wisely changed its name to the "Public Ownership League." As the organization is not a political party, and was never intended to be, its name was misleading, and the change became a necessity. This league is naming candidates for the Illinois legislature wherever there seems to be any hope of breaking the bi-partisan arrangement of the monopoly corporations. It is also endorsing party nominees who are opposed to these monopolies. One of the candidates whom it has so endorsed is Western Starr, the Democratic candidate for the state senate against John Humphrey, a corporation tool whom the Republicans have nominated in the Seventh Illinois district. Another is Frank E. Herdman, an independent Republican, who is running for the lower house against the corporation candidate in the same district. The leading candidate of the league distinctively is Clarence S. Darrow, whom it has nominated by petition for the lower house. With its change of name, which prevents misconception of its non-partisan but anti-monopoly character, the Public Ownership League should place in the next legislature of Illinois a group of men who may be depended upon to expose and fight and possibly thwart the monop-