

remedy which is in the mouth even of so many Republicans. Well may the New York Evening Post say:

This is a subject on which President Roosevelt cannot persist in keeping silent. He must speak to establish his own sincerity. The charge is freely made that his speeches about restraining trusts are only declamation. . . . Unless the President is willing to rest under the suspicion that he is talking clap-trap, for political purposes, and that he has not really enlisted for a war against trusts by every legitimate weapon, he will soon take occasion to say that he agrees with those ardent supporters of his in the West who are clamorous for the removal of the tariff duties that shelter monopoly.

But Mr. Roosevelt had agreed to continue what the Post properly calls his "clap trap for political purposes," when Speaker Henderson stunned him. What he will say now, only the future can disclose. As to the trust speeches he has already made, one can think of no apter comparison for the state of his strenuousness than that of a lassoed bull.

In commenting in the Commoner upon the attitude of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland toward the silver question, as disclosed by Mr. Johnson in his speech as chairman of the Ohio convention, Mr. Bryan has very cleverly and completely laid bare the real motives of the "reorganizers" in their unqualified hostility to the Kansas City platform.

"While it is to be regretted," he writes, "that Mr. Johnson is not prepared to defend every part of the financial plank of the Kansas City platform, his frank acknowledgment of difference on the ratio will answer one good purpose: it will convince the public that the men who have made such a fuss about 16 to 1 are not sincere, for they will oppose Mr. Johnson as heartily as they would have done had he given emphatic endorsement to every word in the platform. Many have taken refuge behind the ratio, when their real objection was to some other plank in the platform." Mr. Bryan adds that "these will be unmasked by Mr. Johnson's position."

Sure enough! Mr. Bryan was right. His prediction was verified even before the public had seen it in print. The Boston Journal, a Democratic "reorganizer" of Republican affiliations, promptly declared that Johnson "would be almost as obnoxious to the conservative forces of the country as Mr. Bryan himself." Some of the Democratic "reorganizing" papers, of Democratic pretensions, found him even more obnoxious than Bryan; while the New York Times, which may be regarded as the journalistic leader of the plutocratic movement within the Democratic party, has lost no time in declaring the same war against Johnson that it has maintained against Bryan. "Between the reorganizers of the Democratic party," it belligerently announces, "and the reactionary Bryanites, with Johnson now at their head, there will be, there must be, open war."

Let it be observed that this war, which the "reorganizing" and "harmonizing" Times transfers from Bryanism to Johnsonism, is not a war against "16 to 1." It cannot be, for not only has Johnson never accepted that doctrine but he expressly declares his opposition to it. In making this hostile pronouncement, therefore, the Times, as spokesman for the "reorganizers," exposes the very insincerity with which Bryan charges them and which he predicted they would themselves expose. It is not the "16 to 1" clause of the Kansas City platform that they have been fighting all this time, under the absurd pretense that that doctrine is the root of all the political and economic evil. What in their hearts they have been arrayed against is the democratic character of the Kansas City platform in general. In some instances holding briefs for the plutocratic interests of the country, and in others deluded by those who do hold such briefs, the "reorganizers" in the Democratic party, while professing that what they want is "harmony," are ready at the drop of the hat to fight anybody and everybody

who does not fall meekly into the plutocratic procession. And of this they now stand self-convicted. No compromise would satisfy them which did not allow them to formulate the platform and name the candidates. As Johnson truly said in his convention speech, what the plutocratic leaders in both parties have feared is "not free silver but free men."

He would be a poor observer of affairs political who did not realize that the chief concern of the Democratic "reorganizers" is to prevent the nomination of a democrat as the Democratic candidate for President. They want a "conservative" Democracy; one that can divide with the Republican party the campaign contributions of the trusts; one that will contest with the Republican party for the plutocratic job in which that party has been profitably engaged; one that would be an assistant Republican party when out of power and an acceptable substitute for that party when in power. With this object in view they are looking hopefully forward to the election of Mr. Pattison as governor of Pennsylvania. Should he carry his own rock-ribbed Republican state, Pattison would be an ideal candidate, in many respects, for the "reorganizers." But Johnson is casting a bigger shadow than Pattison. He is not nearly so congenial to the plutocratic elements, but he is ever so much more acceptable to those that are genuinely democratic. Hence the bitterness toward him. Even Mark Hanna would not be so delighted were Ohio to poll her old-time Republican majority this Fall, as would that plutocratic coterie of Democrats which is composed of Grover Cleveland's intimates and to whose harmoniously belligerent sentiments the New York Times gives utterance.

These malcontents might possess themselves with patience. Johnson is not a candidate for the presidency, in the sense of pulling and pushing for the nomination. He is attending

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