

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1903.

Number 269.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

By an unfortunate oversight the paging of last week's issue of The Public duplicated the paging of the week before. This makes no practical difference, except to subscribers who keep files of the paper; and we will furnish without charge a corrected copy to any such subscriber, upon request made within two weeks.

So much deference has been paid by statesmen and journalists both here and in England to the political opinions of "the man in the street," that it is refreshing to see Lloyd-George, the able and conspicuous Radical-Liberal member of parliament, unceremoniously throw him overboard. In a speech at Newcastle last month Mr. Lloyd-George described this infallible political deity known as "the man in the street," as "the man who gives neither time nor serious thought to politics."

Those shallow minded employers of labor who have been assiduously sowing the wind of fake prosperity, are now reaping a whirlwind of labor strikes. There has in reality been no great prosperity for employers in competitive lines. Though they have done a livelier business, they have not been getting a much greater aggregate of profit. The extra profit has been going to employers who have some kind of monopoly. Consequently, when workingmen, inspired by the constant cry of "extraordinary prosperity," demand a share of this prosperity in the form of higher wages or shorter hours or both, employers in competitive businesses find them-

selves not only unwilling but unable to concede these demands. It is an awkward position to be in, but some of them are beginning frankly to admit that this so-called prosperity is a hollow sham; that it means for them, as it means for most workingmen, more work and less pay in the face of higher living expenses.

The Department of Agriculture is furnishing more census statistics for the use of prosperity editors. According to one of its estimates, as stated by the Chicago Daily News of the 18th—

the amount of human labor required to produce a bushel of wheat from beginning to end is on an average only ten minutes, whereas in 1830 the time was more than three hours.

How pleasant it would be if some of these experts would now figure out an explanation of where all that advantage in wheat production has gone to. Here we find that a given expenditure of human labor will now produce 18 times as much wheat as the same expenditure would have produced seventy-odd years ago. But what becomes of it? Working farmers are not 18 times as well off. Farm hands do not get 18 times their old wages. Middlemen do not get 18 times as much for handling. Millers do not get 18 times as much for grinding, nor bakers for baking. What becomes, then, of all this difference between the productive power of labor in producing wheat in 1830 and now? It is an advantage which somebody gets, if the Department estimate is correct; but who is that Somebody?

Organized workingmen were sensibly warned last Sunday by the Hon. Clarence S. Darrow, who represented the coal miners last winter. In a speech before the Henry George association of Chicago, he pointed out

the dangers that threaten trades unionism in these days of multiplying membership and multitudinous strikes. This danger consists in the disposition of labor unionists to hold trades unionism down to mere business levels, regardless of political, economic and ethical questions. The essence of the lecture, which is reported to have been of exceptional merit, is phrased as follows by one of the news reports:

Any permanent advance in the condition of the workingman must come from two causes. First, a creation of natural conditions that will cause increased production; second, a natural condition that will cause a more equitable distribution of wealth.

These are indeed the conditions of permanent improvement for what is called the labor class. They are, moreover, the conditions of all wholesome advance. Labor can make no permanent advance by means of strikes against employers and treaties with them, so long as production is held in check and distribution is unbalanced. Until trade unions give at least as much consideration to the economic conditions that divert wealth from its producers as to the possibilities of hectoring employers, workingmen will remain poor men.

Not often is a primary for nominating a party candidate for a seat in a State legislature, of national importance or interest. There was, however, an exception to the rule last week in Ohio. What makes this exception important is the fact that it marks the first pronounced victory, outside of Cuyahoga county, for the novel methods with which Tom L. Johnson, the new Democratic leader of Ohio, is renovating and strengthening his party.

The novelty here referred to does not consist in the use of a tent and

an automobile, as sensational reporters and light-headed editors would have it, but in holding party candidates strictly to their responsibilities to the rank and file of the party. Last Fall eight Democratic members of the legislature, all pledged against corporation rings, joined the Hanna and the Foraker members in voting for a corrupt bill which saddled a 50-year street car franchise upon the people of Cincinnati. Johnson notified them all that he would exert his influence with their constituents to prevent their reelection. This gave them little concern at the time. With the support of the railroads, of the Republican bosses, and of the little bosses of their own party at home, they felt secure. But by direct and open appeals to the constituents of these Democratic "black sheep," Johnson has driven them all out of public life.

The only real fight he had to make was against William H. Earhart, of Richland county. Earhart was defiant. So were all the local Democratic leaders. When Johnson had the situation looked over, there seemed no possibility of securing the nomination of C. K. Hershey, who had entered the lists against Earhart almost without local political backing. Then Johnson scattered literature over the county, and from the 20th to the 23d, both dates inclusive, he made a rushing automobile campaign, speaking in every town, village and hamlet. He spoke wherever he could get an audience, and that was everywhere.

To make a contest for a party nomination is, of course, not a novelty in politics. But it is a novelty for the State leader to do this openly, and to do it for the express purpose of purifying his party and with the avowed intention of campaigning for the candidate of the opposite party should his own party insist upon nominating a man whose only offense—usually considered venial in politics

and not infrequently applauded—consists in a record of official treachery to public interests.

The spirit of Mayor Johnson's campaign against Earhart may be seen from this interview with him, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

I informed Earhart immediately after he voted for the Cincinnati curative act that I would fight him to the last ditch, and I am going to do it whether I am beaten in the attempt or not. I will go into Richland county prepared to meet hisses or any other kind of treatment. If I am hissed I will be there when the hissing is over. I believe the defeat of Earhart to be a matter of vital importance to Democratic principles. A traitor should find no place in the Democratic party of this State. If Earhart did not intend to stand upon the principles of the party he should have told the people so before they elected him. If I knew that the vote of one legislator at the next general assembly would decide the senatorial election and send Mr. Hanna back to the Senate I would work just as vigorously for the defeat of Earhart, for the reason that I believe his defeat under the circumstances is of more importance to the people of Ohio than the election of a United States senator. If Earhart should be nominated I will continue the fight against him up until the day of election. I will go into Richland county with the tent and work with all my might for his defeat.

At all his meetings, says the Plain Dealer,—

Mayor Johnson prefaced his address by inviting anyone who wished to speak or ask questions to divide time with him on the platform.

And in answer to the complaint that in campaigning outside of his own county he was violating his principle of home rule, he was accustomed to say, in varying terms but without change in substance:

The principal charge made by some is that I'm violating the principle of home rule in coming here. I believe I'm not. I stand for home rule. If I advocated the election of a county officer whose jurisdiction was confined to county lines I might be open to criticism, but I'm here to give reasons why a legislative candidate should not be elected. The legislature is a State office, in which the legislators pass laws for Cuyahoga county as well as for Richland. The situation is not so secret or so sacred that it should not be open to the people to hear about it.

If a Richland county man were to come to Cleveland with any valuable information against one of our candidates he would be accorded a respectful hearing. We want to know who the crooks are in Cleveland. I would not treat Earhart badly if I had the opportunity, but I want to criticize his public acts and not dictate or request anything.

In the best of senses this was not a partisan campaign. So far as Johnson spoke in behalf of success for the party he appealed to the people to make it successful by making it worthy of success. On that point we find such quotations from his speeches as these:

The Democratic party will remain the minority party in the State as long as a handful of boodlers are permitted to parcel out second terms to such men as Earhart. It is worth much to the Democratic party to punish one who has betrayed his trust.

I charge Earhart with voting for unjust corporation privileges, against two platforms and a caucus of his party.

I'm not for every man that marks himself a Democrat. I'm not with every local or national leader. The mission of the Democratic party is to advocate principles that will bring victory to liberty-loving people of all parties.

When a handful of men distribute the local offices, when Democracy sinks to that level, it doesn't deserve success, and I hope it won't get it.

The steam roads don't pay one-third as much taxes as you men who pay rent. You are taxpayers three times as much as the steam roads. I preach a Democracy of equality, justice, home rule, and equal taxation, and am not for legislators who ride to Columbus on passes and when there remember the passes and forget their constituents. When the principles of equality, justice and home rule bring success to your party you bring success to Democrats and Republicans as well.

It is impossible to give more than a faint picture of the dashing work Johnson did in this house-cleaning campaign. The Cleveland Plain Dealer's correspondent described it from Mansfield on the 23d as follows:

When the mayor and his automobile came down into Richland county last Wednesday, against the will of the Democratic leaders, things began to happen rapidly. Such swift campaigning has never been seen in this county before, and the "automobile

in politics" when a man like Johnson is steering it, has shown itself to be a power. The original plan was to hold about a dozen meetings in the county, but once he had entered into the work, he carried it forward with cyclone rapidity, speaking not only in Mansfield, in the opera house and in the union depot, at Shelby and other towns throughout the county, but in front of village stores wherever even a few people were gathered to hear what he had to say. Johnson's circulars were soon broadcast over the county, and when he came to the villages news of his mission had preceded him. His workers did double duty during the campaign and when the mayor left Mansfield at 4 o'clock this morning in his auto, accompanied by Salen and Charlie Gongwer, for a final round up of the county, he soon found affairs so satisfactory to him that he steered his course for Cleveland.

Nor was he disappointed. Although Earhart and the other local leaders, who had refused to come out into the open but had made an industrious "gum shoe" campaign—although they were confident of victory until after the primary polls had closed, they were defeated by a majority of 245. Even the boss-ridden town of Mansfield was lost to them by a majority of 10 for Hershey.

Commenting upon this result, the Plain Dealer's correspondent in his Mansfield dispatch of the 23d, said:

It is a great victory for Johnson. He has made good his promise to defeat Earhart for the nomination because Earhart voted for the curative act. When he was here at the tent meeting last fall he announced what he intended to do, and the results to-night show that he has made good. Mr. Hershey's strength will be with the labor people.

Mayor Johnson's own estimate of the victory appeared in an interview as follows in the Plain Dealer of the 24th:

The result in Richland county is certainly a stern warning to officeholders who hold what they can get out of their offices higher than the principles of the Democratic party. In the future I believe that any handful of officeholders who want to override the principles of the party will stop to think. The defeat of Earhart, of course, means the utter annihilation of the eight "black sheep." Earhart has been beaten, "Bill" Gear is absolutely out of the race in Wyandot county, and the other six have

not dared to show their faces. But the result is of more far reaching importance than the mere defeat of Earhart and the other black sheep. It will have a most salutary effect over the entire State. It will give the Democratic party a chance from now on to move forward and accomplish results. A note of warning has been sounded to the effect that treason to democratic principle in the Democratic party in Ohio will not be tolerated by Democratic voters. Another thing has been conclusively demonstrated by the result, and that is that some of the old leaders of the party in the State have got to take a back seat. Earhart himself may not have been a bad sort of a fellow, but the men that he was training with had to be taught a lesson. I look for great results because of the action of the Democrats of Richland county.

Leadership like this which Johnson has brought to the Democratic party in Ohio, will soon redeem that State from the domination of plutocracy in both parties. In putting party principle high in authority, and party politicians with their gum shoes and whisperings out of power, he is rendering an inestimable public service.

President Roosevelt has the newspaper credit of having got the best of Senator Hanna in the Republican squabble in Ohio; but his advantage is not quite distinguishable to the naked eye. Senator Hanna disputed with Senator Foraker the advisability of endorsing Roosevelt's candidacy at the coming Republican State convention. Mr. Foraker wished to make the endorsement; Mr. Hanna opposed it. The latter gave as his reason, not that he was unfriendly to Roosevelt—"not by no manner of means,"—but that it was too early to select a Republican candidate for the presidency, to be voted for 18 months hence. Mr. Hanna doubtless felt the force of the Wall street sentiment against Roosevelt's antics.

When it began to look as if Mr. Hanna might win in this contest, Mr. Roosevelt himself took a hand in the Ohio fight. He first gave out this significant newspaper interview: "I have not asked any man for his support. I have had nothing whatever

to do with raising the issue as to my indorsement. Sooner or later it was bound to arise, and inasmuch as it has arisen, of course, those who favor my administration and nomination will indorse them and those who do not will oppose them." That was plain enough talk. Those who stood with Hanna were to be Roosevelt's enemies; those who stood with Foraker were to be Roosevelt's friends. But lest this electric hint might not effect its purpose, Mr. Roosevelt telegraphed to Mr. Hanna himself, "intimating," says Mr. Hanna, "his desire to have the endorsement of the Ohio Republican State convention of his administration and candidacy." Mr. Hanna thereupon withdrew his opposition, and the papers say he "had to lie down."

But did Hanna "have to lie down"? On the contrary, may he not have scored a point? Suppose it should seem desirable next year, for party reasons, to advocate the nomination of another man than Roosevelt, of what use to Roosevelt would be this premature endorsement, given perfunctorily at his own personal and pressing request? Neither Hanna nor his party in Ohio could be held in line by so slender a thread if they had reasons for getting out of line.

The Nebraska (Lincoln) Independent assumes responsibility for the following astonishing explanation of the manner in which the expenses of President Roosevelt's vacation tour are met:

A quarrel having resulted among railroad officials out in San Francisco, one of them, while in angry mood, told some things that will enlighten the said farmer and many others as to who pays the expenses. This railroad man, Mr. Kruttschnitt, of the Southern Pacific, having for that road refused to contribute anything toward the local expenses of entertaining the President, put up as an excuse that the Presidential train was being hauled free, as well as the junketing train of the local politicians who go out to meet the Presidential party, and that the company hauled the trains containing the militia companies free also, and further that the road would not contribute. Mr. Wat-