

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