

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1902.

Number 215.

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.

Attention is called by that excellent representative of democratic principles and ideals, the Springfield Republican, to a recent remark upon the question of imperialism as a political issue, reported to have been made by Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland.

Describing Mayor Johnson as a Democratic presidential possibility, the Republican observes that he "has been opposed to the Republican imperialist policy and again announces his opposition;" but it criticizes him because "he is not favorable to any plan to direct the attention of citizens to outside issues when the real issues are to be found right here at home."

In the language of this criticism of the Republican upon Mayor Johnson—

His idea seems to be that syndicate privilege is primarily responsible for the imperialistic plunge of the nation, and that the way to strike at imperialism is to strike at monopoly. This may be true, but the view that the Philippines outrage is not to be considered immediately and apart from its possible ultimate origin, will not find much favor among voters opposed to the course of the Washington administration. A man who regards the Philippine business as an "outside issue" is decidedly too queer in his mental processes to make much headway toward the Democratic presidential nomination two years from now.

It would be a sufficient reply to the Springfield Republican that Mayor Johnson has given no indication of trying to make "headway toward the Democratic presidential nomination." He is mayor of Cleveland; and, so far as we have been able to learn, he has

devoted himself to the intelligent and faithful administration of that office, utterly regardless of the effects upon his personal fortunes, his partisan affiliations, or his possible ambitions. If in this local public service he has developed into a national character toward whom men of all parties look as to a presidential possibility, it is not because he has used the office to "pull wires," to "lay pipe," or to construct "combines," nor because he has cultivated "hothouse issues," "advanced his claims," or otherwise sought the presidential nomination. There is no indication of his having done anything of the kind. It is because his management of the affairs of his city, at a time when municipal administration has become a subject of national concern, has manifestly been guided by principles of broad statesmanship, by disinterested fidelity to his trust, and by a refreshing spirit of elemental democracy.

What Mayor Johnson has accomplished in the first year of his term is worth a brief review. The groundwork for a complete reassessment of all the real estate in the city of Cleveland has been made, which will show the property that is overvalued for taxation as well as the property that is undervalued, and just how much in each case. Among other things it exposes the fact, doubtless true in principle of all other cities, that small properties which are assessed at over 60 per cent. must be reduced by, from \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 to bring them to a 60 per cent. basis; while from \$70,000,000 to \$80,000,000 must be added to under-assessed real estate to bring it up to that basis. To this valuable work the Republican legislature has interposed obstacles in the way of "ripper" legislation. As to the property of public-service corporations in Cleveland, appraisements for taxation have been in-

creased \$20,000,000; not arbitrarily, but in compliance with sound fiscal principles. But Republican revenue officials and a railroad court have interposed for the protection of these long privileged tax dodgers. An ordinance for a three-cent fare street railroad system, with the privilege reserved to the city of taking it over as a municipal concern whenever the legislature assents, has been secured; capitalists to build and operate the road have been found; consents of property-owners have been obtained; the work of construction has begun; and nothing but an injunction procured in the interest of the present 5-cent monopoly system, which Senator Hanna controls, stands in the way of the prompt completion of this low fare road. The parks of the city have been made resorts for the common people instead of mere driveways and gardens for the wealthy; but this reform has been attacked by the legislature through another "ripper" act, which may or may not stand the test of an appeal to the courts. Lastly, the water department has been taken wholly out of partisan politics by Mayor Johnson, who has made merit instead of party service the standard of employment; and the experiment has already resulted in such improvement of the service as to furnish an indication of the benefits to be expected, under good administration, from the further assumption by cities of the monopolies that use city streets.

With such a democratic record to his credit, and it is only a suggestion of all that has been accomplished of similar radical tendency, it is little wonder that Mayor Johnson has turned a Republican stronghold into a Democratic city, that he has turned over the county from Republican to Democratic, and that he is expected

even by leading Republicans of Ohio to place the state in the Democratic column. But none of that has been the end he has had in view. Even though he has spent several days in each week all through the past winter at the state capital endeavoring to promote equitable taxation laws and to defeat monopoly tax measures, he has done so as mayor of Cleveland, in the interest of Cleveland, and only because taxation in Cleveland is inextricably tangled up with the tax laws of the state. And what he has done and tried to do proceeds from an acute perception and firm grasp of the natural economic and moral laws with reference to principles of government that apply with equal force to one municipality as well as another, to one state as well as another, and to the nation itself as well as to its larger and smaller political divisions.

As to the Springfield Republican's contention that Mayor Johnson does not lay emphasis enough upon imperialism as an isolated issue, the Johnstown Democrat, also an able and tireless adversary of the infamous Philippine policy, offers a complete reply when it says:

His critics need not waste time in worrying over Tom Johnson's queer mental processes. Mr. Johnson's queer mental processes have generally brought him to the sanest possible conclusions; and we suspect they seem queer only to those who are not accustomed to logic that doesn't limp and to reason that doesn't fall into fits of the blind staggers. Mr. Johnson knows whereof he is speaking. He understands, as every single taxpayer understands, that imperialism has but one spur—and that is greed. Imperialism has gone over seas on a piratical war, not for benevolent assimilation, and not even for glory. It has gone for loot. It has gone to grab franchises, to gobble up land, to appropriate valuable natural opportunities, to grasp new privileges and through these to exploit labor. But what would happen to adventurers if here at home a rear fire should be poured in upon the whole fabric of privilege—upon franchises, upon protective tariffs, upon government by injunction, upon the hundred and one devices of greed for robbing labor and limiting its opportunities? Would they waste their time in the Philippines if here at home their base

of supplies were threatened? Would they feel safe in centering their energies on a foreign conquest when the enemy was in their rear cutting them off from their communications and destroying the very citadel of their power? Johnson is right. A war on the imperialists here at home would be the quickest possible means of stopping the infamous attack on liberty in the Philippines.

It must be remembered that when men like Tom L. Johnson refer to economic issues at home as too important to be lost sight of in a conflict over foreign policies, he is not to be put in the same category with men like Senator Gorman, who would make the beef trust a paramount issue. With Gorman any popular issue is a "good enough Morgan until after election;" with Johnson issues are not made to carry elections, but elections are held to settle issues. Gorman is playing politics; Johnson is not. Gorman wants to be president; Johnson wants to be right. When Gorman proposes a policy it is to flatter voters and win offices; when Johnson proposes one it is to promote a principle and win a cause. The man who would make the beef trust the subject of a political issue before election for the sake of partisan success, is so narrow in his statesmanship that he could become an imperialist after election as easily as he could take the oath of office. But a man with the principles, the political acuteness, the democratic sensitiveness, and the public record of Tom L. Johnson, though he declares for the priority of questions of home policy over those of foreign policy, could under no circumstances give countenance to a foreign policy of imperialism. To him democracy is a universal principle, which must indeed be rooted in our domestic policy, but which must also control our foreign policy. The advocate of home rule for Ohio cities, upon grounds of principle, as Mayor Johnson is, could not and would not countenance a colonial system and imperial rule.

Some New York clergymen have broken the conspiracy of silence among "the cloth," regarding the

recent disclosures of American atrocities in the Philippines, and have signed an appeal to their brethren in all denominations throughout the United States to protest against the conditions which these disclosures reveal. Among the clergymen who sign this appeal are C. H. Parkhurst and John C. Bliss, Presbyterian; Robert Collyer, Unitarian; D. W. Couch, Methodist; Eugene G. Fuessle, Evangelical Reform; Conrad E. Hermsstaedt, Moravian; P. F. McSweeney, Roman Catholic; H. Pereira Mendes, orthodox Jewish; John McQuirk, Protestant Episcopal; J. B. Remensnyder, Lutheran, and Henry A. Stimson, Congregational. Joseph R. Duryea declines to sign; but in doing so he explains that his objection is to making "the army bear the blame of an immoral policy of subjugation begun four years ago." We are not altogether out of sympathy with that objection. The American policy of subjugation in the Philippines does demand brutality in the execution, if it is to be executed. If we want the policy we must tolerate the brutality. Subjugation involves all sorts of horrible possibilities. It is no Sunday-school affair. And what can be said for those ministers, of whom there are so many, who not only tolerate the brutality but defend the policy of which it is a natural fruitage? If partisanship in politics and a habit of deference to plutocrats in church pews have left any spark of Christian religion in their souls, how can they read the text of this ministerial appeal from New York without crying out against the whole Philippine iniquity?

The appeal referred to contains numerous extracts from the report of the proceedings of the Senate committee of which Mr. Lodge is chairman. Some of these have been published, but not all of them. Here, for instance, is a description of the water torture, which the imperialist papers characterize as gently as if it were a mild form of infant school hazing:

The Witness—I witnessed quite a number of cases, because I was act-