

code of the State; and since he had no associates upon his "no party" ticket, the Republican machine candidates (except mayor) have been elected to positions where they can harass and balk him. Probably the best service he will be able to render his city under these conditions will be as a watch dog and an example.

It is to be regretted that Mayor Hinkle, of Columbus, Ohio, failed of reelection. He was an honest and progressive mayor and a democratic Democrat; and his defeat was a triumph not of the Republican party, but of the corporation interests that have preempted that party in some places. Writing from Columbus of Hinkle's defeat, ex-Congressman John J. Lentz says:

We had an election here yesterday, the result of which was to defeat the most thoroughly honest mayor we have had for years; but three of the subsidized newspapers of the city have maligned and villified him throughout the entire two years in behalf of the franchise grabbing corporations, and they succeeded in planting a certain impression in the minds of a few hundred people, who are so easily gulled as to be incapable of self-government. In addition to this class, who believe that whatever is in print is inspired, we had a certain set of traitors within our own ranks, who are in politics for their own benefit and not for the purpose of promoting any cause for the general good. Personally, looking the whole State over, I feel that the cause of democracy is just as strong, and probably a little stronger in Ohio than it has been for several years. The election of Tom Johnson, in Cleveland, keeps the fire burning on the altar.

While President Roosevelt boasts on his travels of the "period of great material prosperity" we are passing through, the evidence of which is derived from the increased incomes of monopolists, it will be well to consider the increased outgoes of the masses of the people and the actual suffering from want to which many are obliged in these "marvelously prosperous times" to submit. Only the other day the Fresno Federated Trades Council of southern California sent out an official warning to the workers of the country in which it stated that average wages in the or-

chards and vineyards in that especially prosperous region are only \$1.25 a day, while cottage rents range from \$20 to \$30 a month, and all food products are very dear. Similar or worse conditions exist on the Atlantic coast. We have all heard of the starvation wages of the anthracite miners whom Providence has for some inscrutable reason entrusted to Mr. Baer's profitable guardianship. And now from New York City we are told by an investigator who sends the facts to the New York World, that opportunities for paying work are oppressively scarce. A well known medical man had advertised for a healthy person willing to take \$5 in exchange for a small quantity of his blood. The replies crowded the physician's mails, most of them coming from men who were unable to find work to do. "In almost every case," says the writer, "the applicant was out of work." When times are really prosperous no man is out of work. Even beggars and tramps are drafted into industrial service. But Mr. Roosevelt says that this is a period of great prosperity. So does Mr. Morgan. So does Mr. Hanna. So does every other man of the type that Kipling referred to when he wrote, "There are some men who, when their own front doors are closed, will swear that the whole world's warm."

When a legislator has the courage to do what Clarence S. Darrow did in the Illinois legislature last week, his action should be reported far and wide as an example of faithfulness to public obligation in trying circumstances. A bill had come before the lower House appropriating \$5,000 to the widow of Gov. Altgeld. As appropriations go it was a legitimate bill. Many appropriations of public money much more personal in character than this, and far less deserved, have been made and approved. But any appropriation of public money for private purposes is wrong, and so it appeared to Mr. Darrow. Yet John P. Altgeld was his friend. Every personal consideration, every

individual emotion, naturally called upon him to vote for that measure. It is all the more to Darrow's credit, therefore, that he voted against the bill. We give his explanation as he made it upon the floor:

No man ever lived whom I respected and loved outside my blood relations as I did John P. Altgeld. There is no woman more worthy of respect than the woman who is to be relieved in this bill. I know, and we all know, what John P. Altgeld sacrificed for the State of Illinois and for his devotion to duty as he saw it and as he believed it to be; and no man ever followed his duty more devotedly than did John P. Altgeld. A few weeks ago I voted against a bill to erect a monument to the memory of a good and great woman who lived and died in Illinois (Frances E. Willard). I voted against the appropriation to give \$5,000 to the Swedes and Finns who doubtless were in need. I do not intend to vote against all appropriations. There are appropriations which must be made and which should be made liberally. But I do not see how we have the right to vote the money that must be paid by the property holders of this State, great and small, to any private individual, no matter how much I respect them, no matter how high they stand in the common esteem. Much as I regret it, I believe that this sort of legislation is not proper legislation and that there is nothing for me, at least, to do but to vote no on this bill.

If the weekly newspaper which calls itself Public Opinion were as non-partisan as it pretends to be, or as frank in its partisanship as it surreptitiously is therein, it would be less misleading and correspondingly more useful.

In his recent campaign, Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, set a valuable example in Democratic campaigning which may also prove valuable elsewhere. He completely frustrated one of the methods which, under Hanna, the Republicans have adopted for coercing the employes of big establishments. Mr. Hanna's candidate for mayor, true to the Hannaistic method, had begun a speaking campaign at noontime in the big factories. His meetings there were called by the proprietors; and everything was put in shape to create an im-

pression among outsiders that factory workmen were unanimously for Hanna's candidate, and among the workmen themselves that they had better be for him or jobs in their shop would grow scarce. But Hanna had counted without Johnson. Immediately after this kind of campaigning began, Mr. Johnson wrote courteous letters to the proprietors of each establishment in which Hanna's candidate had spoken or was announced to speak, demanding, in the name of common fairness, that he be given similar authority and facilities for presenting his cause. The first factory owners to receive Johnson's letter were thrown into a panic, and referred the matter to Senator Hanna's committee for advice. Of course, only one kind of advice could be safely given. The committee dared not sanction openly so marked an exposure of attempted coercion as a refusal to allow Johnson to speak at factories where Hanna's candidate had spoken would have been. So Johnson had his innings. And he made such good use of them in his speeches that the Hanna combination quickly gave up that kind of campaigning.

### THE "PROTECTIVE SPIRIT."

The cleverest part of Buckle's "History of Civilization" is that in which he points out and combats the idea of the Protective spirit. To see what he means by this term, and then to determine where one stands with reference to its doctrine, is the most vital exercise to which the modern mind can apply itself. To fix one's self definitely on one side or the other—at least so far as one's ideals are concerned—is absolutely necessary as a basis for clear judgment of social, political and economic problems.

We pass over the religious phase of the question, except merely to call attention to the fact that the thought runs into this realm as well. Is religion something external to yourself, managed for you by authority, by the church? is it a government, dictatorial and "protective"? Or is it

within yourself, a play of your own free spirit? is it, so far as any other man whatsoever is concerned, independent and democratic? Right in these questions we have the determination of the kind of religion one believes in and lives by. Right in these questions we have the great dividing line between the two religious attitudes of men—a dividing line far deeper than that between the various denominations.

So in the political and economic world the great dividing line is to be found in the attitude of men with reference to this same question. Do you believe that men are to be governed from without, to have things done for them from without; in other words, are to be protected and cared for by some external authority, apart from and superior to themselves? Whoever believes this believes in the Protective spirit. It is the antithesis of the Democratic spirit, whose ideal is the equality of men, and not that some are so much better than others that they are called upon to think for them and protect them in paternal fashion.

The Protective spirit in government begins by believing in absolute monarchy with a favored aristocracy. If it must descend a little from this ideal, it comes next to a limited monarchy with a somewhat extended aristocracy, the two constituting a superior oligarchy. If it must descend still lower and accommodate itself to a republican form, it believes in a restricted suffrage, which cuts out the poor and ignorant—and women, of course.

On the economic side the Protective spirit believes in lords of the manor, in great landed estates, in large proprietors, in great fortunes. It believes that great landlords can manage better for the tenants than the tenants themselves, that great capitalists can distribute wealth for the people better than the people themselves.

The Protective spirit believes that the good of most people, the development of most people, must come from without. It does not believe that the great majority can develop themselves even if they have equal

opportunity and a fair show. This lack of belief in the capability of people to develop themselves is the benevolent basis of all landlordism and special privilege.

The Protective spirit is rampant in American life to-day. It has taken on subtler forms than in ruder days, but it seems to be enjoying renewed life in a modern reaction. It is far more potent than it was fifty years ago, if we except the one feature of actual slavery, which was, of course, the acme of the Protective spirit. There is not to-day the enthusiasm for democracy and republicanism that there was when Kossuth came over here, and when all America glowed in sympathy for the revolutions of '48. There is not the same spirit of independence in business and determination to be one's own employer. Concentration under a great manager is rather the prevailing tendency. Even in practical politics, even in the centers of urban democracy, the spirit of managing and being managed has manifested itself in a queer way. The modern boss represents essentially the protective idea. He directs our voting; it is he that nominates our candidates. Whichever way we turn, in business, in educational matters, in economics, in politics, there is a lack of the freedom and independence and individual initiative which belong to real democracy.

During a good part of the nineteenth century we thought we had got emancipated. Alas, we find that the work was but half done. The people are still servile, still subject to this same Protective spirit of which Buckle wrote.

There were tremendous strides in political freedom and intellectual enlightenment in the century beginning with the last quarter of the eighteenth. The American revolution and the French revolution, each in its kind, were great steps forward, and their influence pulsed onward, in spite of conservative forces, into ever widening circles of political and individual freedom. But in this material world, as we are just now beginning to see, there cannot be substantial freedom of thought and ac-