

least it is supposed to be civilization. While some people in Rhode Island are allowed to appropriate public revenues as if they were their own, others must go to jail for not paying a poll tax. And what is the poll tax? It is a tax for permission to live—to live, that is, outside of jail. It is twin sister to the business license tax. One is a tax for existing; the other is a tax for working. Wouldn't it be much more sensible to make valuable monopolies the source of public revenues, and allow the right to live and the right to work to go untaxed?

The military outing along the coast of Maine, where a war game for "points" has been in progress, is properly condemned by the Universal Peace Union as farcical and expensive. This game is another imitation of the sports of the war lords of Europe, and about as useful for military purposes as baseball in a back lot or chess in a back room.

The price of candy has been raised in England. This is due to the abolition of the sugar bounties. Heretofore German sugar producers have furnished the Scottish confectioners with sugar at less than cost. They were able to do so because the German government has paid a bounty for sugar exports. Consequently British children got cheap candy at the expense of German taxpayers. Thus did Germany "invade" the British sugar market. It was quite a sensible arrangement, don't you think?

#### THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN OHIO

To understand the present political situation in Ohio it is necessary to go back in thought almost three years, to the time when Tom L. Johnson publicly announced his intention (vol. iii, p. 658) of devoting the remainder of his life to the service of radical democracy. This occasion marked the beginning of a new order of things in the politics of the Buckeye State.

##### I.

Prior to that time Johnson had taken an interest in politics, not unlike the interest of most rich men who turn to politics instead

of yachting or horse racing for their recreation. The resemblance, however, was only superficial. Johnson had a higher purpose than recreation and a deeper interest than excitement.

As far back as 1884 he became an enthusiastic disciple of Henry George; and since 1886 he has been a leader of wider than national fame in the great democratic movement that derived its impulse from George's work and which bears the label of "the single tax."

Along with Thomas G. Shearman, Johnson contributed nearly all the fund, above the penny collections at mass meetings, which made the George mayoralty campaign of 1886 in New York a possibility; and he participated both in person and with financial contributions in the George mayoralty campaign of 1897. He joined, moreover, with August Lewis, in providing means—without solicitation, as George says in his dedication to these two long-time friends of his—whereby George could devote himself to the writing of his last great book, "The Science of Political Economy."

In numerous other ways Johnson has, for nearly two decades, financially promoted the cause of which Henry George was leader, and rendered it even greater service by his words and work—for he is no perfunctory adherent of this cause. He is grounded in it thoroughly, and expounds it clearly and accurately.

It was at George's urgent request that Johnson plunged into the democratic politics of the Twenty-first Congressional district of Ohio in 1888. As the Democratic candidate for Congress that year he contested this Congressional seat without the slightest effort at concealment of his radical economic views. Not only did he not conceal; he publicly avowed. A single taxer, he was, of course, a free trader; and his campaign was made upon absolute free trade grounds.

He was opposed not alone by Republican leaders and Republican campaign touters, but also by the moss-backs and soreheads and spoilsmen of the local Democratic machine whom he had defeated at the Democratic primaries. They seized upon his

avowed free trade and single tax principles, and professing to be protectionists, or tariff reformers with incidental protection, or society savers, they united with the Republican machine to defeat him at the polls. This was his first fight, and the protection sentiment in his district—represented at the preceding term by a protection Democrat—was too strong for a radical and candid free trader immediately to overcome. It was the year also of President Cleveland's defeat for a second term of the presidency.

But Johnson has never been a "quitter," either in business projects or political conflicts. In 1890 he went again before the Democratic primaries; and, again defeating the unprincipled elements of his own party, he was for the second time nominated as the Democratic candidate for Congress.

It was in this campaign that his adversaries learned the wisdom of shunning invitations to debate with him. He accepted the challenge of his opponent, a distinguished public speaker, and though he used none of the arts and scrupulously avoided all the bitternesses of debate, depending entirely upon a plain and sensible presentation of his cause, his triumph in the debate was not only claimed by his friends but acknowledged by his adversaries.

He has never since been challenged by Republican adversaries, and in none of his subsequent campaigns has he been able to secure an acceptance of his challenges to them.

In this contest, also, Johnson went before the people with the same candor that has characterized all his campaigning, and which the uncandid find it so difficult to understand. He was elected by a vote of 17,646 to 14,256—a plurality of 3,390 and a clear majority over all of 2,953.

At the next Congressional election Johnson was reelected, under circumstances quite similar, though by a slightly reduced plurality. Owing to a larger side party vote, his majority over all was considerably reduced. His vote was 17,389 and his Republican adversary's 14,165, the side

party vote being in the aggregate 1,019.

His third campaign was notable for the same candor he had shown in the others. It was characterized, also, both at the primaries and at the polls, by the same opposition of Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoilsmen which he had met in 1888 and 1890.

Johnson's record of four years in Congress was of the highest order.

He delivered from the floor two or three speeches of the first class. He secured the adoption of George's "Protection or Free Trade" as a public document of the United States. He voted with five others for the single tax bill. He maintained a steady and intelligent opposition to the Gorman ring in their emasculation of the Wilson bill in the interest of the Sugar Trust. He stood out against both the Sugar Trust and the Steel Trust. And he placed upon record, from the committee on the District of Columbia, in which an unsympathetic Speaker had tried to smother him, a report on taxation which is a model of fiscal investigation and cannot fail to serve a most useful purpose at no distant time.

Among Johnson's acts in Congress to which attention should be specially recalled, was his refusal to play the demagogue by voting, against his free trade convictions, for a tariff on cloaks, to please a labor union of his city which demanded it. Instead of complying, he responded in a statesmanlike letter,—not in the usual paternal spirit of such letters to workmen, but as man to man—plainly expressing his own convictions and freely explaining to the cloak union the injury to themselves and their fellow laborers which tariff protection invariably produces.

On the money question, while he refused to vote in favor of digging up silver from a hole in the ground in the Rocky Mountains only to bury it in a hole in the ground at Washington, Johnson consistently opposed money monopoly. He was the author and supporter of the bill for supplying an elastic currency by making interest-bearing bonds readily in-

terchangeable with non-interest-bearing notes. His position on the money question, therefore, was more like that of a greenbacker than that of a bimetallist. In other words, while he did not regard bimetallism as the best safeguard against money monopoly, he opposed money monopoly none the less strenuously, as well as monopoly of every other kind.

Perhaps the most striking incident in Johnson's Congressional career was his famous reply, in debate on the floor, to a Republican protectionist member who especially represented the Steel Trust. Johnson was opposing the tariff on steel, a large product of his own private business, when this member accused him of inconsistency for taking profits of the steel tariff as a business man while voting against the steel tariff as a member of Congress. Johnson's reply was a sharp declaration of his own invincible position and a startling indictment of the trust attorneys in Congress. "As a business man," he exclaimed, "I will take advantage of all the bad laws that you put upon the statute books; but as a member of Congress I will not defend them, and I will repeal them if I can."

Milk-sop moralists criticise that position. With a peculiar notion of civic morals they seem to think a public man ought either, in private life, to keep out of all businesses upon which the law confers unjust privileges, or else, in public life, to stand loyally by the bad laws and plundering policies that support his unjust privileges. It appears to be their idea that beneficiaries of monopolies are entitled to good moral standing only as they, as citizens, vote for the servants of monopolists, and, as legislators, support monopoly laws. Johnson's morality is not of this "hog wash" order. He believes that it is as voters and public servants, and not as business men (excepting business men who bribe or otherwise improperly influence voters and public servants) that citizens are responsible for monopoly laws.

There is virility in civic morals of that type. Out of the other kind comes nothing but that peculiarly repulsive respectability

which analyzes into Sunday piety and week-day plundering.

Johnson's fourth campaign for Congress was as candidly conducted as the others had been. This time also he successfully opposed the Democratic moss-backs, soreheads, and spoilsmen at the primaries, and met their treachery at the polls. But he never flinched in his principles.

A few extracts from one of his campaign documents will illustrate the candor of his campaigning methods:

The foreign goods that compete with the goods of our manufacturers and trusts are heavily taxed at the custom house, but foreign laborers are admitted free of duty.

The present hard times have been felt all over the world, in countries of low tariffs and high tariffs; countries with little money and those with plenty of money; in monarchies and in republics. The real cause cannot be tariffs, or money, or form of government; it is something that we find everywhere—the monopoly of land, the source of all production.

Tariffs only make monopolists richer. Free trade will lead to the single tax. The single tax will abolish all monopoly.

Protection is not a theory; it is a swindle.

Free trade—real free trade—means free production, for trade is but a branch of production. Free trade in its true sense means free access to land, the source of all production. How shall we make land accessible to all? By taxing out the dogs in the manger who hold building lots vacant, mines, factory sites, and millions of acres of lumber lands, and farming sites, and prevent others from using them.

The candor of these declarations furnished Johnson's adversaries an opportunity, of course, to arouse ignorant prejudice. Not so good a one, however, as his single tax ideas may afford them this year, when the prejudices of the farmer can be played upon; for Johnson's Congressional district was in a city crowded with object lessons in land monopoly—crowded much more with such object lessons than with buildings.

Johnson's compact and conclusive answer to the demagogical appeal of his adversaries to farmers, will be found farther on in this editorial. Our present concern is with the Congressional election of 1894.

Though defeated at the polls

in this his fourth campaign, Johnson was clearly not at fault. Neither he nor his cause was weak. He polled 13,260 votes to 17,968 for his principal adversary, who had a plurality of 4,708, but a clear majority of only 2,275—698 less than Johnson's of four years before.

The cause of Johnson's defeat was evidently the unpopularity, all over the country, of Cleveland's administration. For this reason the Democratic vote everywhere, as well as in Johnson's district, had collapsed (vol. v, p. 177; vol. vi, p. 65), the Democratic representatives in Congress being reduced from 219 to 93, and a Democratic majority of 41 in the House being wiped out by a Republican majority of 74. Ohio was lost to the Democrats that year by a Republican majority of 137,000. Johnson went down with his party.

From that time until three years ago Johnson was neither a candidate nor a leader in politics. He went as a delegate to the Democratic national convention in 1896, as he had in 1892. He voted for Bryan in the Ohio delegation, but the unit rule nullified his vote in the convention. In the campaign he supported Bryan because in Bryan he saw a national leader against financial monopoly, a pronounced free trader, and the popular exponent in our time, as Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln had been in theirs, of radical democracy. In these views and this course of conduct Johnson was in full accord with Henry George.

For the same reason he supported Bryan in 1900, both at the convention and in the campaign. The issue of imperialism then bound him even closer than before to Bryan's democratic leadership.

But the tidal wave against President Cleveland's administration, which had gathered force in 1894, was resistless in Ohio. The Republican plurality in the whole State rose from only 1,072 to 80,995 for governor in 1893 and 137,087 for secretary of state in 1894. In 1895 it fell again, but only to 92,622; and in 1896 Bryan reduced it to 47,497. Under the influence

of the Bryan wave of sentiment it dropped to 28,165 for governor in 1897, but rose for secretary of state in 1898 to 61,139, and dropped back as far as 49,023 in the vote for governor in 1899. In the presidential year of 1900 it went up to 69,036, and fell only to 67,567 for governor in 1901.

A similar collapse of Democratic strength had taken place in Johnson's Congressional district; and Cuyahoga county became more hopelessly Republican than ever; while in the city of Cleveland both political parties were controlled by spoilsmen who were mortgaged to the public service corporations.

The city was normally a Republican stronghold. But a faction fight between the Republicans let into the mayor's office in 1899 the Early administration, nominally Democratic, but really an ally of the Hanna Republicans and a creature and tool of the public corporations. Democracy of the Jeffersonian type was dead in Cleveland and the corporations were enthroned.

Such was the condition of Ohio politics in the early winter of 1900-1, when, as stated above, Tom L. Johnson announced his intention of devoting the remainder of his life to the service of radical democracy.

## II.

The announcement was made in a speech at the Jackson day banquet in Cleveland. Johnson had succeeded in relieving himself of all business responsibilities, and in so securing his fortune that the trust magnates could not cripple his powers as a public man by playing pitch and toss with his property interests in the great game in Wall street. Freed of anxiety over the conspiracies of political and private enemies, and of the necessity for devoting his energies to private affairs, he entered at once upon a campaign for lower street car fares in Cleveland, with ultimate municipal ownership and operation. When the municipal campaign was about to begin in the Spring of 1901, Johnson was solicited by a large representation of local democratic Democrats to allow the use of his name as the Democratic candidate for mayor. The rest is pretty well known, and

need be only briefly referred to here.

In a Republican city; opposed by both Republican factions; opposed as usual by the moss-backs and spoilsmen of his own party, who were intrenched in the city hall and in control of the Democratic city committee; and without the use of "boodle," but by the same kind of direct and candid appeals to the people which had characterized his Congressional campaigns of ten years before, he was elected mayor of Cleveland by 6,000 majority.

Then began a fight against the privileges of public corporations, defended by spoilsmen of both parties. This fight came so near to success that nothing availed to check it, but the overturning of the city charter by the Supreme Court, which was done upon the application of the attorney general with whom Senator Hanna had displaced Attorney General Monett. Mr. Monett had proved faithful to the State, though tempted by a rich bribe from the Standard Oil Trust, and was therefore unavailable for renomination by the Republican machine. With the Cleveland charter smashed, Mayor Johnson could proceed no further against the privileges of the Cleveland public service corporations without the consent of the Supreme Court of the State, and that body insisted upon the status quo.

It was the same way with Mayor Johnson's crusade for the equalization of taxes. The big corporations and rich real estate owners were shielded at the expense of the small home owners and farmers, and Johnson's efforts to expose them were held in check.

When the Republican legislature, controlled by Senator Hanna, of Cleveland, and Boss Cox, of Cincinnati, who were aided and abetted by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoilsmen—when this body had made a new charter for Cleveland, its work turned out to have been constructed especially in the interest of the privileged corporations, with reference both to street franchises and to taxes. But if Johnson could not yet overcome the ring of corporations and "grafters" politicians, he could get the

ear of the people of Cleveland. His success in this respect is phenomenal, and the spoils politicians are amazed by it.

Six months after his election as mayor in 1901, he had elected a delegation to the legislature from Cuyahoga county, which was composed of men of exceptional ability and integrity, as the event proved. All of them were democratic-Democrats. So with the county officers. For the first time since the civil war Cuyahoga county went Democratic. Some difficulty had been experienced because two or three of the candidates had voted for Palmer and Buckner in 1896, and were, therefore, persona non grata to many of Johnson's own supporters. But Johnson knew his men and the genuineness of their democracy is not to-day distrusted by a genuine Bryan Democrat in Cuyahoga county.

In the following Spring, 1902, Johnson won his second victory in Cleveland against the Republican machine combined with or treacherously served by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and spoils-men. He won his second election in the county in the following Fall—one year ago. Even the State ticket carried the county in this year of 1902.

It was the first year in which Johnson had begun to play a leading hand in State politics. With Herbert S. Bigelow, the candidate for secretary of state, he campaigned the State as well as time permitted. In the northern counties, where he was best known and had been able to reach the people, the Democratic vote was increased by 10,000. But in the Cincinnati region the machinery of the party was wholly against Johnson. It was controlled by Bernard, the Democratic "boss," and used in the interest of Coxe, the Republican "boss." The consequent increased Republican pluralities in that region were enough in themselves to raise the Republican plurality in the State from 67,567 to 90,465—about 10,000 higher than in 1893 though nearly 50,000 lower than in 1894. Measured superficially in figures, this campaign was as a whole a failure. But properly understood, it has made an excel-

lent starting point for the campaign of the present year.

By the time Johnson had finished his local campaigns of 1902, with two splendid victories to his credit, the once favorite cry against him that "Tom Johnson ain't sincere!" had worn itself out. Not only had Johnson won the Republican county of Cuyahoga and its Republican city of Cleveland completely over to democratic-Democracy, but he had proved faithful to every pledge; and the people had acquired such confidence in his candor and fidelity that they were now inclined to look with suspicion upon any man in Cleveland who said, "Tom Johnson ain't sincere." The question at once occurred, as it still does when any man proclaims now that "Tom Johnson ain't sincere,"—this very significant question, "What graft of that man's has Tom L. Johnson spoilt?"

So strong was the popular feeling of confidence in Johnson last Spring that Senator Hanna's candidate for mayor, regarded as one of Cleveland's ablest lawyers, especially great as a maritime practitioner, was defeated by Johnson by 6,000 majority. Yet Hanna's candidate had the support of a united Republican party machine, of an energetic lot of "labor skates," of a collection of Democratic moss-backs, soreheads and disappointed spoils-men, and of all the privileged corporations, with their ramifications of influence throughout the State and the country and even into the heart of Wall street. In the Fall it had been said that Johnson was snowed under; but in the Spring the snow melted.

The conflict which democratic-Democracy has thus for nearly three years waged successfully in Cuyahoga county, under Johnson's leadership, now extends over the State of Ohio. The battlefield is enlarged, but the leaders and what they fight for are the same.

### III.

In this Ohio struggle, upon which the attention of the country is centered, the combination of privileged corporations and local Republican leadership is di-

rected by Marcus A. Hanna, of Cleveland.

Himself the nominated candidate for United States senator, Senator Hanna has chosen for his gubernatorial candidate Myron T. Herrick, also of Cleveland. Both are deeply concerned in the profits of privileged monopolies; and both believe so firmly in the sanctity of privilege, that they are committed to the perpetuation of the laws that take from the many to give to the few. They are monopolists in their business connections, and conservators of monopoly in their political principles and conduct.

Opposed to Herrick with reference to candidacy, but to Hanna with reference to leadership, is Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland. He is supported by John H. Clarke, as Mr. Hanna's candidatorial adversary; and Mr. Clarke also is of Cleveland. Though a monopolist in property interests, Johnson has for nearly twenty years demonstrated by the severest tests his hostility as a citizen and public official to the principle of monopoly and to all monopoly laws. Clarke stands upon the same platform. It has been said of him that he is a lawyer for a railroad. That is hardly a good reason for rejecting him in favor of Hanna. But Clarke holds his democracy in higher esteem than his job, which is an excellent reason for rejecting Hanna in favor of Clarke.

Thus equipped with Cleveland candidates, the democratic-Democracy and the corporation Republicanism of Ohio go forth from Cleveland to carry the warfare of democracy versus plutocracy over the State.

In five tremendous contests in Cleveland, corporation Republicanism has gone down in overwhelming defeat before the democratic-Democracy under the leadership of Mayor Johnson. If this experience may be regarded as furnishing a guide to prophecy, it indicates that Johnson will defeat Senator Hanna as disastrously in the State as he has repeatedly defeated him at home.

### IV.

In considering the possibilities of such an outcome, the great Republican majority in the State seems like an impassable barrier

to Johnson's advance. With a plurality in 1902 of 90,465 against the Democratic candidate for secretary of state, and 67,567 in 1901 against the Democratic candidate for governor, the outlook for complete success is discouraging. A change of 4½ per cent. in the vote for governor in 1901 and of 6 per cent. in that for secretary of state in 1902 is necessary to elect Johnson governor. Yet such changes in percentage, when there is a revolution in sentiment, are possible.

In his State campaign Johnson will be opposed by the Democratic reactionaries because he supports Bryan. But he was opposed by them in Cleveland, and he has won there.

He will be opposed by some silver men because, when a thorough-going Bryan man disappointed him at the last minute as candidate for Senator, he threw his influence to one of his ablest and most faithful lieutenants in Cleveland, a democratic-Democrat who had voted against Bryan in 1896 but for him in 1900, and who stands upon the unmistakably democratic platform of the Ohio convention. But Johnson was opposed by some silver men in Cleveland for practically the same reason and under practically the same circumstances. Yet he won.

He will be opposed by Democratic moss-backs, soreheads, disappointed candidates and hopeless spoilsmen, and the Republican press will exploit their opposition. But he has won in Cleveland in spite of the same kind of opposition there.

Will the discarded Bernard ruin Johnson's chances in Hamilton county? Possibly. But Bernard's facilities as an outcast from the Hamilton county Democratic organization this year, will be much narrower than they were when he was at the head of the organization a year ago.

Let it be remembered, however, that these are not the only considerations. Johnson and Clarke, and their Democratic coadjutors throughout the State are preparing to campaign the State as they have campaigned the city of Cleveland and the county of Cuyahoga.

They will go to well-meaning Republican voters and well-meaning Democrats alike, presenting the cause they stand for and doing it as man to man. They will show that Herrick and Hanna are the candidates of privileged corporations, while Johnson and Clarke stand for the abolition of all legal privileges. They will go to the people in village and hamlet and highway, instead of waiting for the people to come to them in opera houses or door yards and at the end of a palace car. And they will challenge their adversaries to debate, and courteously answer questions from the people.

Two months of such campaigning will be apt to "take the tucker out" of the campaign for corporate privileges which the Republican machine is to make in Ohio under the mask of a national campaign when no national issues are at stake.

Of course Johnson's plan of campaign will expose him to nagging questions in agricultural districts about his belief in the single tax, which is supposed to be very objectionable to farmers.

But Johnson has met that kind of demagoguery already, and most effectively. In one of his Cuyahoga county campaigns a year or two ago it was resorted to when he spoke in the farming regions bordering upon Cleveland. His answer never failed to command the attention and secure the sympathy of his farmer audiences. We give it as reported on one of these occasions.

After Mayor Johnson had spoken on this occasion on State and county issues, a venerable farmer said: "I have a suspicion, from what I read in the papers, that Mayor Johnson desires to place all taxes on land. Is this correct?" Some one else in the audience then called out: "Tell us about the single tax." Replying to his elderly questioner, Mayor Johnson answered:

Most emphatically, No! But if you mean that I have a desire to place all taxes on land values, I answer most decidedly, Yes!

If you want to hear about the single tax, I will stay with you and let my tent meeting in the city wait, while I say that if it were not for this idea, called single tax, I would not be here to-night. This is the rea-

son that I am making the fight which we are now in.

A tax on land would be an unjust and iniquitous system, but a tax on land values would be the best and fairest system that the world has ever known. Laws which would bring about the taxation of land values would be of more service to humanity than any legislation ever yet enacted.

Farmers are large owners of land, but not of land values. We have land in our city that sells at the rate of \$5,000,000 per acre; have any of you farmers land as valuable as that? In New York city there is land that sells for \$15,000,000 per acre; is there any land in this neighborhood at that price?

To answer my friend's question, I will relate a little talk I had one day with Congressman Pierson, of Tuscarawas county, when we were in Washington together. Pierson was a farmer and he said to me one day:

"Tom, I can't go your single tax. It would be a hardship on the farmers, and they already have more than their share of the burden of taxation."

I replied: "Look here, Pierson, if I thought the single tax would increase the farmers' burden, I would not stand for it for one minute. If I did not know it would be the greatest blessing to the farmers and to the workingmen in the city as well, I never would advocate it again. But I can show you that the single tax will lighten the farmers' burden as compared with the present method. Let me ask you some questions, to see if we can get at the facts in the matter. How much, Mr. Pierson, of the present tax burden do you think the farmers bear?"

"Well," he answered, "the farmers constitute over half the population of the United States, and I should say that they pay at least 60 per cent. of all taxes."

"Very well, let's call it 50 per cent. to be safe."

"No, no," said Pierson, "that's too low. They pay more than 60 per cent., rather than less."

"All right, but to be safe, let's call it 50 per cent. Now, Mr. Pierson, I want you to tell me how much of the value of land the farmers have in the United States? Please take into consideration all the valuable coal lands, the iron, silver, gold, copper and other valuable mines—the water power privileges, the railroad rights of way and terminals, including street railroads, telephones and telegraphs, for these are built on the most valuable lands; all the gas and electric lighting rights of way, built on land of great value; all the city lots, some of which are worth more than a whole county of farming land. I want you to take all these into consideration, and then tell me how much of these values in the United States the farmers have."

Mr. Pierson replied: "Well, I



should say, less than five per cent."

I said: "Call it ten per cent. to be safe."

"Oh, no, no; that's entirely too high; that's double."

"Well, we will call it ten per cent. anyway. Now, don't you see, if the farmers are paying 50 per cent., that if all the taxes were raised by a single tax on land values the farmers, since they have but ten per cent. of these values—you say five per cent.—would pay less; that their taxes would be reduced five times? Instead of paying one-half as now, they would, under that plan, pay but one-tenth?"

"I declare, Tom," said Pierson, "I never looked at it in that light, and I guess you have got me."

So, I say to you farmers here tonight, that this single tax, of which I am proud to be an advocate, would be to the overburdened farmers and workingmen the greatest boon, the greatest blessing, the greatest God-send that any country ever knew.

With all the rest, it must not be forgotten, either, that Johnson is not making a campaign for himself. He begins with the assumption that no Democratic governor can be elected in Ohio this year. His campaign is not for Johnson, but for the legislature.

Nor is it for the sake of the United States senatorship that he is trying to elect a Democratic legislature. That is a very minor consideration. Whatever the result, the senatorship can neither help nor hurt the Republican party, nor any faction of the Democratic party. Whether the next senator from Ohio is a Republican or a gold Democrat, can make no difference. The Republicans are so largely in the majority in the United States Senate that one senator less for them, or one more for the Democrats, is of no earthly consequence, except to gratify personal ambition and vanity.

Johnson's object in making a campaign especially for a legislature of Democrats pledged to the anti-monopoly platform adopted at Columbus, is to turn the Ohio corporations out of power. This accomplished, his work for the present is also accomplished.

The combination of Republican leaders and privileged corporations understand that as well as Johnson does, and will do all in their power, by hook and by crook, by misrepresentation and by pious pretenses, by raising up ani-

mosities toward Johnson among men who have been accounted his supporters, by the lavish use of corrupt and corrupting money, by all the artifices of spoils-hunting politics, to secure another legislature of Ohio which can be controlled by the corporations for the corporations.

Upon this their plunder depends. Against this, Johnson fights. That is the present issue in Ohio.

With the corporations, victory will be a temporary advantage; defeat a permanent disaster. With Johnson, victory will be a step forward, and defeat but a temporary check; for Johnson is enlisted not for one campaign alone but for life. Whether in office or out of office, in leadership or out of leadership, he cares not, except as it may promote the cause to which for two decades he has been devoted and to the service of which he three years ago pledged the remainder of his life and all his powers.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 3.

Immediately after the adjournment of the Ohio Democratic convention on the 26th (p. 326), Tom L. Johnson, the candidate for governor, went to Caldwell, the county seat of Noble county (a strong Republican county), where he addressed an audience on the 27th, which was estimated by the press dispatches as numbering 8,000 people. He dwelt especially upon the issues of home rule and just taxation. On the 29th he spoke at Akron, county seat of Summit county (also strongly Republican), to an audience which the press dispatches report as numbering 12,000. The latter meeting was a farmers' picnic to which both candidates for governor had been invited, but Myron T. Herrick, the Republican candidate, failed to appear. Mr. Johnson spoke upon three points—for home rule, against the municipal code, and for just taxation,—and the dispatches report that he was repeatedly and loudly applauded. His next meeting was at Oak Harbor, Ottawa

county (Democratic), where he and F. B. Niles, the candidate for lieutenant governor, addressed an audience in the afternoon of the 31st, which is described by the dispatches as numbering 1,500. At Toledo, Lucas county (Republican), in the evening of the same day, he and Mr. Niles were welcomed by an audience that comfortably filled the Memorial Hall, which seats 2,000. One of the speakers here was Mayor Jones, who was enthusiastically received as he introduced himself as "a Democratic-Republican-American." He explained his presence by saying:

My friend and comrade, Tom Johnson, invited me here; and if my friend Herrick asks me to a meeting of his, I'll come. I have no party; I belong to the whole push. This Democratic ticket comes as near being non-partisan as anything that ever came out of a convention.

The significance of Mayor Jones's reference to the non-partisanship of the Democratic ticket may be better understood from the following signed statement of his which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 28th:

I think the ticket is the most democratic of any we have had since Campbell's election. Being a man without a party, I make no pledges to support any convention-made ticket. I will support and speak for the Lucas county Independent ticket, and I think we have a mighty good chance to elect a legislative delegation. I see in the Democratic ticket a hopeful sign of the destruction of partyism. Johnson, an avowed single taxer; Niles, a Jeffersonian Democrat; Monett, a Republican, whose convictions took him out of his party; and Clarke, who has shown the courage of his convictions. I believe all those men are honestly following the voice of their consciences.

Mr. Bryan had been billed to speak with Johnson and Niles at Oak Harbor and Toledo, but a telegram canceling the engagement was received from him. It was read at the Toledo meeting, as follows:

"Hon. F. B. Niles, Toledo, O.: Regret exceedingly cannot reach Toledo for to-morrow's meeting; will come in October. (Signed) W. J. Bryan."

This telegram of regret was one incident in a complicated situation of which Johnson's adversaries have made much through the newspaper dispatches. The

situation grew out of the nomination (p. 326) of John H. Clarke for United States senator, the circumstances of which may be briefly told.

For several weeks prior to the convention Johnson had been assured that John W. Bookwalter, a silver Democrat, would be a candidate before the convention for the senatorship, and had announced that he would support him. This was known throughout the State during the primary elections, and it was accordingly understood that Johnson and Bookwalter would be the leading candidates of the radical, or Johnson, wing of the party. The Johnson campaign at the primaries was made upon this avowed understanding. But three days before the convention Mr. Bookwalter intimated his unwillingness, for personal reasons, to go into the senatorial contest before the people. Johnson at once sought an interview with him, and endeavored to dissuade him from withdrawing. But Bookwalter was firm. The only possible candidates left were M. E. Ingalls, president of the "Big Four" railroad; Gaylord W. Saltzgaber, John J. Lentz, and John H. Clarke. Ingalls was out of the question from the point of view of the Johnson men. Not only had he opposed the national party in 1896 and 1900, but he had recently cast in his lot with the John R. McLean "reorganizers" of Cincinnati. Mr. Saltzgaber was looked upon as a man without sufficient popular strength to make an effective campaign over the State. Mr. Lentz had declared his inability to bear the expense and the sacrifice of professional engagements that proper devotion to the requirements of the campaign would entail. Mr. Clarke had voted against Bryan in 1896 and was still opposed to bimetallism; but he had voted for Bryan in 1900, and had ever since been one of Johnson's strongest supporters in his radical democratic campaigns. He was regarded, also, as an impressive public speaker without a superior in the State. This was the situation at the close of the Johnson-Bookwalter interview of the 23d, when it was conceded that if a nomination for

senator were to be made Clarke should be preferred. Accordingly Johnson conferred with Clarke, secured his consent, and from that time forward supported his candidacy.

At the convention on the 26th, the "reorganizers" opposed the making of any senatorial nomination. Mr. Lentz resisted them in this. Mr. Saltzgaber took no part in the debate. Mr. Ingalls had retired with the unseated delegation from Cincinnati. The "reorganizers" were defeated by an immense majority, and three candidates for senator were proposed. Clarke was nominated by 395 votes to 205 for Lentz and 95 for Saltzgaber. As Mr. Lentz refused, upon his defeat, to offer the customary motion with reference to Clarke's nomination, that it be made unanimous, he was reported by the dispatches as preparing to bolt the convention. These reports were followed by others announcing that he had induced Bryan to refuse to accept the invitation of the convention (p. 327) to participate in the campaign unless Clarke were withdrawn, and that he and Bookwalter had joined in sending an ultimatum to Johnson demanding that Clarke be withdrawn. Bryan's brief telegram to Toledo, quoted above, was interpreted as canceling his Ohio dates and as confirmatory therefore of these disruptive reports. Even when Bryan explained in an interview from Lincoln that his telegram had been misunderstood, that he had not canceled any dates in Ohio but that business matters at home had prevented his reaching Toledo in time for his appointment, and that he would fill all Ohio dates in October, his explanation was treated by the dispatches as if he had "relented to a certain extent." Neither did the announcement of the 31st from Lincoln that he had left home to speak at Versailles, Ohio, on the 1st, quiet the reports that he had been induced by Lentz's protests to refuse to speak in Ohio while Clarke remained on the Democratic ticket. It took an actual speech by Bryan, with Johnson and Clarke, to do that.

Bryan made this speech at Versailles, Darke county, (a Demo-

cratic county), on the 1st. The press dispatches regarding this event are much more brief than were those regarding the expected refusal of Bryan to assist in the campaign. Still, the facts reported are sufficient to show that for those expectations there was never any reasonable basis. We give the Associated Press report of the Versailles meeting in full:

Versailles, O., Sept. 1.—The Ohio Democratic State campaign was formally opened here to-night with a large meeting. Excursion trains were run from the surrounding country and brought thousands to the meeting. The chief speakers were: W. J. Bryan, Tom L. Johnson, Democratic candidate for governor, and John H. Clarke, candidate for United States senator to succeed Senator Hanna. Bryan in his speech spoke enthusiastically of the ticket nominated by the Democratic State convention, and predicted victory for the ticket. He also indorsed Clarke for United States senator.

On the 2d Mr. Bryan emphasized his position with a signed statement issued from Columbus, where he had delivered a non-partisan lecture at the State fair grounds. As reported by the dispatches, this statement, after recounting Mr. Clarke's good qualities at length and showing that he is in accord with the last national Democratic platform on all issues but the silver question, concludes as follows:

While we might prefer some other Democrat to Mr. Clarke, we certainly must prefer him to a Republican who is against us on all questions, especially when the legislature that will elect him will also give the people home rule, cheaper railroad fares and more equitable taxation. To oppose him because of his action in 1896, in spite of the fact that he helped us heartily in 1900, in spite of the fact that he has supported Johnson in all his reforms, in spite of the fact that he is now helping us on everything except one phase of one question, and in spite of the fact that on that question I believe his sympathies will lead him to our side when he thoroughly understands the subject—to oppose him, I say, in spite of these things, would be unreasonable and unjust.

The Republican campaign in Ohio is to open at Chillicothe on the 19th. The speakers are to be Senators Hanna and Foraker, and the nominees for governor and lieutenant governor—Myron T. Herrick and Warren G. Harding.

In the midst of his State campaign Mayor Johnson leads a movement in Cleveland for a municipal lighting plant (pp. 283, 288), upon which a popular election is set for the 8th. The fight began in July, when Johnson caused an ordinance to be introduced in the city council providing for the sale of \$200,000 in bonds for the erection of the lighting plant. Under the State law a two-thirds vote of the council was necessary, and the ordinance was defeated. Although a full two-thirds of the membership, all Democrats, had pledged themselves, when candidates, to this kind of legislation, three voted in the negative—Stanton, Roche and Gunn. With all the Republican councilmen also opposed to the ordinance, this Democratic defection defeated it.

At the subsequent meeting of the council, August 9, a member who supported Johnson moved a suspension of the rules to adopt propositions for submitting the question, with others, to the people on the 8th of September. This motion required a three-fourths vote. But the three recalcitrant Democrats did not oppose it, although they voted against reconsidering the ordinance they had voted against the week before, and one Republican was won over. So the rules were suspended and the propositions adopted. They are six in number, as follows:

For purchasing and condemning land and improving land already acquired for boulevard purposes, \$600,000.

For completing park improvements already started, \$100,000.

For building a high level bridge to connect the East and West Sides, \$500,000.

For building a bridge across the Cuyahoga valley between Clark avenue and East Clark avenue, \$200,000.

For street openings, \$100,000.

For municipal electric plant, \$400,000.

The vote to suspend the rules was 23 Democrats and 1 Republican in the affirmative, and 8 Republicans in the negative; but the vote upon the resolution, after the rules had been suspended, was unanimous. Johnson's object in securing a suspension of the rules and passing the resolution at once, instead of allowing it to stand over for a week, was to prevent corrupt tampering with the

members by the electric lighting corporation.

Having passed the council by a two-thirds vote, the propositions recited above go to the people of Cleveland, who must support them by two-thirds of all who vote, and then they must be confirmed by two-thirds of the council before becoming a law. Whether the special election will come off on the 8th or not is now not quite certain; for news dispatches of the 1st from Columbus are to the effect that Attorney General Sheets has instituted proceedings before the Supreme Court of the State to secure an injunction. His proceedings are based upon the contention that the law under which the special election of the 8th is to be held, is unconstitutional.

Pennsylvania's political activity (p. 121) for the year has advanced a stage. The Democratic convention was held at Harrisburg on the 2d. The platform is devoted entirely to State issues, and Arthur G. De Walt was nominated for auditor general, the highest office to be voted for.

In Illinois the Republicans are experiencing a factional conflict in advance of their State convention of next year. Gov. Yates seeks renomination. He is opposed by a large part of the party, chiefly because his nomination three years ago is attributed to the dictation of Congressman Lorimer; and he is opposed by the Lorimer faction apparently because it fears the strength of the revolt. Partly in consequence of this internal disturbance, a conference of Republican delegations from three neighboring Congressional districts—the 11th, 12th and 13th—was held at Rockford on the 1st. Twelve out of the 16 counties of those districts were represented. They rejected a resolution approving of Gov. Yates. The principal business of the conference, however, was the appointment of a steering committee of five from each county of the three districts to see to it that at the State convention the votes of those districts are cast as a unit.

New York city is to elect a

mayor in the Fall to succeed Mayor Low, elected in 1901 (vol. iv, p. 487); and at a fusion conference held on the 1st the indications of Low's renomination were strong. This conference was composed of delegates from 11 distinct organizations, including the Republican committees for the four counties of Greater New York, the Greater New York Democracy, and the County Democracy. It unanimously resolved—

that the excellence of our city government, administered by officials chosen for capacity and character rather than party affiliations, has justified the non-partisan policy adopted by the parties to the fusion of 1901; therefore, we, the parties to the fusion of 1903, hereby reassert the pledges of the last municipal campaign, and declare our unalterable determination to deliver the city permanently from the scandalous misgovernment of Tammany hall.

The availability of candidates was discussed, and all the delegates except those from the two Democratic factions named above favored Low. The objectors did not say that they would oppose him if nominated, but they were of opinion that as New York is a Democratic city it would be wiser to nominate an anti-Tammany Democrat than a Republican.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Macedonian insurrection (p. 327) and its ominous possibilities continue to engross attention. Dispatches of the 28th from Sofia told of the destruction of all the Turkish forts along the frontier between Bulgaria and the vilayet, or Turkish province, of Adrianople, and of fighting within 20 miles of the city of Adrianople. According to the same dispatches Bulgarian reinforcements had been sent to the Turkish frontier, ostensibly to prevent the crossing of Bulgarian bands over into Macedonia. A small insurrectionist victory was reported as occurring on the 25th at Neveska. But this was offset by a severe reverse at Smilovo on the 28th, after a battle in which 1,000 insurgents out of a body of 3,000 were reported killed.

Civil war in northern Macedonia was proclaimed from Sofia on the 1st, by all the members of the insurgent general staff, with Gen. Zontchieff, presi-