

and dominant systems of plunder. If moral sense is lost and greed has dulled the popular conscience, a government of angels could work no redemption. Nations are as individuals.

"When faith is lost, when honor dies,
The man is dead."

We have seen sad times before and lived through adversities that threatened wreck. Strengthened by the memory of the nation's previous awakening and recovery we look with courage for signs of morning amidst the present "encircling gloom." We must not doubt that cheering omens exist. To point out and emphasize them is the duty of the hour. We cannot question that privilege will fall when democracy grapples with it in deadly earnest.

But there are various brands of democracy. The dominant and vociferous one is that of party. Ex-Gov. Hill represented it in his declaration, "I am a Democrat." Except as a badge of organization the words were without meaning. From them no one could predict how the Governor would act in a given case involving democratic principles, unless indeed one counted him on the hostile side although in party harmony.

Genuine democracy, based on the ideals expressed by Thomas Jefferson, has many professed admirers and few adherents. Politicians of sinister purpose parade Jeffersonian sentiments as a shelter from which to strike at the roots of self-government. For idealists who accept the gospel as a living one there is only a tolerant contempt. Success and not ideals is the quest of parties. Of what use is organization if not to control offices and patronage? Otherwise, as the ingenuous Flanagan, of Texas, asked, "What are we here for?"

In conspicuous politics I should be puzzled to name more than two men who stand solely for democratic ideals. One of them is Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio. Although emphatically defeated at the recent election he will surely reappear upon the field if life and health are left him. Well did he say: "Truth loses many battles but no war," and politicians cannot yet reckon without him in their cunning schemes.

The other Jeffersonian I shall name was not submerged by the political flood of last November although his party was overwhelmed. For the second time he was landed safe and sound in the Governor's chair of Rhode Island, a miracle full of cheer. Speaking unwelcome truth in a corrupt and machine-ridden state, regardless of personal fortune, his simple courage and fidelity touched the hearts of his Republican opponents and commanded their respect. To their aid he owes his re-election.

This Democrat of the pure brand is with us to-night for no partisan purpose. From his lips you will hear no platitudes or empty rhetoric. For many years it has been my privilege to know and honor this modest, thoughtful, clear-sighted, determined and

undiscouraged reformer. Wherever in his own state a suffering cause needed a champion, an abuse demanded exposure, a beneficent law called for enactment, one man at least could be counted on to respond "Here am I." That man is the speaker of this evening whom I am honored in introducing, Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island.

COMMUNICATIONS.

TWO WRITERS IN AGREEMENT.

Editor Single Tax Review:

There are, to my mind, strong arguments that may be urged on both sides of this question. Among the arguments in opposition to independent action are: (a) The moral certainty of no immediate success at the polls; (b) only a small portion of those who believe in the justice of Single Tax are willing to give up their old parties and vote for it, and hence a ballot will make the cause seem weaker than it really is; (c) the division of the reform forces of the country caused thereby; (d) the antagonism which it thus invites from the adherents and especially the leaders of the old parties; and (e) the belief that Single Taxers can work best for their reform by teaching its principles within their old parties.

Among the arguments in favor of independent action are: (a) The interest which is thereby aroused among many of the believers in the reform who love the concrete rather than the abstract, and who thus become active and efficient propagandists of its principles; (b) the great advertising which results therefrom during a campaign.

The amount of Single Tax literature that was issued here in Chicago during the last two or three campaigns was very great indeed, and the pieces numbered up in the millions. The amount of money expended reflected great credit upon the members of the club, and bore witness to their activity and loyalty.

If our American cities had a form of cumulative voting something after the style prevailing in Brussels there would be still more encouragement than now exists for independent political action.

Whatever may be our decision regarding independent action under prevailing conditions, it seems certain to me that we cannot expect that any legislation favorable to Single Tax will be enacted until we first secure the initiative and referendum. Direct legislation by the people through the optional initiative and referendum, such as has existed for many years in Switzerland, with such excellent results and for a less period in South Dakota will have to be secured in any state that desires to try to experiment with the theory of Henry George. Nothing else will dethrone the political boss.

Single Taxers should bear this in mind,

and while they need not cease to advocate their great reform they should remember that the key to all reform is direct legislation by the people.

JAMES P. CADMAN.

Editor Single Tax Review:

As a Single Taxer from the inauguration of the movement I should like to have the privilege of your columns to express some of my views relative to the present status and future prospects of the Single Tax especially with a view to independent political action.

I desire to say in the first place that I am opposed to a Single Tax political party not because I am opposed to all so-called third or independent parties, but because such a course at present could in no wise benefit the Single Tax, but on the contrary probably very much impede its chances of ultimate success. Theoretically, political parties are assemblages of citizens holding certain views in common which they hope by associating themselves together to further, by a formal appeal to their fellow-citizens at the ballot box. Practically the parties are nothing of the kind. All political parties that have ever existed since the beginning of the republic have had for their real purpose the seizure of the power to make laws. In other words they are law-making firms. They carry on this business solely for the purpose of making money, just like any other private enterprise is carried on. The party in power gains a temporary monopoly of the law making power with which its leaders or owners proceed to "make hay while the sun shines" by collecting as large a boodle fund as the circumstances of the time warrant.

Now the Single Tax will benefit no one special interest. It is for the benefit of the whole people, and will in my opinion do the whole people more good than any agency that has ever been devised by man. In order to start a Single Tax party you have to look to the masses of the people for financial support as they are the only beneficiaries except you run the new party as a side-show to one of the great political parties. Now the people do not possess means enough to pay the cost of running a new party which under no conceivable circumstances from the very nature of its being could ever have any legislation to sell and thus provide itself with the sinews of war. It will thus be seen that a Single Tax party is impracticable, viewed from the standpoint of practical politics which defines the sole function of a political party to be the accumulation and distribution of a campaign fund.

Principles are used in politics like Christianity is used in the so-called Christian churches simply as pretenses, and something to talk about and to pretend to believe in order to catch the unwary "suckers" who constitute the multitude.

The primary question of a political nature

to be solved in this country is not the question of taxation. It is—Shall the people rule this country, or shall the special privileged classes continue to control public affairs? Many Single Taxers have failed to grasp the meaning of this question. As a rule Single Taxers think they may succeed under the existing form of government which practically precludes the masses from any share in the law-making. I assert that the success of the Single Tax under our present form of government is to all intents and purposes absolutely hopeless.

This is true also of all the other economic reforms closely allied to the Single Tax.

As things stand nothing at all in the interest of the whole people is going to happen. Upon the contrary, plutocracy is bound to become more arrogant and triumphant than ever before. It is quite within range of possibility that the Single Tax idea will disappear entirely from the minds of the masses of men quite as completely as the "l'impot unique" of the French physiocrats disappeared from the popular mind until interest in it was revived by the late Henry George.

I beg of our friends that if any independent political action is contemplated that they eliminate the Single Tax from the declaration of the new party. Let the party be formed solely upon the idea of putting the masses of the people in control of the law-making by means of direct legislation.

The Single Tax means direct taxation, the first of all the functions of government. Give the people power to make the laws and among the first things they will do will be to demand that the control of the taxing power be vested in themselves. The only way that the taxing power can be kept within the control of the people is by direct legislation. With a full initiative and referendum both the incidence and amount of taxes would be within the control of the people. Now they have control of neither. The fundamental political superstition in the United States upon which is grounded all our other political superstitions is the idea that we live in a "government of the people by the people and for the people." The truth is we live in a government of plutocrats, by the plutocrats, and run entirely in their interests. This remark applies equally to the executive legislative and judicial function of the national, state, or municipal division of our government. Money and special privileges bought with money rule them all. I have for years taken an active interest in all kind of practical politics and know the foregoing to be gospel truth. In the light of these premises where is the hope for the Single Tax unless the people get the power to make the laws for their own benefit? A fair answer to this query will be much appreciated and may help to make the new year of happier augury to the Single Tax cause.

WILLIAM A. HILL, M. D.