

servient to the classes of privilege and monopoly. To the suggestion that they are open to young men of every class, and that as matter of fact all the large universities contain students who are poor, and are working their way, he replied that such young men are animated by purely personal ambition, and are likely to become the very worst exponents of class privilege. He said that he had known such.

The position of the professor is more surprising, especially as the opinion comes from one connected with what may be called the ultra-practical side of his institution. The conversation began by his criticism of a lecture by one of his colleagues engaged in what may be called the literary side of the institution. He was surprised that this lecture based the value of the study of language and even of history and literature upon their scientific aspect, and that the lecturer seemed to find all his satisfaction in claiming that these subjects had now become as truly scientific as chemistry or physics. There was nothing, he said, in the lecture that upheld the ethical or ideal-producing value of the study of literary subjects. He thought that the lecture was a sign of the times and reflected the prevailing spirit in universities. His attention being called to the great advance in the scientific treatment of such subjects as language, he replied that he was only objecting to the putting of this side first. The universities, he asserted, have been given over partly to purely practical aims, and even those departments which might not be considered purely practical are ashamed to stand for fine ideals, but base their value upon what looks like the practical. He said that he had great respect for his side of the university, which professedly looks toward the bread-and-butter side of things, but that he could not keep from regretting and condemning the course of those departments of literature which seem to be neglecting their great work of maintaining ideals, and to be surrendering their high opportunities to the worldly spirit of utility or to the cold intellectualism of exact science. He had, he said, nothing to

say against practical knowledge or the accurate training of exact science; but these are not all. He went so far as to say that the great need of this age is enthusiasm for ideals, enthusiasm for causes that cost sacrifice, and that the universities are doing nothing, apart from their strictly scientific work, to foster enthusiasm for anything but getting on in the world.

Here, in a way, the two critics may be said to have met. Each of them charged that the universities are fostering chiefly the promotion of personal ambition, and are doing little or nothing for the promotion of higher ideals for the common good or for the progress of the social spirit that fosters a broad, rather than a narrow, democracy.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 10.

The news dispatches of last week to the effect that the Supreme Court of Ohio had granted an injunction forbidding the special election at Cleveland on the question of establishing a municipal lighting plant (p. 346) have proved to be well founded. The injunction was granted on the 1st by three judges of the Supreme Court—Shauck, Crew and Davis. It was granted upon the application of the attorney general of the State, in a suit brought by Thomas H. Hogsett, of Cleveland, the attorney of the Cleveland Gas company, who represented the Citizens' league, an organization just formed to oppose the municipal ownership proposition. Politically Mr. Hogsett is accounted a Democrat. He was city solicitor under the administration of Mayor John Farley, whom Tom L. Johnson succeeded. But he does not affiliate with the Democratic party as at present constituted in Cleveland. The injunction order was granted without notice to the city of Cleveland, and it was set for argument on the 22d—two weeks after the date for the special election. A motion to dissolve the injunction, made on the 5th, was heard by Judges Crew and Shauck and denied. Conse-

quently the special election did not come off.

Mayor Johnson continued the speaking campaign in favor of the establishment of a municipal lighting plant up to the 8th, notwithstanding the injunction, his last public meeting being held on the 7th, according to the original programme. No public meetings were held by the opposition. At the last meeting but one, Mayor Johnson, as reported, laid the blame for the injunction at the door of Attorney General Sheets, and, through Sheets, at the door of Senator Hanna, who, he said, controls Sheets's actions. With some detail Mr. Johnson reviewed Mr. Sheets's record. He pointed out, among other things, that it was Sheets who had brought the ouster suit which had destroyed the federal plan in Cleveland, that it was largely through Sheets's efforts that the \$20,000,000 which had been added to the tax duplicate of the Cleveland public service corporations had been removed, and the city board of tax equalization had been abolished and replaced by a board "perfectly true to Hanna." Mayor Johnson also reviewed the history of the municipal lighting movement in the city council, and attacked the "three so-called Democrats," who had voted with the Republicans to defeat it. "By getting this injunction," Mayor Johnson continued, "the corporations probably thought they would defeat the plan of securing a municipal electric lighting plant. Instead of accomplishing this they have merely made more votes for the proposition. The spectacle of treachery within the Democratic party, the spectacle of Senator Hanna and his factotum, Sheets, enjoining, through the Supreme Court, an expression of popular opinion, the spectacle of the Citizens' association, which is really only a Cleveland Electric Lighting association, posing as the champion of the people and then seeing to it that the people do not have a chance to say what they want, all these have made votes for the municipal electric light proposition, and I believe that the people will decide in its favor by an overwhelming majority. If the people decide otherwise I shall be content, for I

do not want a municipal electric light plant unless the people want it."

Meantime Mayor Johnson had, as mayor, called a non-partisan meeting to discuss the subject. He did this in response to a petition from the German-American Bund and other citizens. The meeting was addressed by William Backus, president of the German-American Bund, who presided; by W. J. Springborn, head of the public works department of the city; by Thomas Moore, president of the United Trades and Labor Council; by Thomas Fitzsimmons, a large manufacturer well known in Cleveland for his non-partisan activities in civic affairs, and by Mayor Johnson. The meeting adopted the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that we, the citizens of Cleveland, in mass meeting assembled thank the public service corporations for the effective manner in which they have furnished proof of their infamous interference with our legislative bodies; and be it resolved that we condemn the motives and actions of the so-called Citizens' league and their attorneys as unworthy of good citizenship, and that we leave these to the contempt of every citizen who has the welfare of the city at heart; and be it further resolved that we look upon the misuse of judicial power in granting injunctions without giving both parties a fair hearing, as opposed to the fundamental principles of our republic and as calculated, if persisted in, to bring the dignity and high standing of our courts of justice into discredit; and be it further resolved that we do all in our power to elect such men to public office as are free from taint of corporate influence and whose part and position in politics and economics are proof that they will execute the respective trusts to the interests of all people. We demand equal rights for all and special privileges to no one.

The Democratic campaign in Ohio, which has been in progress under Mayor Johnson's leadership since early in August (p. 281), began systematically on the 9th at Akron. A new tent (the old one being retained in Cleveland for local campaigning) was pitched for the first time. Mayor Johnson, as candidate for governor, and John H. Clarke, as candidate for U. S. Senator, appeared as the principal speakers before a

large audience. The Chicago Chronicle, in an unfriendly report, estimates the audience at 3,000. Akron is the county seat of Summit county, which is strongly Republican.

Prior to this, Mr. Johnson had spoken at several meetings (p. 344) in different parts of the state. Wm. J. Bryan, also, had spoken at immense meetings. Mr. Bryan's signed statement, regarding the senatorial candidacy of John H. Clarke, issued from Columbus on the 2d and of which we were able to give only the concluding paragraph last week (p. 345), can now be given in full. As printed in the Columbus Press it was as follows:

I would have preferred the nomination of some one who had been active and earnest in the support of all the planks of our platform; but the delegates who endorsed the Kansas City platform also endorsed Mr. Clarke, and after talking with him and listening to his speech last night, I am satisfied that his sympathies are with the people in their fight against organized wealth, and that if elected senator he can be trusted to stand for the reforms for which the Democratic party is contending. As an evidence that his sympathies are with the masses I point to the fact that he has long advocated the election of senators by a direct vote—a reform without which other reforms are impossible. He is opposed to government by injunction, and this question is a good test of his sympathies. He is in favor of an income tax—another proof that he is not the representative of plutocracy. His views on imperialism and the tariff are also sound and in line with democratic purposes. His one difference is on one phase of the money question—namely, metallic money—and on this question I believe he was grievously in error in 1896.

But since that time the quantitative theory of money has been established and the arguments made in favor of a larger volume of money have been vindicated. Believing as I do, that his sympathies are right, I shall trust him to carry out his platform on all questions that come before him rather than give encouragement to those who would elect a Republican legislature and thus not only re-elect Mr. Hanna but prevent the enactment of needed State legislation. On the more acute phases of the money question I believe he will be found in entire harmony with Kansas City platform Democrats. I can not conceive of his supporting an asset currency or the Aldrich bill, neither do I believe that he would support the Republican measures which provide for

branch banks and for making the silver dollar redeemable in gold.

Mr. Clarke recognizes, as he said last night, that revolutions do not go backward; he recognizes that the Democratic party is marching forward to meet the issues presented by plutocracy, and he is opposed to the scheme of the reorganizers. While we might prefer some other Democrat to him, 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."

Mr. Clarke's response to Mr. Bryan's statement came in the form of an interview in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on the 4th. Referring to his meeting with Mr. Bryan on the 1st, with which, says the Plain Dealer, he expressed great satisfaction, Mr. Clarke said:

Mr. Bryan agreed thoroughly with me that we are in perfect accord upon all important matters which are before the people in this campaign. In this respect I mean that we are in accord upon all the great principles of the Democratic party, both national and State. The fact that we have differed on some points as to the methods to be used to gain the same great ends did not for a single moment stand in the way of an indorsement of my candidacy by Mr. Bryan. He does not require agreement with him upon every principle in order to secure his hearty cooperation. No one who knows Mr. Bryan can question for a moment that he is heart and soul in a movement to secure what he sincerely believes to be the best for the great masses of the American people.

Mr. Bryan's last speech for the present in the Ohio campaign was delivered at Marion on the 2d to an audience numbering at least 6,000. He was accompanied by John J. Lentz, C. C. Philbrick, and W. W. Finley, the latter being the chairman of the State committee. Mr. Monnett, the candidate for attorney general, was one of the speakers and Mr. Lentz was another.

Some idea of the kind of cam-