

chances may be taken in other respects. Should Mayor Harrison, or any of his type of Democrats be put to the front by Democratic conventions acting freely as the representatives of their constituents, well and good. The party would then be getting what it bargained for. But when it has candidates saddled upon it, and finds its influence under the supreme control of mere office huxters, men who take no interest in "causes" and go into politics only for what they can bring out—when the party is so managed, almost any change would bring relief.

Besides the name, other objections to the "Tilden Democracy" are put forward. Chief among them is a fear that this movement is part of the process of "reorganizing" the Democratic party of the nation, so as to bring it back under the dominion of those plutocratic and reactionary elements which may probably be best distinguished as "Grover Cleveland Democrats." There is, indeed, such a danger. Mr. Hopkins, who is at the head of the "Tilden Democracy" movement, was one of the bolters of 1896. His sympathies in national politics doubtless still run toward the Cleveland element rather than toward the new and progressive elements which sprang up in that memorable first year of Bryanism. But there is far less danger of such an outcome from the Hopkins movement than from the Harrison machine. We have reason to believe that the Hopkins movement, or "Tilden Democracy," is being organized upon democratic lines as to local party management. If that is so, it cannot contribute to democratic reaction in party politics unless the rank and file of the party in Chicago are reactionaries, which we do not believe. But the Harrison machine can become reactionary at pleasure. Should reaction appear to be desirable in the personal interest of its managers, it would become reactionary without any reference to popular sentiment in the party. It could be swung over to

the support of a Cleveland reaction three years hence, as easily as it gave the Democratic city of Chicago to McKinley a year ago. As between Hopkins and Harrison, the place of greater safety from reaction is with the former.

This fear of Clevelandism, while something to be guarded against, should not be allowed to frighten democratic Democrats. Yet it is being used with some effect in New York to influence votes for Low. Shepard is said to be a Grover Cleveland kind of man. He is described as now in training for Democratic candidate for president. Through him, if elected mayor, it is said that the national Democratic party is to be reorganized for reaction, and the Cleveland element put once more in control. Now, there may be some slight danger, as we have already said, of such a reaction in national politics as a result of the new movement under Mr. Hopkins in Chicago; but there is absolutely none with reference to Mr. Shepard. For neither Mr. Shepard nor any other Eastern man can secure the nomination of a united Democratic party in 1904. Such a nomination would smash the party to smithereens, and nobody knows it better, probably, than Mr. Shepard himself. So far as the Democratic party of the nation is concerned, the one important thing for Democrats of New York city to do this fall, is to see that the city is not turned over to Senator Platt.

While it is of much importance, with reference to national politics, that Mr. Low, the Platt candidate, be defeated, and while there is not even the shadow of an excuse for voting for him on municipal grounds, since his adversary, Mr. Shepard, is conceded to be his equal in every quality which good local government demands of a mayor, no such considerations call for the support of subordinate candidates on Mr. Shepard's ticket. If the real objection to Mr. Shepard is, as his adversaries urge, that while he

is acceptable some of his fellow candidates are not, that objection is easily removed. There is no reason why objectionable fellow candidates of his should not be discriminated against. The main consideration is the election of Shepard.

In one instance, at least, we should have no hesitancy about advising a discrimination in voting at the New York election. We refer to Samuel J. Seabury, the "fusion" candidate for judge of the city court. Mr. Seabury is a six foot man with a six foot mind; and in times like these, when men of that grade are likely to have man's work to do in broader fields, we should regret to see him stowed away upon a judicial bench. But he is a young lawyer of culture and marked ability, and it is undeniable that he would strengthen and purify any court to the bench of which he might be called.

Another case for discrimination appears to be that of Judge Jerome, the "fusion" candidate for district attorney. Jerome has given earnest in his campaign of an honest purpose to prosecute big and respectable thieves as well as the little and comparatively harmless ones. He has also had the courage to cut entirely loose from Platt. Judge Jerome's speech on the 30th, in which he exposed a treacherous bargain between Platt and Whitney, tells more for Jerome's metal than all the superficial municipal reforming with which he is credited. Had Mr. Low declared himself as publicly and emphatically against the ways of Platt, as Jerome and Shepard have against those of both Platt and Croker, there would be better reasons for supporting Low on municipal grounds. But Mr. Low has not done that. He is a Republican partisan now, in training under Platt. The ideal result, in local respects, would be the election of Shepard as mayor and of Jerome as district attorney. In campaigning, such cross-match party distinctions cannot, of course, be made. But independent voters, if intelligent, need have no

difficulty in making the distinction upon their ballots. Local questions aside, however, and the national outlook alone considered—which is necessarily the attitude of Democrats outside of New York—Shepard's success is the desideratum.

One of the interesting incidents of this New York contest is the strenuous efforts that are being made to secure for Mr. Low the support of the friends of Henry George, as such, as if Mr. Low were a better friend of what Henry George stood for and what his memory now recalls and his name represents than Mr. Shepard. Those who know the history of the George movement know something of the aid, even if not advertised, which Mr. Shepard has given it. One of the men most familiar with these circumstances is Henry George, Jr., who refers to them in an open letter in reply to an open letter from the president of the Manhattan Single Tax club, which the Low papers have exploited, though they suppress the reply.

Mr. George begins his letter with a response to the strictures upon himself for supporting Mr. Shepard, which constitute the burden of the other letter. If your communication, he says,—

had been a purely private letter it would not have called for an answer, since it can scarcely interest you how I shall vote. But it is not a private letter. You have given it to the press and written it on the letter paper of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, on which paper your name is printed as president, thereby conveying an impression to the uninformed that you have written with the authority of the single tax organization, whereas you and I know that that organization has not so authorized you—that, indeed, its constitution forbids consideration of politics.

Mr. George then compares the two candidates with reference to the attitude of single tax men:

As to whether few or many single tax men beyond your own immediate circle, or whether men as wise and well known as yourself, are supporting Mr. Shepard, matters not. Nor

need we decide whether or not the Democratic candidate mentally and morally measures up to the mayoralty office, for most of his adversaries testify that he does. It is of no present moment whether Mr. Shepard has, as you say, sneered at the single tax, or whether he has, as I may inform you, contributed generously to help the discussion of that idea, for the single tax is not an issue any more than it was when we voted for the Democratic candidate for the presidency last year—Mr. Bryan. Nor yet need you and I disconcert ourselves over Mr. Shepard's course respecting the rapid transit tunnel contract, for Mr. Low refuses to make that an issue, he himself having been, while the rapid transit plans were forming, an active member of the Rapid Transit Commission, of which Mr. Shepard was counsel.

These preliminary matters Mr. George passes by with only the references we have quoted. But he follows with a consideration of the fact, of which much has been made, that his father, when a candidate for mayor four years ago, fought Tammany Hall bitterly, and recommended Low's candidacy as second to his own, Low then being opposed not only to Tammany, but also to the Republican machine.

Of that aspect of the present campaign Henry George, Jr., writes:

You "thank God" that the influence of Henry George "is still the inspiration of single tax men as a whole, and leads them to throw their weight upon the side of decency and an honest municipal government," by which you mean, of course, for Mr. Low. This observation is, doubtless, predicated upon my father's independent candidacy for the mayoralty in the campaign in which he lost his life four years ago. Now, let me remind you that he struggled against what he denounced as the rotten Democratic machine. He had previously announced through the newspapers that he was a Jeffersonian democrat, that he had no ill-will toward Tammany Hall which a good mayoralty nomination could not remove, and that he would vote for its candidate if the Democratic convention should name Hon. Charles W. Dayton, Justice William A. Gaynor or some other Democrat of equal moral and mental caliber. Instead of this kind of nominee, Robert A. Van Wyck, a mere tool Democrat, was named. Then it was that my father, in spite of the serious warning of the doctors, took the field to protest against such a representative of Democracy and against the

men who were responsible for his nomination. My father was in close enough touch with Mr. Shepard to know that in important respects they were laboring along the same lines—that to democratic educational work to which he was devoting much thought and effort, Mr. Shepard, also, was giving his voice and his purse; and from what I know of the circumstances, I have small doubt that had Shepard been spoken of for the mayoralty at that time my father would have ranked him with Dayton and Gaynor as the kind of men, citizens and Democrats, who were eligible for the office and to whom he could give hearty support. As to what my father, were he alive, would do in the present instance, you are as free to suppose as anyone else. For myself, I venture to say that he strove for the kind of democracy that Thomas Jefferson taught, as opposed to Republican paternalism; that he invariably worked with the Democratic party when it moved, however timidly, in that direction; that he tested that party, not by its past deeds, but by its present actions—in a campaign, by its candidate and its platform; that if he would have deemed Mr. Shepard eligible for the mayoralty four years ago he would have deemed him eligible now. You do not mention it, but it is none the less the fact, that my father four years ago had words of praise for Mr. Low. But why? Not because of Mr. Low's republicanism, but because, though a Republican, Low, as an independent candidate, was struggling against Plattism. Here are the words of my father, uttered in a public address on the last night of his life: "Let me say a word about Mr. Low. On election day, as between Mr. Low and myself, if you are yet undecided, you must vote for whom you please. I shall not attempt to dictate to you. I do entertain the hope, however, that you will rebuke the one man power by not voting for the candidates of the bosses. I am not with Low. He is a Republican. He is fighting the machine, which is all very good as far as it goes. But he is an aristocratic reformer. I am a democratic reformer. He would help the people; I would help the people to help themselves." Apply these words now. Is Mr. Low any less of an "aristocratic reformer" than he was four years ago? And has he not succumbed to Senator Platt, the very Republican boss he assailed before and said was past redemption? Has he not now become the Republican nominee, and is it not by his election that the Republican party leaders hope, in the words of Lieut. Gov. Woodruff, "to make New York state as Republican as Pennsylvania?" Can anyone imagine that "the influence" of Henry George is "an inspiration of single tax men as a whole" to "throw