

probably many such turn downs in store for him yet, but he still believes that the Democrats of Ohio could make a better fight facing the enemy than in running from the enemy; and Mr. Bryan believes that as long as the Democratic party has men like John R. McLean aspiring to the Senate it can not afford to leave the voters in doubt as to whom the Senatorial candidate is to be in case of victory. Governor Harmon may have satisfactory reasons for throwing his influence on the side of those who are opposed to nominating a Senator, but if so he has not yet made them public. Possibly he thought that the nomination for Senator might have lessened his chance of election, and his election may be so important at this time that Ohio can afford to throw away the chance of electing a Democratic Senator. That is a question for the Democrats of Ohio. But Mr. Bryan finds some consolation in the fact that the fight brought out a brave man, as it did in the case of Newton D. Baker, and it is worth a fight to discover a brave man. He finds some consolation also in the fact that there were about two hundred and fifty unterrified Democrats who stood up and voted for the nomination of a Senator in spite of the administration, the breweries and other corporations that do their work in the dark.

+

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), July 16.—Some of the machine politicians of the State are aghast at the prospect of the nomination of James R. Garfield. So unanimous is the opposition of the bosses that Mr. Garfield's boom was at first regarded as a harmless joke. But the joke has become more than serious. Convention delegates from every corner of the State are announcing their intention to break away from the masters, and cast their votes for the Progressive candidate. So great has grown the movement that even now the nomination of Mr. Garfield, in the face of the united opposition of the bosses, appears by no means impossible.

+ +

#### Conservation Principles.

The (St. Louis) Mirror (William Marion Reedy).—Among the best talkers of single tax talk in this country today are Gifford Pinchot, James Rudolph Garfield and all the Conservationists. They want to conserve for public use the values in the unalienated land of the country. From that it is but a step to conserving for public benefit the values in the alienated lands. They haven't yet found out that the values can be conserved and the lands at the same time released to public use, by a simple method of taxation that will make the occupiers use the land or let it alone. A tax upon the actual value of the land—the value the grabbers estimate, not the value at which they grab it from the government—would stop the grab. The solution of the supposed conflict between conservatism and development is as simple as A, B, C. If only Pinchot and Garfield could get this idea into the head of their great and good friend Roosevelt he might get up in his place and say something that would really make plutocracy tremble. He says he is not an economist, but a moralist; but robbing the people of their natural resources is a question for a moralist. Con-

servation without taxation at actual value is a farce. If the resources are only to be locked up, that will retard progress. Tax the resources and let them be free to the use of all who will pay what they are worth in taxes for the public good. Seems to me that Messrs. Pinchot, Garfield and Roosevelt have discovered a pretty bad case of a general disease, but haven't the nerve as yet to recommend the only possible cure. They'll all have to come to it, though, in the very near future. They opened an issue that can only be closed by the application of the philosophy of Henry George.

+ +

#### Government By as Well as For the Governed.

The Chicago Citizen (Irish-American), June 25.—Mr. Roosevelt poses as "a real and not as a mock democrat." Mr. Roosevelt may not know it, but most people of ordinary common sense and intelligent perception have quite a different idea; they are impressed with the conviction that Theodore Roosevelt has despotic tendencies so strongly developed in his character that under certain circumstances, favorable to his personal ambition, he might become a very dangerous man. . . . It may be fashionable among a certain class of bastard Americans to sneer at the principles embodied in our Declaration of Independence, . . . but a principle once true is true forever. . . . The Rev. Isaac T. Hecker, founder of the Paulists, and as good an American as Roosevelt, wrote: "The Republic of the United States is the result of the gathered political wisdom and experience of past ages, shaped by a recognition of man's natural rights and a trust in his innate capacity for self-government beyond what had found expression in the prevailing political systems of Europe." Father Hecker's "man" does not mean the Anglo-Saxon man, the American man, but all men, the Irish man, the Indian man, and the Egyptian man. . . . If we admit the right of might to decide who is and who is not deserving of liberty and self-government, how do we know how soon a man of Roosevelt's temperament, and perhaps greater and unhollower ambition, backed by the concentrated wealth of the few, and ministered to by the necessities of the many, may not decide that it is better for the American people that they be governed by a privileged few who will give them the best government they ever had—in the estimation of the governors? And if we rebel and demand the restoration of the Constitution of Washington and the Fathers, may not our plutocratic and aristocratic rulers decree that we are ignorant of what is good for us, that we are uncivilized, according to the standard of our rulers, and that weakness, timidity and sentiment on their part is worse for us than violence and injustice? And as a result may we not behold the American empire rise above the ruins of the American republic? This is no fanciful dream. We are nearer the monarchy than some people imagine. . . . If we do not soon get back to the religious and moral home life of our fathers, and to the letter and spirit of the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, somebody—Roosevelt or somebody else—will be governing us for our own good without weakness, timidity or sentiment.