

religious freedom for all churches; but it is reasonably expected that churches will reciprocate by at least refraining from coercive interference with the freedom of voters at elections.

* *

The Campaign for Governor Johnson.

As we suspected it might, the single tax endorsement of Governor Johnson by the "Pennsylvania State Single Tax League" (p. 27) turns out to have been a "fake." There is no "Pennsylvania State Single Tax League." Nor is this the only "fake" which Eastern engineers of the Johnson campaign have launched. One of the others, first published in the Boston Herald and then scattered through the West from the Johnson headquarters at Chicago, purports to be a letter from a New Hampshire friend of Bryan's. It was addressed to Mr. Bryan, and expansively promised, on condition of his refusal to allow the use of his name as a candidate, that the electoral vote of New Hampshire should go into the Democratic column!

*

The "faking" of which these are specimens is not to be attributed to Governor Johnson personally. He is an honest and courteous gentleman, who wouldn't tolerate even the comprehensive "fake" of his candidacy, if he understood it. That he does not understand it is evident from his resenting the implication that he is a political protégé of James J. Hill. That the Interests, symbolized by "Yim Hill" in the Northwest as they are by "Wall Street" in the East, have hit upon Governor Johnson as their most available instrument for baffling democracy in the Democratic party, does not appear to have occurred to the courteous Governor. Oblivious to this "faking," he is so of course to the incidental and petty "faking" in which agents of the Interests have engaged in his behalf.

* *

Naturally.

"Bryan's name was put on ice" at the Jefferson day banquet of the Democratic Club in New York, say the plutocratic newspapers. What else was there at that banquet to put it on?

* *

Mayor Johnson and National Politics.

When the Interests were on a still-hunt for a popular Democrat to use for baffling the pronounced Bryan movement, they turned at first not to Governor John A. Johnson of Minnesota but to Mayor Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland. This was

clearly the wiser choice of the two. For Mayor Johnson is a democratic Democrat, and Governor Johnson is not yet known to be anything better than a traditional Democrat—hardly that, for he was a Republican on the question of imperialism. In behalf of Mayor Johnson, therefore, a diversion of magnitude might have been made; one of sufficient magnitude at any rate to alienate Mayor Johnson's friends from Mr. Bryan's, and thereby enable the plutocratic Democrats to ride in between the two, which was their object. But Mayor Johnson, free from the purblind ambitions which have made Governor Johnson an easy prey to the Interests, promptly declared himself for Bryan (vol. x, p. 985) in a manner so direct and emphatic as to preclude all reasonable question of his sincerity. It was hard for the plutocratic press to believe that the Cleveland Mayor could not be used as the Minnesota Governor has been. But after the action of the Cuyahoga county convention last week, which Mayor Johnson is reported to have controlled, even the plutocratic press must concede that Mayor Johnson's refusal to be a candidate is sincere. For the Cuyahoga Democratic convention has given uncompromising instructions for Bryan.

*

Doubtless the Ohio convention, in which Mayor Johnson will have influence, will also instruct for Bryan. As Ohio is a State in which Democratic victory this year is regarded as at least a possibility, and Minnesota is one in which the Democrats have as little chance of a victory as they have in Pennsylvania, the appearance of a delegation for Governor Johnson from Minnesota and of one for Bryan from Ohio, would make an interesting contrast. But it would be a contrast in which the friends of Governor Johnson are not likely to find the reasons for honorable pride of which the friends of Mayor Johnson could boast.

* *

Mr. Hearst's Independence League.

The first test of the strength of the Independence League since it decided to become a national side party (vol. x, p. 1138) occurred at the aldermanic election in Chicago last week, and resulted disastrously. The entire vote for the League candidates was less than 15,000. In percentages this vote was less than 6 per cent of the entire city vote, and less than 9 per cent of the entire vote in the 23 wards out of 35 in which the League nominated candidates and made a campaign. As the aggregate Democratic vote in the wards in question was nearly 33 per cent of the

entire vote of those wards, almost four times that of the League vote, the outlook for Mr. Hearst's Independence League in the national election is not especially bright.

+

Not only does the Chicago vote itself suggest inherent weakness in the Hearst movement, but the suggestion is intensified upon a comparison with the vote the League cast a year ago last Fall and with the expectations of its managers even after the close of the polls last week. Its vote last Fall was 40,000 in round numbers; and so confident were the Hearst papers and the League leaders of a repetition of this substantial result that they actually claimed the election of some of their candidates in their earlier election bulletins. The difference between 40,000 and 15,000 is significant.

+

Since the election the Hearst papers have boasted that the defeat of certain corporation candidates for re-election in both parties was due to the Independence League. But the facts hardly warrant the boast. The candidates named are Considine (Dem.), against whom the League made no campaign; Maypole (Dem.), Herlihy (Dem.), and Williston (Rep.), none of whom would have been elected if he had got every League vote in his ward; Badenoch (Rep.), who would have had a bare plurality of 77, if every one of the 462 League votes had been united to his 3,990; and Dougherty (ind.), who didn't come within 2,500 of election in a total of 6,000, and against whom the League made no campaign anyhow.

+

With such a showing in this first and fairly significant test, what reasonable expectation can Mr. Hearst have of gratifying his animosity toward Mr. Bryan by thrusting an Independence League candidate into the Presidential field? If the voters of Chicago not only refuse to respond to his call, but actually abandon the Independence League to the extent of 25,000 out of 40,000 polled a year and a half ago,—if this is so when conditions are more favorable to revolt against old parties than they will probably be in the Presidential contest next Fall, the people of the country are not likely to vote for its Presidential candidate in sufficient numbers to affect the election. The expectation, therefore, that Hearst's Independence League will be an obstacle to Bryan's election, is dispelled. But if Bryan should be defeated for the nomination, and a reactionary policy adopted by either or both parties, what figure

would the Independence League cut then? In all probability none at all. If a vigorous third party movement did not spring spontaneously out of the situation, the Independence League would fare no better than manufactured side parties usually do; and if such a movement did spring out of the situation, it would not take up with any side party, but would organize itself.

+

The manifest weakness of the Independence League, as exhibited this Spring in Chicago and last Fall in New York, is easy enough to understand. The League has been discovered to be under the control of one man in whose integrity of purpose the masses, from whom votes must come, have lost confidence. This is at any rate the explanation of the wreck of the League in Chicago. As a democratic movement within the Democratic party, the Independence League would have had great strength, and possibilities of a splendid triumph, which Mr. Hearst would have shared in spite of the disagreeable personal "boosting" his papers do for him. Had the League been disinterestedly devoted to securing control of the Democratic party and making it truly democratic, it would today doubtless control Democratic politics in Chicago and be well on the way to controlling the party in this and other States. But the League appears to be only a personal agency of Mr. Hearst, to whose aims every larger consideration is subordinated. Mayor Dunne's election and administration in Chicago, for instance, meant nothing to Mr. Hearst and his immediate lieutenants, but another rung in the ladder to the gratification of his own ambitions. It was nothing to them except as it might help, regardless of the interests of the people of Chicago, in getting national "delegates for Hearst." Through a multiplication of indications of this character, for which the Independence League has become responsible in the public mind, that organization is now a negligible factor in Chicago politics. Similar considerations dating farther back burden it in San Francisco, and later ones in New York. It is consequently a reasonable inference that long before the Presidential vote is counted next November, the Independence League will consist principally of Mr. Hearst's personal representatives, if indeed it should then have even a nominal existence.

+ +

Election Contributions.

What the exact facts may be is not yet quite clear, but that the Republican committee which