

Moines (p. 8), readers who are interested in this promising experiment in municipal government will doubtless be glad to know something more of the result than appears in the bare statement we were able to make in our news columns last week. The councilman whom the dispatches named "John Macnicav," is really John Macvicar, former mayor of Des Moines and widely known as secretary of the League of American Municipalities. He is a trustworthy specialist in municipal subjects. Two groups were trying to control the election—the old "City Hall gang" and the silk stocking or "business man" crowd. The latter, which had much to do with originating the "Des Moines plan," especially its autocratic Galveston features, is said to have promised the public utility interests that Macvicar should not get into the council. A survey of the result indicates that the election was a defeat for both the "City Hall gang" and the "business man" crowd, and a victory for Macvicar and union labor, two of the councilmen being labor candidates. Although the Mayor is credited to the "City Hall gang" he is understood to be a good man personally. The public utility people tried to defeat him at the primary with a man of their own, who came in at the bottom of the poll. The Mayor was a "wide-open" candidate; and as the new city government announces a policy of strict enforcement of the law, it would appear that the item of mayor is not overwhelmingly important under "the Des Moines plan."

+ +

Why They Fear Bryan.

At a recent meeting in New York City a number of conspicuous representatives of predatory wealth, three of whom bitterly denounce President Roosevelt, were discussing the approaching Presidential election and its probable result. While they could not find language severe enough in which to condemn Roosevelt, they were also opposed to Bryan. One of the gentlemen present, a Southern Democrat, asked these "captains of industry" and railroad magnates why they feared Bryan, reminding them that if he should be elected President there was a reasonable probability that the Senate and the House would nevertheless be safely Republican. One of the most aggressive of the predatorialists candidly replied: "We fear him for the Attorney General he would appoint."

+ +

Governor Johnson's Campaign.

It is now quite evident that Governor Johnson is the choice of the Eastern syndicates for thwarting the democratic demand for Bryan as the Presi-

dential candidate of the Democratic party. Bryan's nomination is the one thing these interests now fear. They would risk any man to sidetrack Bryan. But they do not regard Governor Johnson as a risk. James J. Hill's "o. k." is good enough for them.

+

The one specific virtue urged in behalf of Governor Johnson is that he would surely win. The same assertion came four years ago from the same sources regarding Judge Parker. It is as baseless regarding Johnson as it proved to be regarding Parker. Governor Johnson has no popular strength outside of his own State. The prediction that he would carry Wisconsin is the veriest moonshine. If La Follette were the Republican candidate no Democrat could carry Wisconsin, and Bryan is the only Democrat who can carry that State against any Republican. As to Governor Johnson's own State, Minnesota, no Democrat can carry it for President. With all the support which Governor Johnson had from the corporations in his campaign for Governor, and even with a Republican candidate whose candidacy the corporations should ignore, as they did that of Governor Johnson's gubernatorial adversary, Governor Johnson could not secure the electoral vote of his State. He could not carry a single State that Bryan would lose; and he would lose States that Bryan can carry.

+

There has never been any probability of Governor Johnson's nomination. There would be less than ever, were it possible, now that one of Mr. Hill's handy men has opened Governor Johnson's headquarters at Chicago under the evident and only thinly concealed patronage of Mr. Roger Sullivan, and that the Republican papers are singing Governor Johnson's praises in chorus, as they did Judge Parker's about this time four years ago. Democrats who put principle above pie have come to understand fairly well that any Democrat whom corporation magnates vouch for and Republican newspapers exploit, adds nothing to his Presidential availability by encouraging their overtures. Such a man must win his spurs as a Democrat of principle, free from Big Business entanglements, before he can hope to command the confidence of democratic Democrats.

+ +

Single Taxers and Democratic Politics.

One of the minor manifestations of the Big Interests movement in Democratic politics that are masking under the Governor Johnson candidacy,

is of special concern to single taxers. It consists in a resolution purporting to come from the "Pennsylvania State Single Tax League," but without other authentication than the signature of Walter Evans Smith, a name which single taxers generally will not readily recognize. The resolution proposes Governor Johnson for President, because, as stated in the preamble, he "has declared that it may be that some of the principles of the single tax on land values could be adapted to work out a satisfactory system of taxation," and William H. Berry for Vice-President, because he "has frequently stated that the land question is a fundamental question and that the single tax is an equitable and practicable solution of the question." These gentlemen are therefore recommended "to the suffrage of a quarter-million (as estimated by the secretary of the American Single Tax League) single taxers of the United States." It is interesting to observe the avidity with which the Big Interest newspapers have seized upon this resolution for publication, and regrettable that others, notably the Springfield Republican, have been misled by it.

+

If the resolution were an expression of single tax sentiment at all general, it would exhibit some indications that are significantly absent. It would, for instance, bear signatures more familiar to single taxers, coming as it does from Philadelphia where single taxers of national reputation abound. And whatever the signatures, if the resolution were intelligent as well as genuine, it would hardly relegate to second place a straightforward single tax man like Mr. Berry, while naming for first place a man who, if he may not indeed be called a pronounced opponent of the single tax, would certainly be the last to acknowledge that he accepts it. Another consideration is the fact that Mr. Berry is a Bryan leader in Pennsylvania—the Bryan leader there, it is perhaps safe to say—and a man whose high sense of honor would not under existing circumstances permit him to consent to this use of his name. Those single taxers of Pennsylvania who, under the signature of Walter Evans Smith, if there be any such in addition to Mr. Smith himself, may honestly enough suppose that Mr. James J. Hill's choice for the Democratic nomination for President may also be a good single tax choice, or they may have acted without knowledge and impulsively. They are entitled at any rate to all possible credit for good intentions. But we have more confidence in the judgment on this point of the single taxers of Minnesota, who know Governor Johnson and his affiliations, than in that

of the best of our single tax men in places as far distant as Philadelphia. The single taxers of Minnesota, inclusive of some of the ablest and truest democratic Democrats of the whole country, are, without dissent so far as we have been able to learn, opposed to the Presidential candidacy of Governor Johnson.

+

For the benefit of non-single-taxers, it should be explained in this connection that no organization does or can represent the single tax movement politically. If there are a quarter of a million single taxers in the United States, as there probably are, and more—at any rate we hope so,—they are not organized and cannot yet be organized for political action. Some are Democrats and some are Republicans; some are wealthy, and of these some are perhaps aristocratic; many are poor, and many are of the middle class. Some believe in promoting the single tax idea by local, and some by national agitation; some through the Democratic party, some through the Republican party, some through third parties, and some outside of all parties. All are doing work for the single tax in their own way and none without good effect. Some of those in the Democratic party believe that a popular leadership like Bryan's, though the single tax issue be not yet specifically raised, and measures not strictly in line with single tax dogmas must be sometimes tolerated, will best promote progress toward single tax issues, and most certainly secure the ultimate triumph of single tax measures. Others in the Democratic party cling tenaciously to academic principles, regardless of political exigencies and regardless of the side of a dominant issue in Presidential politics which this fidelity to doctrine may compel them to take. And then there are many believers in single tax ideas in a general way, who are nevertheless not thorough-going single taxers. Their tendencies are toward it, but its label is not upon them. Yet they are a highly important factor. For these reasons among others the strength of the single tax movement does not lie at this period of its development in political organization. No organization, no organ, no person, can speak for single taxers politically.

+ +

The Single Tax in Oregon.

Under the initiative and referendum clause of the Constitution of Oregon (vol. x, pp. 827, 1229) a fiscal amendment of the Constitution is to be voted upon in that State at the election in June. It is in these terms:

All dwelling houses, barns, sheds, outhouses, and