

done nothing but peaceably to request and try to persuade others to join them in a strike, or else see the injunction treated with quiet contempt, another and less simple phase of government by injunction will be presented.

The degradation of American ideals is often felt, but nowhere is it so bluntly expressed as in the financial papers. They circulate chiefly where there is little call for euphemistic paraphrase, and the editors make no effort to disguise their sordid sentiments. An example is afforded in a recent issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, one of the great American authorities in financial matters. Commenting on the steel strike, in sympathy, of course, with the financial ring that has cornered the steel business, this paper makes no concealment of the satisfaction it derives from the statement of Mr. Shaffer, the strike leader, that the strikers "are not contending for wages, but for a principle." It is sure that the strike cannot last long, being for principle and not for money. So thoroughly saturated is it with the idea that men neither fight nor endure for principle, and that principle wouldn't be worth the sacrifice anyhow, that it doesn't hesitate for an instant to assume that upon the basis of principle instead of wages the strike is necessarily lost from the start. Nor is there any implication that the strikers are peculiarly sordid. No slur is cast upon them. The whole matter is regarded as a business affair, in which the strikers are subject to the same considerations that influence the paper's own constituency, to whom money always talks and principle never. This aristocracy of wealth, which is taking possession of our country, and in the talismanic name of Liberty destroying Liberty herself, has confessedly, even boastfully, come to merit the condemnation of Lowell's Hosea Bigelow. It—

don't vally princerples more'n an old cud.

But that condemnation does not apply in financial circles alone. Of the leader of the steel strike himself,

notwithstanding his verbal appeals to principle, Hosea Bigelow might also say that—

He don't vally princerples more'n an old cud.

In an interview published in the paper of the 22d, this leader, Mr. Shaffer, was quoted in these repulsive, even if excusable, terms:

If the republican party is going to obtain power to foster institutions that will destroy labor organizations it cannot longer rely on the support of labor. I have always been a republican, but if it comes to the worst and the administration stands by and allows the combine to crush us out of existence, in the future I shall be "all things to all men." Suppose the administration should be offended at J. Pierpont Morgan and his colleagues, and to punish them, should present restrictive measures to congress—laws tending to restrict the Morgan power—could not the administration have these laws passed? You will admit that it could. Then the administration is all-powerful and will be held responsible for the consequences of this conflict to labor and to the republican party.

Mr. Shaffer found no difficulty, it seems, in supporting Mr. McKinley when engaged in the ruthless slaughter of his brethren of the Philippines. That was not Mr. Shaffer's fight. He was deaf to principle when the crushing out process only affected others, and is ready to support Mr. McKinley again if Mr. McKinley will join the strike. But why, if Mr. McKinley may crush a distant republic with Mr. Shaffer's assent and hearty cooperation, may he not allow Morgan to crush the steel workers' union without Mr. Shaffer's assent and against his protest and threats? What is the difference—in principle? When Mr. Shaffer talks so glibly about principle, does he mean principle so far only as he and his are concerned? Is the crushing process right enough in principle when applied to men fighting for their homes against a foreign invader, and bad in principle only when applied to Mr. Shaffer's labor organization? In a word, is Mr. Shaffer one of those—

slaves most base,  
Whose love of right is for themselves  
and not for a.l the race?

Wisely, but not unexpectedly, Mr. Bryan has distinctly refused to countenance the folly of a bolt from the democratic party in, Ohio. The stronger such a movement could be made, the weaker would the democratic democrats of Ohio be in their fight for democracy within the party.

That the fight within the party is being made with vigor and intelligence is evident from this resolution, proposed by Mr. Salen, of Cleveland, and adopted by the state committee on the 20th:

Resolved, That the next call for a state convention shall contain the following provision: That in all counties containing a city in which there is registration of electors, and in which the number of voting precincts in such city form a majority of the precincts of the county, delegates to the state convention must be selected by a direct vote of the people, or by a convention composed of delegates selected by a direct vote of the people, at a primary election held under the laws of Ohio relating to primary elections; and no county central or executive committee shall have power to name delegates to the state convention.

The meaning of that resolution is not hidden in verbiage. To understand it nothing is necessary but to know that McLean's power in Ohio conventions has been due not to his influence with the democratic voters of Cincinnati, but to his control of a self-perpetuating committee. When Cincinnati elects delegates at primaries, instead of having them appointed by Mr. McLean's committee, Mr. McLean will not be able to enter state conventions with packed delegations. This is the beginning of a new regime in the democratic party of Ohio.

It was hardly necessary for the mayor of Cleveland to deny that he is about to announce his candidacy for the United States senate. He has said that he is not a candidate for the senate, and he is believed in spite of gossip newspapers. The once prevalent idea that his public actions are directed by some new and unfathomable kind of insincerity has been dissipated. Prof. Bemis was right when, in writing to the Springfield Repub-

lican that Johnson "declares that there is no use in trying to assert that he is sincere, for time will sufficiently prove it," he added: "I observe that it is already beginning to do so." Few any longer doubt Mayor Johnson's sincerity. The people not only in Cleveland, but throughout Ohio and over the country, are coming to realize the force of what Prof. Bemis said in the same letter to the Springfield Republican:

The people who voted against him are now praising his work, and it is entirely possible that he may carry out his present ambition, which, as recently stated, is to give Cleveland so good an administration that he will be reelected two years hence by twice the recent majority, which was about 6,000, in a city that went republican for the rest of the ticket, by 5,000 majority.

The mayor says that those who charge some inconsistency entirely miss the point that he is driving at. If he criticises Mark Hanna and others for owning street railways, he would be inconsistent, but he does nothing of the kind. He simply urges the community to change the system of private control of such enterprises. Where, however, the community refuses to do this and insists that private management is better than public, there is no crime, he holds, in receiving the enormous financial benefits which the city thus insists upon bestowing upon private management, provided, of course, that no corruption is used to secure the favor of the city government. He is willing to pursue a public policy inconsistent with large gains to himself as an investor, and he not only prides himself on that form of inconsistency, if others choose to call it so, but is constantly appealing to other men of wealth to do the same, and we all remember how President Hadley, of Yale, has lately declared that unless our leading men of wealth and power are thus willing to pursue a public policy in opposition to their private financial interests, there are serious and dangerous times ahead for this republic.

Those who know the mayor of Cleveland best, even though they may disagree with him, candidly admit that he has retired from money-making in the very vigor of his manhood, when he could probably double his fortune in the next five years by keeping out of public life. The only kind of an attack that remains is to assert that the man who will do this may do so in order to so win the approval of his fellow-citizens as to secure still higher positions of public

honor and trust, and such an ambition which these critics assume that Mr. Johnson possesses, is held to be ignoble. That such a view should be taken of the effort to merit high position by public service, while kindly consideration should be given to the efforts of corporation attorneys to secure senatorships in less honorable ways, speaks volumes as to the mental and moral attitude and standards of those who take that view.

If Mayor Johnson becomes a candidate for governor, senator, president, or anything else, it will not be as a mere seeker for place, but as a faithful public servant, whose promotion, not so much to higher honors as to larger possibilities of public usefulness and wider fields of public duty, the people themselves, those of them that are democratic, unmistakably demand.

Having accepted the responsibilities of mayor of Cleveland, Mr. Johnson has made those responsibilities his first care. He has even refused not only to abandon the duties of his office for a place upon the state ticket of his party, but also to accept the obligations even of a member of the executive committee of his party during the campaign. How exacting the duties of his office are, ambitious as he is to promote what he believes to be the true natural solution of social problems while serving the city and securing to all its inhabitants the fullest possible equality of rights with the laws as they are or as he may cause them to be amended, may be seen by reference to his work in equalizing taxation. Some account of this and other work of his has been given in these columns (pp. 23, 28, 43, 66, 84, 100, 115, 131, 139, 155, 163, 173, 187, 229). But it has only fairly begun.

We told last week of the action of Mayor Johnson's city board of equalization in raising the tax valuation of the "Little Consolidated" street car company (so called to distinguish it from the "Big Consolidated," the former being capitalized at \$8,000,000 and the latter at \$12,000,000) from half a million to \$6,000,000. Since then the director of law of Cleveland

has given an opinion sustaining the method of the board upon legal grounds, and this revaluation of the monopolies is going on in a way that exposes the enormous tax dodging they have been doing. When the case of the "Big Consolidated" came before the board, its officials procured an ex parte injunction against the board. The injunction was issued by Judge Ford, of Cleveland, on the 22d. This is the beginning of the legal proceedings that will test the validity of Mayor Johnson's efforts to secure an equitable distribution of tax burdens. Whatever the decision of the courts may be, however, the cat is now out of the bag. Johnson's proceedings have already disclosed an enormous extent of monopoly tax dodging in Ohio. In the case of the "Big Consolidated" the city board of equalization has discovered facts upon the basis of which it was about to raise the assessment some \$9,000,000, when the injunction intervened.

Another of the tax dodging monopolies of Cleveland is the gas monopoly. When Mr. Warmington, the president of one of the two gas companies (which operate in different districts), appeared before the board as a witness as to values he was questioned about the other company, it appearing that he owned stock in it. He said he owned some, and would be glad to sell it at \$250 a share. He must have been ignorant of the mayor's custom of offering to buy undervalued property. Hardly had the words left Mr. Warmington's mouth, when, according to the Plain Dealer, the mayor exclaimed:

"I'll take it."

"Well, I don't know as I want to sell just now," slowly answered Mr. Warmington.

"I'll buy all you have right now and pay the money at \$250 a share," stated the mayor.

But Mr. Warmington backed down. He did not want to sell.

The assessment of this company has not yet been raised by the board, but on the 22d that of the other company was almost trebled. The board found its money value to be \$1,790,000, and

assessed the same for taxation at 60 per cent., or \$1,074,000. This was by unanimous vote of the board, the minority which at first objected to the mayor's policy having now joined the majority in supporting it. Unless prevented by the courts, Mayor Johnson expects the increase in the valuations of the properties of the two street car companies and the lighting companies to amount to \$22,000,000, which would produce a decrease in the tax rate of the city from \$3 per \$100 to \$2.55. Should the valuations of the steam roads be fairly increased the rate would fall to \$2.00.

As will be remembered, the county auditors refused to assess the steam railroads on more than 12 or 15 per cent. of true value, though farms and homes are assessed at 60 per cent.; but the state board of equalization is yet to pass upon that matter, and two of the four state officers composing this board are candidates for reelection at the coming election, which may make them less deferential to railroad sentiment than to public sentiment. The board has agreed to give Mayor Johnson a hearing. He will be accompanied by Prof. Bemis, as an expert; and the mayors of several other cities have agreed to appear and support him. This question is now attracting more attention in Ohio than any other, and is almost certain to be the only live issue in the campaign—the question, that is, of whether steam railroads shall be taxed on only 10 or 12 per cent. of the true value of their property, or on 60 per cent., the same as farmers and home owners.

The new chief of police of Chicago, Mr. O'Neill, has given, since his accession to that office, several indications of his special fitness for the place. He seems to realize that Chicago is not Moscow and that he is not a censor, something which chiefs of police are usually slow to learn. Some of them never learn it. Mr. O'Neill's most notable act is his refusal to suppress a socialist street meeting near Newberry library. These meet-

ings are orderly gatherings to which no objection had been raised except by habitues of the library, who complained that the talking upon the street disturbed their thoughts. It is suspected, however, that they were less concerned about their own continuity of thought than with a desire to interfere with free speech. At any rate the chief of police decided in favor of free speech, and for that he should be applauded, not only by the socialists whose rights he has respected, but by every one who believes in protecting the rights of citizens regardless of diversity of opinion. Every city ought to maintain at convenient points open air forums for public meetings such as the socialists are holding in Chicago. But so long as this is not done, street meetings which do not interfere with traffic should be encouraged, not suppressed. What is said at these meetings makes no difference, with respect to the right to hold them. Public security is always conserved and public opinion kept wholesome by free speech. Even dangerous sentiments are less dangerous when they may be freely expressed.

A new term has been contributed by Dr. Lyman Abbot to the discussion of social and industrial subjects. It is "medicine-man"—not a new term absolutely, but new in this application. In explaining the term, which he introduces in his serial essays in the Outlook on the rights of man, Mr. Abbot says:

The fourth leader who adds to our perils I call the "medicine-man." I will not call him "quack," because this would involve too great obloquy; nor "professional reformer," because this pays to him too great deference. I call him medicine-man because he thinks there is one medicine which will cure all the ills to which humanity is subject. He is generally morally honest, but intellectually narrow; he is not a hypocrite, but he is apt to be a pharisee, with a strong sense of "I am holier than thou" pervading his dogmatic utterances. He imagines that universal suffrage will cure all political evils; or free silver all commercial and financial evils; or a single tax on land all industrial evils; or woman suffrage or

prohibition, or the two combined, all moral evils. I do not here consider the value of prohibition, or woman suffrage, or the single tax on land, or free silver, or universal suffrage; but he who imagines that all evils are due to one social or political cause, and can be cured by one social or political reform, has studied human nature and human history to little purpose. And, unfortunately, there are many good men in America who cannot be influenced by the demagogue—their moral sense resents his appeals to popular prejudices; nor led by the boss—they are too independent; nor purchased by the plutocrat—they are too honest—who are swayed by the medicine-man because he appeals to their conscience, and their conscience is not very intelligent.

If an unintelligent conscience were especially susceptible to hypnotism of the sort Dr. Abbot describes, he himself must long ago have fallen a victim to some "medicine-man." No one with a very intelligent conscience could have written what we quote from him above. A more absurdly unintelligent interpretation of the idea of so-called panaceas for social ills it would be hard to find elsewhere than in the comic papers. Writing on a philosophical subject, not as a penny-a-line paragrapher but as a philosopher, Dr. Abbot seizes upon a colloquialism and treats it as if it were the complete statement of a philosophical proposition! No social reformer ever claimed for his reform a cure-all quality in the sense in which Dr. Abbot interprets this colloquial expression. What such reformers do claim in that particular is that their respective reforms are fundamental. Universal suffragists have never meant to assert that universal suffrage would cure all political evils, but that political evils cannot be cured without universal suffrage. Prohibitionists do not maintain that prohibition will cure all moral evils, but that drunkenness is a root of moral evil. Woman suffragists make no such absurd contention as Dr. Abbot, with childish literalness, attributes to their colloquial phrases; their contention in that regard is that woman suffrage is indispensable to wholesome political development. Free sil-