

an equal among the weeklies of the country in its wide scope and its painstaking accuracy. It must cost the editor an immense amount of labor, for it is really a condensed history of the world for the week covered. Not one of the long-established New York weekly papers gives so complete a review of the world's news as *The Public* gives in its "News" columns.

But there is one serious lapse to which I beg to call the editor's attention. I do not think I have missed the reading of a single number; and yet I have seen no record of the facts pertaining to the greatest activity of our institutions of higher learning. It would be no exaggeration to say that there have been at least 10,000 columns devoted to this activity by the daily press during the past month. It must be from the daily press that the editor selects and gathers his valuable record; and yet he has neglected entirely those 10,000 columns. How can he claim completeness for his otherwise valuable work so long as he overlooks this inspiring news from our colleges and universities, to which the daily press devotes so much space? What will his chronicle be worth to future historians if it tells nothing of the prowess of the Princeton Tigers, or of the Carlisle Indians, or of "Old Eli's eleven"?

We respectfully submit that the editor should not permit any possible disagreement with the economics taught in the universities to prevent his chronicling the important achievements of these great institutions. He should, we think, even go farther in his liberality, and occasionally make editorial comment. He could, for example, point out how the modern universities are coming into touch with real life, causing hundreds of thousands of dollars to change hands in business centers when two great university activities come together.

We say nothing of the inner history of these great moments, for of this inside knowledge even the daily papers preserve a commendable disregard. What we complain of in the editor is that he disregards in his summary of news the readily attainable facts of higher education.

MEDIUS.

A FARMER'S VIEW OF THE COAL LANDS PROBLEM.

A paper read by J. F. Cowern, of Contoocook, N. H., before the Contoocook Grange.

When our assistant lecturer asked me to write a short article on some

serious question, the strike in the anthracite coal regions was the all absorbing topic of conversation. Go anywhere you might it was being discussed by men, women and children with equal interest. It was, in fact, a burning question in more senses than one. Numerous methods for settling the difficulty were advanced and eagerly debated.

Although not in sympathy with the idea, it seems to me that the general opinion has been that in the interest of the whole people the government should seize and operate the coal mines. As a temporary measure to provide immediate relief I should favor the taking over of the mines by the government, but as a permanent undertaking I should oppose it. If you are going to have the government seize and operate the coal mines, why not seize and operate all other mines, gold, silver, copper, etc.?

And, if the theory on which you would proceed is sound, the government should also seize and operate the shoe shops, iron foundrys and all branches of industry, not even omitting our worthy chaplain's potato patch. It seems to me that this would be overstepping the true functions of government, which, as I understand it, is to secure to all men equal rights, equal liberties. The simpler the government with which this can be done the better.

The plan of our socialistic friends, in my opinion, would practically destroy individual initiative, the force that makes for progress in all branches of industry.

Under normal conditions there is nothing about the business of mining coal that does not admit of competition.

It is the present abnormal condition brought about by joint private ownership of the highways and coal lands that seems to have put anthracite mining outside of competition influences.

If the government were to take over the highways, thus insuring to all equal rates, it would place the independent operator on an equal footing with the present ring.

If, in addition, a heavy tax was laid on coal lands, those held out of use as well as those in use, in proportion to their value, exempting improvements, or that part of the value due to labor, the competition principle would have full sway. Such a tax would make it decidedly unprop-

itable to hold valuable coal lands out of use, and, in proportion to amount of tax, would lower their selling price, thus enabling a small capitalist to go into the mining business.

As it wouldn't pay to hold them out of use, present mines would be run at full capacity, creating a demand for labor and raising wages, while lowering the price of coal to the consumer. This it seems to me is the right, and, therefore, the only permanent solution of the problem.

I admit that before this method can be adopted a great deal of educational work has got to be done. But we can take a step in that direction now, and if the Grange would use its influence it could be taken at once.

You all know that the farmer is taxed on anywhere from 60 to 100 per cent. of the value of his property. Now there are hundreds of acres of coal lands in Pennsylvania held out of use, and worth from \$3 to \$30,000 an acre, the taxes upon which are merely nominal—in some cases as low as three dollars an acre. Isn't it a short-sighted policy that encourages the dog in the manger spirit at the expense of the industrious?

Why should those who monopolize a great natural supply of fuel, which, as Edward Everett Hale recently said, "the good God has given for mankind," be taxed a merely nominal sum, while the farmer is taxed to the limit? The Grange should take this up, and insist that the property of the coal barons should be taxed as high as the property of the farmers.

There is, in my opinion, no possible reason for government ownership of a business in which the competitive principle is possible; such businesses should be, and are best, left in private hands. But any business in its very nature monopolistic, and they are few, such as the railroads, post offices, etc., should be in the hands of the government.

THE REPUBLICAN ATTACKS FURNISH ENDORSEMENTS OF MR. JOHNSON.

The explanations about the election don't explain. The attacks upon Tom Johnson by Republican papers are in the nature of an endorsement.

If the object of a political organization is merely to secure control of the offices defeat would end the purposes of its existence. A great many of the people do not seem to care who hold office, but all the people are equally interested in the manner in which

these trusts are administered. An honest, vigilant, and courageous minority is a vital and necessary force in our form of government, and can do much to preserve a high moral tone in legislative and administrative acts, and compel the majority to respect public opinion and keep close to the path of honor. The Democratic party has been the minority in Ohio for 12 years, but it has in that time had numbers and power enough to retain and check the excesses of the majority, had it the moral vigor to act. This it has not done. Excepting a very few political matters, the Democrats in the legislature have not been a unit upon any question. Until it is animated by a higher moral purpose, the Democratic party has no mission and does not deserve to be entrusted with power, for it would be no better than the Republicans. For years the Democratic party in Ohio has pointed out the bad things the Republican party has done, and when it has occasionally been successful, it has proceeded to do the very same things that it has condemned in the Republicans.

It succeeded last in 1889, when Foraker ran for a fourth time and a third term for governor, and had proceeded to build up a personal machine by depriving our cities of home rule and vesting the appointing of city boards in the governor. The Democrats at Dayton denounced these methods as outrageous and declared in favor of home rule for our cities. They elected Campbell governor, and a Democratic legislature. That legislature proceeded to knock down the Senatorship to the highest bidder and a non-resident of the State. It then proceeded from its first crime to commit additional blunders and repudiated the home rule declarations that made Democratic success possible, by passing a bill to place the government of Cincinnati in the hands of another set of politicians and vested the appointing power in the hands of the governor, who lacked the courage to carry out the platform upon which he was elected. Gov. Campbell tried to remove his own board, in less than a year, because he said they were dishonest, and he had to call a special session of the legislature to help him out of the muddle, and it only made matters worse, and in 1890 the Democrats lost Ohio by 10,000 and they have been on the toboggan ever since.

There has not been a job passed in years, and these have been many and terribly tough ones, that enough cheap Democrats have not been found to put

the rascality through. Bribery has become the remunerative occupation of too many members of the legislature, and perjury is an official amusement and a playful pastime.

The Rogers bill, with its 50 year franchise, would never have become a law if Democrats in the legislature had not sold themselves to lobbyists who stood in the halls of legislation with money in hand to pay for the votes when they were cast. No Democrat, or person posing as a Democrat, has done more to seduce Democratic members from their party obligations, their duty to their constituents and their personal integrity, than L. G. Bernard. His plea has always been "that the Republicans were in the majority and the Democrats could not be held responsible." Four Democratic senators in 1896 sold out for spot cash and made it possible for Foraker to get his 50 year franchise through, for which he is said to have gotten a fee of \$600,000 from the Cincinnati street railroad.

This weakness and wickedness of Democrats has had much to do with muzzling the press, silencing criticism and preventing a bold stand and aggressive action by the Democratic party.

The Ohio Democrats have had a bad case of peritonitis. It needed a surgeon who could wield the knife.

It found one in Tom L. Johnson.

The patient, 335,000 strong, has survived the operation, and is able to sit up and recognize some things. Tom Johnson says he will stay with the patient until he is able to be up and around.

It needed some brave, rugged, strong man to grasp the situation and apply the remedy. Tom Johnson has done it in a courageous and masterly manner. He has been driving the thieves from the altars of Democracy and the decent people who remain need not be ashamed of the company they are in.

The most signal example of the good work Tom Johnson did in the campaign not closed, but just begun, was the defeat of James A. Norton for congress. Dr. Norton has been a Democrat for revenue only, almost since his first advent in politics in 1872. He has, according to his abilities and opportunities, done as much to demoralize the Democratic party of Ohio as any man in it. Posing as a friend of the masses he has for years been the hired agent of corporations, and while dealing in platitudes upon the stump he has used his influence to secure the passage of legislation in the interests of corporations and against the people. He has helped to seduce public officials

that corporations might escape their just share of the public burdens in the shape of honest taxes. When the attention of Tom Johnson was called to this fact at his Tiffin meeting in Dr. Norton's home, he denounced him boldly without hesitation, and said such a man was not fit to represent any party or any people in congress. With 6,500 majority behind him, Dr. Norton felt secure, but he was defeated by a street fakir. Years ago, Dodge Hare, of Wyandot, was a candidate for congress, when the present district was formed. He had served two terms, but was a candidate for another term, in the new district. Dr. Norton opposed Hare because he said two terms were enough for anyone in congress, and, besides, it was good Democratic doctrine. Norton has served three terms and secured a nomination for a fourth term by "ways that were dark and tricks that were vain." He was not the choice of the honest Democrats of his district, but through blind loyalty to party, that may be pardoned if it is not commended, they were willing to try Dr. Norton once more, as he begged so hard and so piteously for only one more term, but Tom Johnson's slogan startled the sturdy Democrats, opened their eyes and made them think that it was a greater treason to party to vote for a bad man than to turn him out, and Norton lost his own county by 300 when he has carried it by 1,200.

Will the conscience of the honest people of all parties not commend the good work Tom Johnson has done here, and what he did here he did in other counties in the state. Certain thieves and politicians are appalled at Johnson's audacity, and selfish and uncertain Democrats are laughing over the result in Ohio and claim that it is a rebuke to Johnson. If it is, it is a sad commentary on the absence of all moral purpose in the Democratic party.

If a party were beaten for being dishonest all of its self-respecting members should hang their heads in shame and hide away, but no honest man need be ashamed of a defeat that followed an attempt to expose bad men; men who have been faithless to every trust; who sold the people's birthright for a mess of pottage, who have betrayed party; who have reveled in bribery and rascality; who have trodden every crooked path with patience and profit, and with brazen audacity and a tireless zeal that has amazed all people but those of Ohio, and made the devil tremble for the safety of his dominion when these chosen ones enter his kingdom in the heated hereafter. While

Moses held out his hands the children of Israel pursued and slew their enemies, but his arms grew tired and they had to hold them up until the slaughter was completed.

Let honest Ohio Democrats hold up the hands of Tom Johnson until his work is completed.

Let him strike and spare not.

Let all guilty men escape.

Drive the rascals out.—Columbus (O.) Daily Press of November 19.

LESSONS OF THE STATE ELECTIONS.

Editorial in the December Pilgrim (Wills J. Abbot, editor).

Gov. Odell, of New York, who was elected two years ago with a plurality of more than 110,000, has been reelected by a slender plurality of scant 15,000. He has made admittedly an admirable governor; so that it is not to dissatisfaction with him that we must look for explanation of his loss. It is to be found in the enormous plurality, exceeding 120,000, rolled up in New York city under Tammany leadership, for Coler—an indication of metropolitan dissatisfaction with the "reform" administration of great pretenses and pitiful performances. "Up the State" Mr. Coler did not make so good a showing, indeed falling behind the vote given for his two immediate predecessors in Democratic candidacy. This fact undeniably proceeded from the general recognition of David B. Hill as his sponsor and manager, and a general unwillingness among voters to return Hill to power.

In Ohio, Rev. H. S. Bigelow, under the campaign management of Tom L. Johnson, not only failed to cut down the normal Republican vote, but was beaten by an adverse majority greater by 20,000 than the majority against Col. Kilbourne, the Democratic candidate for governor in 1901. But in districts where no malign influence of a corrupted Democratic machine was exerted, Bigelow ran admirably. For example, he carried Cuyahoga county by more than 2,500, though the State as a whole went against him by nearly 90,000. But in the days when Ohio used to go only 30,000 Republican, Cuyahoga gave 8,000 to 10,000 majority for that party. The explanation of these seemingly irreconcilable facts is clear. Hamilton county—Cincinnati—has for years been dominated by a corrupt Republican boss, George B. Cox, and a corrupt Democratic boss, John R. McLean. Whichever party won, the deals by which these two bosses profited went through, and the polit-

ical workers in their employ were taken care of. But Johnson and Bigelow announced that they wanted nothing to do with either corruptionist. Their victory would have put John R. McLean out of the political business. He accordingly threw his strength to the Republicans, that his friend and ally, Cox, might be saved, and the great adverse vote rolled up by the machine in Hamilton county overcame the vote of loyal Democrats throughout the State. This is a result to be expected in Ohio so long as McLean's power endures; it is a result which will be paralleled in other States where undemocratic influences dominate the Democratic party.

Throughout the roster of States the elections as between the two parties were chiefly in favor of the Republican party. To thinking Democrats, however, their chief significance lies in the evidence they furnish of an utter irreconcilable division within the party ranks between the Cleveland, Hill, Gorman type, and the more ardent and progressive Democrats who asserted themselves in 1896, and of whom Bryan in the West, Johnson in Ohio, and Williams in New England are the militant leaders. Every effort to harmonize these forces is time wasted. Not until the one faction shall be driven into Republican ranks, where it logically belongs, or the other shall be forced to form a new radical party of its own, will the Democratic party be a coherent force. Of the two alternatives the former is the more probable at present.

Of the States which seemed to furnish fair fighting ground, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan and Indiana may be taken as fair examples of the fruits of "harmony." In all, the old-line Cleveland Democrats had their way; by force in the first three, by chicanery and intrigue in Michigan. In all, their hopes soared high, for they had killed Bryanism, obliterated any reference to the Chicago or Kansas City platforms, put "sane, conservative men" at the head of the tickets, and tried to be just as much like the Republicans as they could. The results? Official returns are not yet obtainable, but approximately these are the facts:

In Michigan the Republican majority was greatly cut down, but not by an increase in the Democratic vote, which was smaller than has been cast in the State since 1894. The Republican governor was exceedingly unpopular and thousands of Republicans refused to vote either for

him or for a colorless Democrat, while thousands of Democrats declined to vote at all.

In Illinois the Democratic campaign was managed by John P. Hopkins, who conducted the campaign of Palmer and Buckner in 1896. All the gold Democrats were much in evidence and enthusiastic over the outlook, but the Democratic vote showed an actual falling off, and the State was lost.

In Wisconsin Mayor Rose, who used to masquerade as a progressive Democrat, threw off the disguise and appeared as the avowed champion of the corporation interests. Thousands of Democrats voted for Gov. La Follette, and though the corporation Republicans supported Rose, he was decisively beaten, losing even the city of Milwaukee, which in his capacity of "Bryanite" he had three times carried.

Indiana was the first of the middle western States to succumb to the blandishments of the "reorganizers." Its convention voted down all reference to the national platform and Mr. Bryan. Its national committeeman boasted that the first steps were taken to assure an Indiana delegation in 1904 for David B. Hill. The eastern reactionary newspapers applauded the Indiana programme, and predicted great things for election day, but the Democratic defeat was complete and crushing, the total Democratic vote being less than it has been since 1894.

The only really notable Democratic victory was in Rhode Island, where an avowed radical Democrat and Henry George man, Dr. L. F. C. Garvin, was elected governor.

A survey of the political field suggests these reflections to a radical Democrat:

1.—Repudiation of the radicalism of 1896 and 1900 means Democratic downfall.

2.—A closer alliance with the working class element, and a more sincere and ready acceptance of the growing socialistic sentiment is necessary to Democratic growth and success.

3.—It is matter of the gravest doubt whether the Democratic party can be made an effective party of progress, and whether 1904 may not witness all its radical elements moving in mass into the socialistic party—which profited most this year from Democratic cowardice.