

for forty-one consecutive days, as in 1878, or rains for seven consecutive weeks, as in 1884."

Many of the greatest farms have been entirely denuded of trees, and the laborers are obliged to buy or steal fuel.

The corn land is worked only every third year to save fertilizing.

The regular population of a Roman farm consists of a massaro, or manager-in-chief, of three or four cowboys, of three or four shepherds, of a few plowmen, and of one or two cartmen, who carry the milk to the city in the early morning and come back in the cool of the evening with provisions.

"The hired hands [harvest hands], like the cattle, have no shelter in the farm buildings. They sleep in caves or in huts, or under a tent, or in the open air, and they furnish, therefore, a considerable percentage of the general death rate of the country."

The rents have all gone to a small number of people during those two thousand years, and now the laborer on the land must steal his fuel, or go without, and is reduced to the alternative of sleeping in the open air, or in a cave, or of looking elsewhere for a job; which is to say that he must accept whatever the landlord may choose to give, or die. For it is certain that he would take a better job elsewhere if he could get it.

In that fertile territory, in the heart of the Old World, pasturage and sheep prevail, while agriculture and human population decline.

The Italian government has been trying to improve conditions in the Campagna, and has divided up great farms among the peasantry. Prof. Lanciani says that the landlords do not get half the income from the land under this plan that they did before, and that "experienced colonists from Lombardy have been put in charge of some of the farms to ascertain if it is possible to improve the state of the Campagna without undue injury to the interests of the landed proprietors."

The landlords have exercised their power to take everything hitherto, whether that everything was little or much. By the introduction of the Lombardy colo-

nists, it is no doubt confidently believed that conditions will be greatly improved, without having recourse to so harsh an expedient as interfering with the landlord's power to take everything, as heretofore! This may be "historical" sociology, but it certainly is not economic science.

Remember, Prof. Lanciani says that: "Since the days of the Empire the state and condition of the Campagna have only altered for the worse." If any advantage from any source whatever has arisen, then, the landlords have appropriated it—and more too. Which means, of course, that if any advantage arises from the introduction of the Lombardy colonists the landlords will not appropriate that! So thinks the learned professor.

Thus we perceive that "neither safe inference nor sound action can be built upon" the theory that rent tends increasingly to absorb the produce of human industry! Do we or do we not?

"The most interesting result of this campaign," Prof. Lanciani further observes, "has been the colonization of the once pestilential swamps of Ostia by a band of socialists, who have become models of thrift, order and propriety since the late King Humbert gave them the means of acquiring possession of the lands which they had rescued and drained with their own hands."

Now, at the risk of incurring the contempt of the "historical" economist, I confess that I deduce, from the Ricardian law of rent, that but for the intervention of King Humbert the landlords would have reaped the benefits of the improvements made by the peasants in this case, as in all others in that territory.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

OHIO.

Columbus, O., June 1.—I think I am able now to make you a fair statement regarding the principal happenings at the Democratic convention of last week, and about which the papers of Ohio are not yet through speculating.

To begin with, the reactionaries had a majority of the delegates. They are likely, too, to control the Ohio delegation at the national convention, al-

though this is not certain. Notwithstanding their majority in the State convention, however, they were so badly managed that the radicals under Mayor Johnson fairly beat them on two distinct and important contests.

One was the nomination of A. P. Sandles for secretary of state. Mr. Sandles is an out and out radical, who has always been with the Johnson faction, and who is likely to dominate the party organization against the interest of the reactionaries. He was nominated in a contest against a reactionary.

More significant even than this was the contest regarding the railroad ring. This ring had influenced the committee on resolutions to keep out of the platform the demands for 2-cent per-mile railroad fares, prohibition of railroad passes, and equitable taxation of railroads. It was plausibly argued that as no legislature was to be elected this year those questions ought to be ignored by the convention. Mayor Johnson did not think so, and making a test of one of the demands, that for reducing fares to two cents, he started a contest on the floor of the convention, and greatly to the chagrin of the reactionaries he won.

It is evident that if Mr. Johnson had made any fight at the primaries for delegates, he could have controlled the convention. But he had decided not to do this, and his friends now say that he does not regret that decision. They do not regard his temporary loss of control, which they look upon as more apparent than real, as a calamity at this time. On the contrary, they believe that the principles he is fighting for will soon stand out all the more clearly for this seeming eclipse.

The most sensational thing regarding Johnson's relation to the convention is the story, which is persistently published, that a break has occurred between him and his political lieutenant—Charles P. Salen. There is just enough truth in the reported facts to make the story plausible.

Salen is not Johnson's kind of politician. Whereas Johnson is frank in all he does and says, depending upon the essential honesty and common sense of the people in the long run, Salen is a politician of the machine type who believes in heelers and combinations rather than political principles for effectiveness in winning political battles, and who has not the patience to court present defeat for the sake of future victory. But Salen is a skillful manager, in whose personal probity and loyalty to the radical principles of democracy Johnson has had implicit confidence, notwithstanding his unwisdom at times as to methods. Many of Johnson's supporters have never shared his confidence in Salen, and when they found him lobbying here

last Winter with a Republican legislature to prevent the repeal of a Republican law making county offices fee offices instead of salaried offices, they were confirmed in their distrust; for Salen, as county clerk of Cuyahoga, is in receipt under the fee system of perhaps \$40,000 a year, and Johnson is known to be strongly opposed to that system.

It was easy, therefore, for Johnson's friends to believe that a breach had occurred when they found Salen at the convention last week opposing radical contests and in some cases apparently denying Johnson. And when Salen instead of Johnson was elected as one of the four delegates at large to the national convention, the newspaper men generally jumped to the conclusion that this meant war between the two, and they have ever since been spreading irritating gossip about the matter.

The main facts are very clear. Johnson was not a candidate for delegate-at-large to the national convention. He and Clarke, who had been the party candidate for U. S. Senator, had agreed weeks before that it would not be good policy for them to go upon the delegation at large, and both refused to be candidates. They did become candidates, however, for district delegates to the national convention and both were elected by the 21st district convention. Salen also was elected as a district delegate, by the convention of his own district, the 20th. It is true furthermore that Johnson opposed Salen's becoming a candidate for delegate at large, which Salen did not do publicly until the State convention met. But Johnson's opposition appears to have been only advisory, on grounds of wise policy, and was not improbably prompted by the fact that Salen had fallen under suspicion of having made a corrupt compromise with Bernard, the Cincinnati boss and McLean's lieutenant. In the face of this suspicion Salen's candidacy was certainly well calculated to bring both himself and Johnson under suspicion of making the kind of deals that Johnson is opposed to. But Johnson threw no arbitrary obstacles in Salen's way. He acted against him frankly as a fellow delegate and not arbitrarily as a boss. It is becoming better known that Johnson never does act as a boss. He controls his honest following by advice and argument; and as to the dishonest, he refuses, when convinced of their dishonesty, to cooperate with them either openly or secretly. What Johnson did regarding Salen's candidacy was simply to lay the matter candidly before the Cuyahoga delegation. Telling them of the situation, he advised them that they need not oppose Salen's candidacy on any such theory as that it was a personal affront to him, for both he and Clarke had been urged to become

candidates and had persistently refused. So far, therefore, as he was personally concerned, the field was open to Salen. But he also advised them that he thought Salen's candidacy bad policy. I am assured that Johnson could have carried the delegation unanimously for himself, but as between Salen and an outsider, a considerable majority were for Salen. The minority were still for following Johnson's advice; but, as I am informed, Johnson suggested that they vote in the convention with their colleagues in order to prevent ill-feeling in the delegation. He and Clarke, however, voted against Salen, in protest, as Johnson explained at the time, against what they regarded as Salen's doubtful policy. Johnson moreover nominated and supported Jephtha Gerrard, of Cincinnati, a radical of the Bigelow wing of the party in that city.

The belief among Johnson's friends that Salen had made a bargain with the reactionaries, through "Boss" Bernard of Cincinnati and "Boss" Ross of Columbus, to secure a place for himself as delegate at large in return for using his influence against seating radical delegations, especially those from Cincinnati and Columbus, made his candidacy and his attitude toward those delegations particularly exasperating to Johnson's radical friends. This belief, while natural enough under the circumstances, seems upon the surface to have been unfounded, for both the Bernard and the Ross delegations, except five of the latter, voted on the floor against Salen for delegate at large. It is probably true, nevertheless, that Salen did lend aid and comfort to the reactionary delegations from those cities when their seats were contested.

From Cincinnati the reactionary delegation's seats were contested by Bigelow's radical delegation, and from Columbus the contestants were led by John J. Lentz. The Cincinnati contest appears to have been weakly supported with evidence, although it is a moral certainty that the contestants had been cheated by a combination between Bernard and the Republican boss, Cox. In point of evidence the Columbus contestants' case was much stronger. Mayor Johnson became satisfied that they ought to be seated, and although it is well known that he and Lentz are not friendly, he accordingly supported them. The credentials committee gave the seats to the contestants and Johnson secured the entire Cuyahoga delegation in support of that action. This was done against Salen's urgent opposition. In the Cincinnati case the committee had reported adversely to Bigelow, and nothing could be done to reverse that report.

Although these circumstances do indicate the possibility of Salen's having made an arrangement with the reactionaries, the strong probabilities are

that it was less objectionable considerations that influenced him to oppose the Lentz and Bigelow contests, and that bad judgment prompted by personal ambition caused him to ignore Johnson's advice as to the place of delegate at large.

One thing is certain. Johnson's friends know that he would have tolerated no deal with the reactionaries. Four years ago he declared that clean and effective politics in the Democratic party of Ohio demanded the expulsion of McLean from power in the party, and the overthrow of his Cincinnati ring which operates in collusion with the Republican ring. He has not yet been able to accomplish this. McLean may even get the national committee-manship for which he is planning. But Johnson has not abandoned the effort to make his party in Ohio represent principle instead of spoils and plunder. It is freely stated that he declared here during the convention that he had countenanced no bargain with the ring and would rather lose everything than do so; and whoever knows him well enough to understand his faith in clean and candid political methods realizes that he would rather break with any of his supporters than to wink at corrupt bargains.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 2.

The bloodiest battle of the Russo-Japanese war (p. 118) and one of the fiercest of modern times was fought on the 26th from Kinchow to the crest of Nanshan hill, the strongest of the outer land-defenses of Port Arthur.

Upon their double landing near Kinchow three weeks ago (p. 87) the Japanese advanced upon Kinchow, beginning their attack on the 21st. After taking it on the 26th they proceeded along the Russian railway toward Port Arthur, 32 miles to the south, and upon reaching Nanshan hill the same day they became engaged in the fearful conflict which is reported as making this day's battle the fiercest of modern times. Nanshan hill commands the very narrow neck of land just south of Kinchow and is 1,100 feet high. The Russians had covered the top with heavy guns and guarded the slopes with trenches, entangling wires and explosive mines. They believed their position to be impregnable. Up these slopes the Jap-