

There are only two kinds of citizens—"natural born" and "alien born." If McClellan is not of one kind he must be of the other. Since he was born in Europe it would appear that he is "alien born." And that would be true had his father been an alien at the time. But McClellan's father was not an alien. He was a citizen sojourning abroad. This fact gives to McClellan's citizenship the characteristic of "natural born." True, he might have chosen to adopt the country of his birth instead of the country of his parentage, which would possibly have changed the matter. But he didn't. He clung to the country of his parentage, of which there is ample proof, and thereby put his eligibility to the presidency beyond question.

President Roosevelt tells the Washington correspondent of the Vienna Freie Presse that he welcomes "all foreigners who come as farmers or farm laborers," but objects "to those whose coming depresses industrial wages." Why is Mr. Roosevelt so solicitous for "industrial wages" and so indifferent to the wages of farm hands?

JOHNSONISM.

In one of the speeches of his campaign for reelection as a Senator from Ohio—his speech at Toledo on the 27th—Senator Hanna said that the Democratic platform of Ohio stood for "Henry Georgism, socialism, populism and Johnsonism."

Senator Hanna's ideas must have been much confused, or he would not have confounded Georgism with socialism and communism, nor either of these with the other. Intelligent men know that communism is a very different thing from socialism, and that Georgism is radically different from both.

But it requires no intelligence to jumble words pretentiously together, nor to be influenced by that time-honored method of concealing thought. What Senator Hanna wanted in his campaign was opprobrious epithets, not symbols expressive of human intelligence; and the words he chose

answered his purpose extremely well—if it was they that influenced the Ohio electorate.

This view of the matter is confirmed by the fact that Mr. Hanna piled up his epithets so recklessly. Recognizing in the Democratic platform of Ohio a sincere and vigorous declaration against plutocratic ideals and monopolistic methods, he drew upon his vocabulary of newspaperisms for every epithet that might convey to the minds of his somewhat dull and rather credulous auditors an offensive significance. Hence, not only his "Henry Georgism," his "socialism," his "communism," and his "Johnsonism," but also his "populism."

Had time permitted and Mr. Hanna's breath held out, he might have supplied his followers with several other epithets with opprobrious connotations. For really there is a considerable collection that could have lent themselves to his purpose; such, for instance, as "Fourierism," "Owenism," nihilism, agrarianism, and anarchism. But for the sacred traditions of his party he might have used "abolitionism" and "black republicanism" with good effect, as did the political leaders who stood for essentially the same thing in the fifties that Mr. Hanna stands for now.

And think of what Mr. Hanna might have done with "Jacobinism"! How did he come to forget "Jacobinism"? But never mind. His majority was big enough without it. Under the circumstances, "Jacobinism" would have been wanton waste.

But if Senator Hanna did indulge freely in epithets, he must be conceded to have perceived, however vaguely, the significance of the campaign that Mayor Johnson was leading.

While the teachings of Henry George were not at issue in this particular campaign, the questions that really were at issue lead directly toward those teachings. That Mr. Hanna really appreciated this appeared from another part of the same speech, where, with much greater reserve of epithet, he pointed out the way in which Tom L. Johnson expects to establish Henry Georgism. "His whole scheme," said Mr. Hanna, referring to Mr. Johnson, is "to

put the burden of taxation first on the railways and corporations, but finally on the land."

In saying "land" instead of "land values," Mr. Hanna was able to score a point with his ignorant audience. He made them feel—to say he made them think would be an unwarranted assumption,—he made them feel that Johnson seeks to put the burden of taxation on small home owners and farmers; whereas, had he said "land values," they might have perceived what the truth is, that Johnsonism aims to undermine the monopoly of valuable land, such as business sites in cities, railroad rights of way, rich mines, etc., by putting the burden of taxation upon its privileged owners. Nevertheless, it is evident that Mr. Hanna and his associates in special privilege have some realization of the drift of what he called "Johnsonism."

He sees that it leads toward "Henry Georgism," and he knows that Henry Georgism would be ruinous to all monopoly.

That Senator Hanna's governor-elect, Mr. Herrick, also perceives this drift of "Johnsonism," is evident. He fought his entire campaign against Henry George's single tax idea. On the same occasion on which Mr. Hanna expressed himself as noted above, Mr. Herrick made the significant declaration that the Henry George idea is one of the issues the Republicans must meet.

Mr. Herrick stated the matter mildly. Not merely is the Henry George idea one of the issues the Republican party must meet; it is the issue. And Senator Hanna and Mr. Herrick have made it so.

By forcing it into discussion in Ohio, as the distinctive characteristic of "Johnsonism," they have done what Johnson was not himself in position to do directly at this time—set the people to thinking about it and asking questions.

Had Johnson attempted to make the single tax idea an issue in the Ohio campaign, the attempt would have been met, as all such attempts have been met heretofore, by a conspiracy of silence. But the silence of the opposition has now been broken. They have broken it of their own motion, because they were foolish

enough to suppose that Johnson would dread the single tax issue.

Hanna and Herrick have ploughed the ground all over the State of Ohio, and Johnson and his single tax friends may be trusted to sow the seed. In Ohio the single tax policy is henceforth in practical politics.

And it needs only to be discussed to win. For it is grounded in justice, and like all just policies it would improve the condition of everyone who lives by his own industry. It would injure none but those who live in the sweat of other men's faces. Nor, indeed, would it injure even them. It would make them men instead of parasites.

This is the coming issue in American politics. It cannot be confined to Ohio. Wherever monopoly flourishes, this simple and just method of undermining and abolishing monopoly will be discussed. Let good citizens but familiarize themselves with the question, and the power of the privileged will quickly be dissipated.

Three possibilities present themselves: (1) The plutocratic-socialism of the trusts, with their ship subsidies and plundering taxation, their land-grabbing expansion and imperialistic colonies; (2) democratic socialism, with its submergence of the individual; (3) the policy of natural and beneficent evolution proposed by "Johnsonism," with its socialization, as public property, of land values and public utilities, and its more complete individualization of private affairs and private property.

From these three possibilities the choice must be made, and the day for making it is even now at hand.

A CONDEMNATORY CONDONATION.

A man's gift maketh room for him and bringeth him before great men.—Bible.

And thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous.—Ibid.

Mr. Bengough's recent cartoon (p. 464), in which a Janus-faced monopolist is pictured as offering a railroad pass, which "Theodore Roosevelt, as Theodore Roosevelt," on his right, has rejected,

but which "the personage who happens at the present time to occupy the position of President of the United States," on his left, is in the act of accepting, is (oh, the pity of it!), a graphic representation of fact.

During President Roosevelt's recent trip it was charged that the railroads were carrying him free.

Instantly Republican newspapers indignantly denied the charge. They repelled with scorn the allegation that the President of the United States of America—"Time's noblest offspring;" the land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln—should have accepted a gift that even malice might regard as a political bribe.

But now it appears that the railroads did carry him free. Do these Republican editors, so recently shocked at the bare aspersion, now hang their heads in shame when confronted by the undeniable fact?

So revolting was the act charged against the President that his political adherents hastened to assure the country that none but a base demagogue would be guilty of so vile an accusation. Now that the charge is known to be true, do these high-minded sons of a glorious ancestry repudiate the guilty and disgraced offender?

No! (publish it not in Gath!) they seek to exculpate him!

And on what ground? Hear, oh my countrymen! On the ground that the gift-taker is a public official!

Could infamy search out, in the whole realm of sophistry, a more disgusting refuge?

Could political degeneracy find a lower depth?

The very defense offered by his friends defines with inevitable precision the President's act.

When does a gift become a potential bribe? Is it when the recipient is a private individual, and as such merely, incapable of rendering valuable service in re-

turn; or is it when the recipient is a public official, and as such, clothed with ample power to reward the donors?

The Lord, instructing Moses, as governor of Israel, said: "And thou shalt take no gift; for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous."

All human experience has proved the wisdom of the above words; and "the personage who happens at the present time to occupy the position of President of the United States" may read with profit a part of the twentieth verse of the ninth chapter of Job, which says: "If I justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me."

Republican editors, in their attempts to justify the President, have but emphasized his condemnation.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 12.

Events in connection with the Panama revolt and the relation thereto of the United States government (p. 486), have come in rapid succession. At the present time the revolutionists have acquired control of Panama, the Colombian troops having departed at the request of the American naval commander; the United States has formally recognized the provisional government of the republic of Panama; and the Colombian government has been authoritatively advised from Washington that it will not be allowed to recover its authority over its seceding member.

Panama has been a part of the territory now known as Colombia for two centuries. It was originally part of the Spanish vice-royalty of New Granada, which included Ecuador and Venezuela. Having achieved independence, 1811-24, the vice-royalty of New Granada established the Republic of Colombia. This republic being dissolved in 1829-32, by the withdrawal of Ecuador and Venezuela, the re-