

strictly to the particular public business that has been entrusted to him. When asked by a newspaper correspondent last week whether he was a candidate for governor of Ohio and then for President, this was his reply: "I am not a candidate for anything except for mayor next Spring. It is my belief that my field of usefulness lies very close to the city of Cleveland." It is chiefly because he is Mayor of Cleveland that Mr. Johnson is campaigning the state of Ohio for Herbert S. Bigelow as the Democratic candidate for secretary of state, and the remainder of the Democratic ticket. The interests of Cleveland have been thrown into State politics by "ripper" litigation which has divested that city of its model charter, and the action of the Hanna governor and the Hanna majority in the legislature, which threaten to burden Cleveland, in common with all the other cities of the State, with board and boss government, and to perpetuate street car monopolies in the interest of Senator Hanna's personal "savings bank." It is necessary to secure if possible a popular condemnation of this policy at the polls this Fall; and that can be done only in the way in which Johnson is trying to do it—by going out among the people of the State and telling them the truth.

Because Johnson uses a large circus tents for this purpose, it pleases the plutocrats of both parties to sneer at his campaign as a circus performance. The one thing about it that is characteristic of a circus is the tent, which serves for a hall to accommodate thousands of people where local halls would hold only a few hundred. But in the estimation of the Republican press, the tent makes the affair a "circus," notwithstanding that the only performance is speech-making of the most serious and thoughtful kind. A striking commentary upon that clownish style of criticism upon Johnson was afforded last week by the Republicans of Chicago. They gathered

some 75,000 men, women and children into a park to participate in prize drawings and to receive hundreds of gifts comprising samples of nearly everything, from canned corn or a bottle of whisky to a house and lot. And food and amusements were abundant for all comers.

As described approvingly by the party papers, this Republican campaign opening was more suggestive of the old "bread and circus" days of Rome than of a serious political gathering. In those times the thoughtless herds of Roman voters were bought with gifts of bread and promises of circuses. The Republican managers seem to have reached the conclusion that America has now its thoughtless herds of voters, like those of ancient Rome, who can be bought with petty gifts and crude amusements. They may be right. But such demonstrations are not unlikely to cause the poor American voter, who is shrewd despite his poverty, to ask himself where the money comes from with which this intelligence-insulting generosity and display are paid for. When that question is seriously asked by the classes of people who were drawn by hopes of food and prizes to the Republican performance at Chicago last week, the Republican party as now organized will get a fatal fever.

If the Cincinnati Times-Star had more knowledge and less billingsgate in its editorial equipment, it would not print so many obviously vicious and transparently foolish things about Tom L. Johnson, Herbert S. Bigelow, and the late Henry George. Neither would it put itself in the ridiculous position before an intelligent public, of seeming to suppose that the kind of taxation which Johnson and Bigelow advocate is some new-fangled species of villainy. That it is neither villainous nor new-fangled, is fairly indicated by several facts which the Times-Star ignores. For one thing, the city of Glasgow and over 200 other cities and towns of Great Britain, including Liverpool

and London, are petitioners before Parliament for permission to adopt it in some measure. For another, the Royal Commission upon Taxation of Great Britain has recently reported in favor of adopting it in restricted degree; while one of the members, a distinguished British judge, advocates it in a minority report in full degree. For a third, over 50 municipalities in New Zealand, some of them farming regions and one of them the capital city of the colony, have adopted it by popular vote. Finally, its great advocate, Henry George, has never been answered in his logical exposition of this system of taxation (the only system that holds property rights as sacred), save as the Times-Star answers him—by billingsgate and diatribe.

An interesting account of the progress of the single tax movement appears in the Independent of September 11, from the pen of Joseph Dana Miller. Mr. Miller makes a brief survey of the world, with respect to this movement, calling attention to such experiments as those in Australasia and that of Germany in China, and to the advanced agitation in Great Britain, but referring particularly to the struggle now on in Colorado over the Bucklin amendment, and the policy Mayor Johnson has for eighteen months been pursuing in Cleveland and which he has now been able to extend to the State of Ohio. Had Mr. Miller written somewhat later, he might have been able to cite the most significant evidence of all, of the advance of this cause to which Henry George devoted his life. We refer to the effect upon the public mind of President Baer's bald claim that certain Christian gentlemen have been entrusted by the Creator with the ownership of the natural coal deposits of Pennsylvania. This assertion of ownership came in such a way as to excite public laughter where it did not excite public scorn or wrath, at the thought that these natural gifts of the Creator to all could be claimed as the private property of some. Such discussions

as have been seen and heard, in the papers and on the streets, since Baer's unguarded language, discussions which evidently rest upon a growing public perception of the rights of all to the enjoyment of the advantages of Nature's gifts to mankind, were formerly confined within the covers of Progress and Poverty and the walls of single tax clubrooms. The fact that they are now the common talk of "the man on the street" is the best possible evidence of the progress of the single tax movement.

"Well, gentlemen, what do you want? A change? Nominate your poison. State the remedy for a general condition of prosperity probably unexampled in this or any other country?" That is the comment of a cynical editorial writer of the Chicago Tribune upon recent bladder-blown business reports in Bradstreet's and Dun's. If it is workingmen the Tribune is addressing, the "poison" they might fairly "nominate" would be a share in this unexampled prosperity. With their living expenses increased 40 per cent., and their wages increased only slightly or not at all—in most cases not at all—they might be less timid about a change than the classes that are monopolizing all the prosperity in sight.

When President Roosevelt was in the South on his recent campaign tour, he complimented that section upon its increased prosperity as indicated by the Southern factories that have sprung up within the past few years. The essential character of this boasted prosperity may be inferred from the somewhat more minute observations of Irene Macfayden, published over her signature in the American Federationist. She says:

Only a few weeks ago I stood at half past ten at night in a mill in Columbia, S. C., controlled and owned by Northern capital, where children who did not know their own ages were working from six p. m. to six a. m., without a moment for rest or food or a single cessation of the maddening racket of the machinery, in an atmosphere insanitary and clouded with humidity

and lint. A horrible form of dropsy develops among the children. A doctor in a city mill, who has made a special study of the subject, tells me that ten per cent. of the children who go to work before 12 years of age, after five years, contract active consumption. The lint forms in their lungs a perfect cultivating medium for tuberculosis, while the change from the hot atmosphere of the mill to the chill night or morning air often brings on pneumonia, which frequently, if not the cause of death, is a forerunner of consumption. How sternly the "pound of flesh" is insisted on by the various employers is illustrated by the case of two little boys of nine and 11, who had to walk three miles to work on the night shift for 12 hours. One night they were five minutes late, and were shut out, having to tramp the whole three miles back again. The number of accidents to those poor little ones who do not know the dangers of machinery is appalling. In Huntsville, Ala., in January, just before I was there, a child of eight years who had been a few weeks in the mills lost the index and middle fingers of her right hand. A child of seven had lost her thumb a year previously. In one mill city in the South a doctor told a friend that he had personally amputated more than a hundred babies' fingers mangled in the mill. The average wage in North Carolina of the children under 14 is 22 cents a day, and in Georgia 25 cents is a liberal estimate. A correspondent gives a sample pay roll, showing an average of \$1.43 a week in a certain spinning room for all children employed. I know of babies working for five and six cents a day. A girl of nine, working at night, when six years old, received 12½ cents a night. The two boys who walked three miles to their work received 12 and 15 cents a night.

This is a side of the prosperity question that does not interest the prosperity "touters."

Socialists have an idea that political power is in process of yielding to industrial power; and that the time is not far off, if indeed it is not already at hand, when the political magnate will bow meekly before the industrial magnate. Of the plausibility of this theory of social evolution the people of the United States had an impressive exhibition last week. The political magnate of one of the greatest States of the Union, Gov. Stone of Pennsylvania, approached a private citizen, the industrial magnate of the greatest combination of industries in the world, J. Pierpont Morgan,—ap-

proached him on public business with all the meekness of the king on his knees at Canossa. The fact cannot be blinked that our political system, from the President down, has become subservient to the industrial powers over which Morgan and men like Morgan preside. Whether this is due to the system, as socialists would have it, or to the incapable or worse than incapable political officials, remains to be tested.

John Moody, the publisher of Moody's manual for investors (35 Nassau st., New York), has issued a booklet on the "morganization" of industry, which makes an excellent pocket companion in these days of trust discussion. It appears from this handy little pamphlet, and the details are given, that the steam railroad interests controlled by the Morgan crowd aggregate 55,555 in mileage and \$3,002,949,571 in capitalized value; while the industrial trusts controlled by the same crowd are capitalized at \$1,734,330,956—a total for this Morgan combination alone of \$4,737,280,527. It is an interesting fact that the word "morganize," recently invented to designate J. Pierpont Morgan's methods when he "organizes business," and adopted by Mr. Moody as the title of his booklet, "The 'Morganization' of Industry," has long been used in another sense—"to murder secretly." This amounts almost to a coincidence, when it is considered how "morganization" really affects legitimate industry.

In describing "morganization" Mr. Moody calls attention to the real secret of its success, without which no possible degree of organizing ability could avail. "Mr. Morgan," he says, "is at the head of no industry which does not have some special element of security and strength, outside of mere ability in management. In other words, his corporations all have an element of positive advantage or strength which prevents them from ever becoming subject to the