

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 29, 1903.

Number 282.

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.

A great work in the renovation of Democratic politics was accomplished on the 26th at the Democratic convention of Ohio.

Tom L. Johnson's nomination for governor was something phenomenal, made as it was after a bitter fight against him at the primaries of the State, and by acclamation.

This is an inspiring example of what can be done without "boodle"—for it is now well understood in Ohio that Johnson uses no "boodle" in his political work, and that he spends but little money for any political purpose, however legitimate. He depends upon open and candid campaigning for radical democracy. This is what makes his public speaking so effective and his party organizing so successful.

Not the least of Johnson's accomplishments at the State convention was his exposure and repudiation of the Cincinnati "boodlers" who have manipulated Democratic politics in Hamilton county so long and so profitably. In Herbert S. Bigelow, Johnson has found a fighter who can not only talk about doing things, but can do them and does do them. It has taken Bigelow and Johnson three years to overthrow the Bernard ring of Cincinnati, but they have done it; and the State convention by a tremendous majority has indorsed their work.

Another of the men upon whom Johnson has learned by experience to trust—for his personal in-

tegrity, his oratorical power, his statesmanship, and his fundamental democracy—is John H. Clarke, whom the convention nominated as the direct adversary of Mr. Hanna in the Ohio senatorial contest. It was urged most strenuously against Mr. Clarke that he had bolted the Bryan nomination in 1896, but the convention sensibly refused to regard this objection in such a case.

It is true that Mr. Clarke does not believe in bimetallism, and that for that reason he voted against Mr. Bryan in 1896, as did many another man who is to-day among Mr. Bryan's staunchest coadjutors in politics. But in 1900 Mr. Clarke did not vote against Mr. Bryan. He both worked and voted for him. And while he is still a non-believer in bimetallism he is an adversary of financial monopoly as pronounced as is Mr. Johnson, of whose hostility to financial monopoly there is no ground for question. Moreover, Mr. Clarke stands squarely upon the platform adopted at Columbus, a platform regarding the construction of which he was consulted and of which he approved. Loyalty to the cause that Mr. Bryan so ably represents does not call for hostility to such a Democrat. Mr. Clarke is no "reorganizer," and there was no reasonable excuse for raising that objection. Before the campaign is well over, the democratic Democrats of Ohio and of the nation will rejoice that the objection did not prevail.

What may be the result of the Johnson campaign in Ohio cannot be predicted. But what Mr. Johnson is aiming to do should be understood in advance. He is quite indifferent to his own election. What he is concerned about is the legisla-

ture. To eject corporate influences from that body is necessary to the municipal reforms he has undertaken to accomplish in Cleveland. So long as the privileged corporations are in power in the legislature, municipal reform is in great degree impossible. It is to get rid of their power there that he consents to make a gubernatorial campaign to promote the legislative fight. Should he be elected, with an anti-monopoly legislature, so much the better. But if he secures the election of such a legislature, though failing of election himself, he will have no tears to shed. Johnson is of the kind of politicians that are so scarce that they are easily misunderstood at first. He has no private axes to grind, no private interests to serve, no private ambitions to obtrude. When his cause wins he wins, no matter what the effect upon his personal fortunes.

In view of the urgency of third party men, as exhibited at Denver recently (p. 290), to adopt a policy which can at this time serve no other purpose than to embarrass the real democrats of the Democratic party and give aid and comfort to the common enemy, we confess our great gratification at receiving so emphatic an endorsement of our opposition to this fatuous policy as is expressed in the subjoined letter from Gen. James B. Weaver:

I observe the recent action of the Populist committee at Denver does not meet your approval. I heartily concur with you. While I have great respect for the gentlemen present, I think the meeting and action taken premature and calculated to do harm. I so telegraphed, in substance, to the secretary at the time. While Democrats who adhere to the Kansas City platform are not Populists, yet they are truly democratic in spirit, sincere in purpose, formidable in numbers and organization, and represent all the reforms which the people are likely to accept during this