

ciple of unionism, is to abandon the whole trade union scheme. Extremely ridiculous, therefore, is the pretense of "capitalists" who approve trade unionism and yet insist upon the "open" shop. To trade unionism it would be fatal to allow organized workmen to work with unorganized workmen in any establishment in which they were sufficiently well organized to prevent it.

"Prof." George Gunton has appeared upon the stump for Senator Hanna in the Ohio campaign. "Prof." Gunton is economist extraordinary and professor plenipotentiary to the plutocratic combines of the country. His appearance upon the Ohio stump is strictly "non-partisan." In fact he does not appear as a stump speaker at all. He appears as a "non-partisan" lecturer. His "bulletins" and leaflets also are "non-partisan." The whole thing was arranged for immediately after Tom L. Johnson's nomination. Senator Hanna arranged for it, quite in a "non-partisan" way.

This may be seen by reference to the following letter from Senator Hanna, if read in the light of the use "Prof." Gunton has made of it.

Cleveland, Ohio,
September, 4, 1903.
Professor George Gunton,
41 Union Square,
New York, N. Y.

My Dear Sir:

I have carefully considered your proposition with reference to educational work along the lines you have planned. I fully appreciate the benefit of such work and heartily endorse your proposition. It will give me pleasure to cooperate with and to assist you in the development of your ideas in this matter. With very best wishes, I remain truly yours,

M. A. Hanna.

With a remarkably good fac simile of that letter "Prof." Gunton is appealing to business men in even the most distant parts of the country for funds to help Senator Hanna's campaign in Ohio. Observe the kind of "educational work" that Mr. Hanna so heartily endorses and offers to assist, and note its deliciously "non-partisan" flavor. "Prof." Gunton ex-

plains it in a letter to selected business men (accompanying Senator Hanna's letter), which appeals to their "personal interest." A copy of his letter has been sent us by a business man, to whom "Prof." Gunton's "managing secretary" had sent it under the mistaken impression that this business man's "personal interest" could be appealed to with the usual effrontery. We quote the pertinent part of "Prof." Gunton's managing secretary's letter:

It is felt that the strong and convincing writings of President Gunton will be of great value in the present campaign in Ohio, and arrangements have been made to send many thousands of bulletins and leaflets into that State—directly into the hands of the voters. This, of course, will necessitate a large and extraordinary expense, and if you do not feel at this time prepared to cooperate with us to the extent of subscribing for a life membership which is fully explained in prospectus [\$100], we ask that you contribute in such an amount as you feel the proposition is worth to you and do so promptly in order that the work for the Ohio campaign may go forward with vigor and in the largest possible proportions. Make checks payable to George Gunton, President, and kindly remember that the greatest good will come from immediate and decisive action.

And so Senator Hanna's good "non-partisan" work in Ohio goes on, under the crafty management of the ingenious "Prof." Gunton; and the ship-subsidy goose hangs excitingly high.

Senator Hanna is a protectionist, yet he is working with might and main for ship subsidies. He says he wants more American ships. But why should a consistent protectionist want any ships?

While Senator Hanna was in Chicago in attendance upon the conference of the National Civic Federation, he learned of the ominous closing down of factories that has already begun in Ohio. One of the closers-down, an Ohio manufacturing friend of his, unfolded the news to him. Naturally enough Mr. Hanna was indignant. Had he not been telling the working people of Ohio that industrial disaster will not come so long as he and his party friends are kept in office? And here were

Ohio captains of industry recklessly bringing on industrial disaster in the very middle of an Ohio campaign, where so much depends upon fooling enough of the people yet a little longer. In his indignation Mr. Hanna turned upon his friend, and not without some bitterness of tone, pungently asked him: "Why couldn't you have waited until after election? Don't you realize that I have some interest in Ohio myself just now?" Mr. Hanna is evidently a good deal of a confidence man in politics. But he was not discreet enough on this occasion to speak easy.

The result of this campaign in Ohio will determine absolutely whether the present condition of prosperity is to continue or not." Did Mark Hanna say that? Are you sure? Will he guarantee that the conditions under which our prosperity labors are to be abolished if he is beaten? For the prosperity was all the trusts said it was, and more. The half was never told. The land wallowed in prosperity. Then the trusts put their conditions on it. Hanna has a condition, for instance, that every one who rides on a street car in Cleveland must pay him toll for use of the streets. Now that is a condition that will be removed if Johnson wins. But the trusts have imposed conditions of the tariff and other devices by which they get a quarter of the prosperity the country makes. Will that be eliminated if Johnson wins? Glory hallelujah! Hanna is like the fellow who proposed to a girl. "I'll buy you a washboard," he said, "and you can have half what you make." Hanna's condition of prosperity is that the people shall have all they make after the trusts have had their rake-off. Boundless, except a limit of two dollars a day. The amount the workers may earn is boundless; the amount they may get is the condition. And if he catches them murmuring he is going to take the washboard away. Thank God, the results of the Ohio campaign, this year or next, this century or next, shall

abolish the conditions Hanna and his sort have put upon prosperity.

Those Hannaistic newspapers which assume to see so much of the sensational in Tom L. Johnson's use of a circus tent for public meetings, something in which Hanna has been obliged to imitate him, and in his use of an automobile for getting out among the people of Ohio in his campaigning, are missing an opportunity to expose the most unique and sensational feature of his campaign. While they waste space in lurid descriptions of such commonplace things as circus tents and automobiles, Johnson's really picturesque performance escapes their attention. This is nothing less than carrying on a State campaign, against the most magnificent campaign fund ever contributed by corporation rings for a State election, and in a State which has for years been debauched with campaign money by leaders in both parties, yet without the use of money. Johnson is actually trying the experiment of trusting to the voters instead of the grafters for success. Could anything more picturesque, unique and sensational be conceived? Yet the sensation hunters for the newspapers are missing it all.

If Johnson were a poor man, there would be nothing very remarkable about his cashless campaign. But he is a rich man. If he were a close-fisted man, his cashless campaign might be attributed to penuriousness. But he is notoriously a free spender and generous to a fault. So there is no way of accounting for his cashless campaign except as a new dodge in politics. And that is what it is. Johnson is making no fight for a season and then to retire. He is making no fight for the governorship nor for the presidency. His fight is for a principle—the equal rights of men; and he is in the fight for life. What may happen this Fall, or next, these are only incidents. The important thing is to arouse the people themselves to a realization

of their condition and an understanding of what they must do; and that cannot be accomplished with campaign funds. So Johnson leaves campaign-fund politics to his adversaries. His appeals are to the conscience of the voters. Until he gets at that, the campaign fund will beat him, if it is big enough and judiciously distributed. But when he gets at that, campaign funds will be so much money wasted. This new kind of politics has won in Cleveland. It has yet to win in Ohio. Perhaps it will win in Ohio this year. If not, may be next year. If not then, there are other years to follow. Meanwhile Johnson has the satisfaction of knowing that his adversaries must keep their campaign funds up to the standard at every election, or be routed by their own indignant heelers at the first sign of shrinkage. The Ohio campaign is a contest between clean politics under Johnson's leadership, and boodle politics under Hanna, Foraker, Cox and McLean.

At the request of Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, Edward W. Bemis and Carl H. Nau, the latter a public accountant and both of them experts in statistical analysis, have prepared a detailed statement of the amount of tax dodging by railroads in Ohio, for the perpetuation of which Senator Hanna is now appealing to the people of that State. It is a valuable document. If the people of Ohio were aware of the condition it exposes, Johnson would be the next governor without another speech, and a great change would come over the political complexion of the legislature. It appears from this report that the railroads of Ohio are appraised for taxation at only 20 per cent. of their true value, whereas other kinds of property are taxed on 60 per cent., thus causing an aggregate loss to the various counties of \$4,484,416 in railroad taxes. Other taxpayers consequently pay 10 per cent. more than they ought to. The extra favors which Senator Hanna's followers give to railroads may be inferred from

the fact that those roads which pass through both Ohio and Indiana are taxed hardly half as much per mile in the former as in the latter State.

When it is considered that in the estimation of the plutocratic press the free silver question has long been regarded as a dead issue and Mr. Bryan as a leader without a following, the dust it is kicking up over Mr. Bryan's reported abandonment of the free silver idea is decidedly entertaining. The report is absurd to any one at all familiar with Mr. Bryan's position on the money question. Yet his published denial was necessary, perhaps, to neutralize the effect upon public opinion of the jubilations of newspapers that are much more at home with diatribes, when they discuss Mr. Bryan, than with the financial doctrines they pretend to criticize.

A single tax man of Baltimore, Mr. John Salmon, expresses no little surprise that Senator Hanna's candidate for governor of Ohio supposes that the single tax has been a disastrous failure wherever tried. Of Mr. Herrick and his notion Mr. Salmon writes:

This stamps him as being a twisted thinker and a loose observer. The single tax is in operation all over the United States, flowing into the pockets of private individuals, which is what single taxers object to. Here in Baltimore more than in any other section of the country, it is strongly apparent. We have the ground rent system in operation, 90 per cent. of the real estate being held on leaseholds. The custom is an old English one grafted on the Maryland colonies by Lord Baltimore and his English compeers, and it has grown and flourished like a green bay tree. When one buys a home here it is in nine cases out of ten subject to a ground rent. These ground rents are dealt in as a form of investment the same as a mortgage or any other form of investment; but the point to observe is that they are a single tax, pure and simple, the price paid for the use of the ground per se and for ground only.

Our last assessment separated the value of land from the value of improvements, and it is done every day in our community. Baltimore has more houses per capita than any city in the country, due to the ground rent system; and a house costing \$1,200 to build is very often sold for \$800 or \$900 in order to