

popular vote. In the third place, unless he keeps his mind open on the question of vocational education, on the question of the Lakes-to-Gulf deep water way, and on the question of taxation, he may find himself involved in humiliating embarrassments.



Plutocratic "reformers" are trying to separate vocational from cultural education. A complexity of grafting interests is involved in the Lakes-to-Gulf controversy. The "tax reform," in behalf of which a favorable vote was trickily got at the recent election, is a La Salle-street reform, designed to release stock gamblers from personal property taxation while taxing tangible personal and real estate improvements higher. When these three subjects shall have been thoroughly canvassed before the new Governor and carefully considered by him, and not earlier, will the time be ripe for him to commit himself safely with reference to any of the three.



Governor Sulzer's Administration.

The Governor-elect of New York is a democratic Democrat. He has made a good record as such in a long Congressional career. He has more than one mark to his credit as such in the New York legislature. But never before has he had so free an opportunity to build his record up to a splendid climax.



Not only is his position as Governor so far above the reach of the Interests and the Bosses that they can do nothing to obstruct what he undertakes, but the political weather has set in from a direction which makes it impossible for them to punish him personally or to baffle his public spirited purposes. He is a free officeholder more completely than any Governor of New York has been in a generation.



Intense or unpopular radicalism is not demanded of Governor Sulzer by thoughtful persons. But unless he utilizes his extraordinary political freedom to give as full reign to his Democratic democracy as the advanced and advancing state of public opinion now permits, he will disappoint scores of thousands, both in his own State and out of it, who look confidently to him to place that State well forward in the march toward fundamental democracy.

Socialism versus Progressivism.

At least one remarkably able and brilliant speech was made at the City Club last week with reference to the lessons of the election. It was by John C. Kennedy, the Socialist Party candidate for Governor of Illinois, who polled 75,000 votes at the recent election. To praise his speech is not to agree with it at every angle, but no one who heard it will deny its plausibility as a summing up of election lessons.



Mr. Kennedy treated the regular Republican Party as dead—as dead as the Whig Party was when the Republican Party came into the arena. For the Democratic Party he foreshadowed early disintegration and collapse. With both those moribund organizations then out of the way, he pointed to the Progressive Party as the only combatant left the Socialist Party to meet—the former clinging to capitalism and making it as tolerable as possible, the latter assailing capitalism root and branch.



Whether or not Mr. Kennedy is right in his prophecy as to particular political parties, his general view is not much awry. The Socialist Party does aim at destroying capitalism root and branch, the good of it that belongs to *free contract* as opposed to monopoly, and the bad of it that belongs to *monopoly* as opposed to free contract. The Progressive Party does as yet aim at preserving capitalism with only its rough edges smoothed and polished. But there still remains a third possibility. With law-created monopolies—from tariff privileges to land monopoly—rooted out of capitalism, all that the Socialist Party aims at would at once be peaceably possible through voluntary economic readjustments, and all that the Progressive Party deplores would disappear. Out of the Democratic break-up that is almost inevitable—the very break-up that Mr. Kennedy predicted—might come the political force which, uniting with kindred elements in all the other parties, could realize Mr. Kennedy's prediction, somewhat different in detail to be sure, but in substance much the same as he pictured it forth.



Thomas Wybrants Lodge.

In the early days of The Public its democratic character drew to it one whose friendship has been unwavering for the fifteen years of its life and ends only with the end of his own. Thomas Wybrants Lodge, of Hahatonka, down in Missouri,

was a lovable character, to whom democracy was a religion and the teachings of Henry George one of its scriptures. Born in Killea Rectory, Ireland, in 1833, he was educated at Dublin University, married Margaret S. Thomson at Pittsfield, Illinois, in 1868, and, settling in Camden County, Missouri, in 1871, lived there until his death from old age in October of the present year. His name on The Public's list continuously all these years was one of its cherished landmarks and his occasional letters of encouragement among its cheering episodes.



THE INITIATIVE AND THE SINGLE-TAX.

There are few places so backward or persons so dull as not at this day to understand the essentials of the Initiative. It is a method of legislation by the people themselves, free from veto by Governor or legislature or any other representative power, and obstructed by no necessity for securing other permission for a popular vote than that of a percentage of the voters concerned. For this reason the Initiative stands out conspicuously as the climax of People's Power.

Not that legislative bodies or other forms of representation would be abolished by the Initiative. Legislation by representatives would be as necessary as ever, and more truly representative.

The effect of the Initiative upon representative bodies would be to take from them the tremendous power which they have usurped, and to restore to them the functions of representation from which they have fallen away. They would be people's *committees* in most things, instead of people's *bosses* in all things.



This restoration of power to the people has made friends for the Initiative among most advocates of radical changes in government.

Wisely so.

For whether or not such changes shall be made or be prevented, the people themselves ought to decide. They ought not on the one hand to be plunged by their representatives into changes they do not want, nor on the other to be obstructed by their representatives in securing changes they do want.

Wisely so for a further reason.

Under representative authority of the plenary sort, general stimulation of public opinion is extremely difficult if not wholly impossible. Legislators themselves may grow in civic intelligence

through the clash of opinion which centers at a capitol during sessions. Consequently, when radical proposals come before legislative bodies with virtually plenary powers, some stimulation of thought may be secured. But it is almost confined to legislators. Even they experience it under circumstances quite likely to prevent free consideration. "Influences" at the capitol, or fear of prejudice among the people at home, may give their thinking a "crooked" course. But however it be with legislators, the people as a whole get little or no political education on public questions that are decided by legislatures, and that is not good for popular government. If their intelligence is to reach its best or even its better possibilities, the people themselves must have direct responsibility for decisions on changes in public policy.

For a double reason, therefore, does the Initiative commend itself to advocates of radical changes in public policy. It makes, for one thing, a direct appeal to the people possible; and incidentally, for the other thing, it promotes public intelligence regarding public policies.



For those reasons, as well as its essential democracy, democratic Singletaxers have ceaselessly and in many places successfully promoted the Initiative and Referendum movement. Its story in any State cannot be fully written without disclosing Singletax persons and influences as the principal motive power. Though some Singletaxers have opposed it, they were few in number and of little influence outside of circles with anti-democratic or other reactionary tendencies.

Most persons who respond to Henry George's profoundly democratic message are advocates of the Initiative and Referendum as the highest known method of democratic government—the Referendum as a people's veto, the Initiative as a people's command. For these it is not easy to look upon a defeat of the Singletax by the Initiative, as in Missouri and Oregon, with complete satisfaction. Accustomed to recognizing the central truth of democracy which is at the core of their simple fiscal reform with its unattractive name, and prone as democrats to believe that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," many of them had no doubt wrought themselves up to expectations of victory for the Singletax immediately upon its submission to the people of those States. Their disappointment at the defeat must consequently be very keen.

But there is no substantial reason for disappointment. All may see this who will remember