

Both political parties approve them definitely in their platforms.

+

On the question of candidates we here repeat our advice above, together with what we advised last week (p. 1010):

Colorado: For Congress from the 2nd district, John H. Martin, Democrat; for Congressman-at-large, I. N. Stevens, Republican; for the legislature from the Cripple Creek district, Tully Scott. Wherever the Citizens' ticket has a candidate, vote for him in preference to Democrat or Republican.

California: For Congress, San Francisco district, Walter Macarthur, Democrat; for Congress, Sacramento district, William Kent, Republican.

Illinois: For Judge of the Circuit Court, Cook county, Edward O. Brown, Democrat; for Judge of the Superior Court, William E. Dever, Democrat; for Superintendent of Schools in Cook County, A. O. Coddington, Republican; for president and member of the Sanitary District, Robert R. McCormick, Republican; for Municipal Court Judge, Chicago, McKenzie Cleland, Republican; for State Superintendent of Instruction, Francis G. Blair, Republican. For Congress (1st district), Michael E. Maher, Democrat; (2nd district) John Charles Vaughan, Democrat; (5th district) Adolph J. Sabath, Democrat; (7th district) Frank Buchanan, Democrat; (9th district) Frederick H. Gansbergen, Republican; (18th district) William I. Cundiff, Democrat; (20th district) Henry T. Rainey, Democrat; (22nd district) Bruce A. Campbell, Democrat; (23rd district) Martin D. Foster, Democrat. For the legislature: (3rd district) Isaac Peterson, Socialist; (4th district) Joseph A. Ambroz, Socialist; (5th district) Hiram T. Gilbert, Democrat, and Morton D. Hull, Republican; (6th district) Dudley Grant Hays, Prohibitionist; (8th district) James A. Prout, Socialist; (14th district) Bernard Berlyn, Socialist; (15th district) H. Winne, Socialist; (19th district) Rev. Frank G. Smith, Independent; (21st district) Christopher J. McGurn, Independent; (25th district) Andrew O. Silversen, Prohibitionist; (26th district) John Waage, Democrat, for Senator, and Carl B. Strover, Socialist, for Representative; (27th district) Edward Harris, Socialist, for Senator; (31st district) Leland P. Smith, Democrat; (41st district) James O. Monroe, Independent; (49th district) for Senator, Fred J. Kern.

Missouri: For the legislature (2nd district), Percy Pepon, Democrat.

New York: for Governor, John J. Hopper, Independence League; for Congress from the 17th district, Henry George, Jr.

Washington State: For the legislature (6th district), William Mathews, Democrat.

+ +

Value of the Initiative and Referendum.

A better statement of the mechanical value in politics, in one respect, of the Initiative and Referendum, could hardly be framed than this extract, editorially approved by the Chicago Tribune, from a speech by Edgar A. Bancroft, one of the prominent members of the Chicago bar, which he

made in the Peoria Conference campaign in Illinois:

The Initiative and Referendum—to destroy the vendibility of legislative representatives. When the corrupt influence of public officials is futile it will cease. The briber will refuse to pay when he cannot be sure of his purchase; and, after all, it is the briber, the man who furnishes the money, who is the chief criminal. He creates the atmosphere and opportunity and temptation of political debasement. The Initiative and Referendum also removes the small group between the electors and the higher officials and puts the ultimate power in practice, where it is in theory, in the people. It makes the people directly responsible for the public servants, and makes public service responsive to the people.

In those last words, a greater value than the mechanical is implied. Not only would the Initiative and Referendum stand in the way of corrupt legislation, not only would it furnish a leverage to compel progressive legislation, but it would also put political "power in practice where it is in theory, in the people." And this would do for the people more in the direction of what is most needed than any other electoral device. It would educate them in popular government.

+ + +

"BACK TO THE LAND"*—A STUDY IN DEMOCRACY.

To suppose that the ideal of "Progress and Poverty," Henry George's great message to mankind on their relation to their planet, the economic essence of which is so picturesquely expressed in Bishop Nulty's famous phrase, "back to the land,"—to suppose that the ideal of this book is merely fiscal, or even no more than comprehensively economic, is to do the memory of its author an injustice, and most gravely to misapprehend its scope.

"Back to the land" in the economic sense alone, is no more truly the ideal of "Progress and Poverty" than is that proposal of this book to which "the Taxation of Land Values" or "the Single Tax" alludes; and these names, as even the most careless reader should know, are allusions only to appropriate and effective fiscal means for the realization of a purpose more remote. Precisely as this message through Henry George is "not for the single tax," as some one has epigrammatically expressed the thought, "but for what the single tax is for," so is it regarding common rights to land values, and common rights to land itself.

From the "single tax" expedient to its

*For an editorial discussion of another phase of this general subject—the economic phase—see *The Public* of October 28, 1910 (vol. xiii, page 1014).

economic principle of common property in land, all the proposals of "Progress and Poverty" are but parts of a process. The structure—not building materials, nor tools, nor workmanship—is the real concern. As parts of the constructive process, materials and workmanship and plans in every part are vital, indeed, and appropriate tools as well; for "Progress and Poverty" wants no "jerry" building, nor does it expect its converts to lay bricks without trowels. But the *object* is the thing; and its object, in the economic field, is what Jefferson's was—the restoration of the earth to its living inhabitants in usufruct. But this is not its largest object; this is not its farthest north, its ultimate pole.

Its author testified for himself when he said:* "Let me not be misunderstood. I do not say that in the recognition of the equal and unalienable right of each human being to the natural elements from which life must be supported and wants satisfied, lies the solution of all social problems. I fully recognize the fact that even after we do this, much will remain to do. We might recognize the equal right to land, and yet tyranny and spoliation be continued. But whatever else we do, so long as we fail to recognize the equal right to the elements of nature, nothing will avail to remedy that unnatural inequality in the distribution of wealth which is fraught with so much evil and danger." This reform, however, as he wrote at the same time and in the same connection,† will make all other reforms easier."

That was the core of Henry George's contention regarding the concentration of all taxation into a tax upon the value of land, and making it heavy enough to take as near as may be the whole ground rent for common purposes. It was not the taxation of land values, and there an end; nor socialization of the land, and there an end. His ultimate object was democracy—fundamental and constructive democracy.

+

Had he been a man of leisure, Henry George might and probably would have written "Progress and Poverty" in three volumes instead of one.

He could then have discussed his subject on the three discrete planes of thought on which he did discuss it—the economic, the democratic, and the religious; but more fully as to the democratic and the religious, and, a separate volume for each, with less risk of confusing the three in the minds of readers not over careful.

*"Social Problems," chapter xviii, page 201.

†"Social Problems," ch. xix, p. 209.

Trammeled, however, by the necessity for making a living while at his larger and unremunerative task, and also checked no doubt by publication difficulties, he compressed the whole subject, with its three distinct fields of inquiry, within the bounds of a single volume, exploring none of them in any but a general way except the first.

The volume is broken up into "books," and each "book" into chapters. All the chapters of the first nine "books" are devoted to the domain of political economy. Those of the tenth "book" make an independent monograph on fundamental and constructive democracy. In the final chapter of the volume, the religious hypothesis is considered in a brief presentation of "the problem of individual life."

It is not improbable (and the otherwise unaccountable difficulties which some readers encounter in grasping the meaning of "Progress and Poverty" seem to confirm the guess), that these three discrete divisions of one general subject between the same book-covers sometimes confuse. A reader may fall into the error of supposing the volume to contain a continuous argument from cover to cover.

Yet the marks of distinction are clear.

The *economic* inquiry closes in the ninth "book" with a request to readers who have gone with the author so far, to go with him "further, into still higher fields."

Then comes a monograph on *democracy*. It begins in these opening words of the tenth "book": "If the conclusions at which we have arrived are correct, they will fall under a larger generalization. Let us therefore recommence our inquiry from a higher standpoint, whence we may survey a wider field."

With like preciseness of distinction, the *religious* chapter of the volume is thus introduced: "My task is done. Yet the thought still mounts. The problems we have been considering lead into a problem higher and deeper still." For out of his economic inquiry had come to him something he did not think to find, and a faith that was dead revived.*

Let it be observed, then, that "Progress and Poverty" is not one continuous inquiry, but three independent though correlative inquiries. Whoever reads the first nine "books" as an economic argument, an inquiry into the industrial relations of men to one another and to the land; the tenth "book" as an argument for fundamental and constructive democracy; and the final chapter of the volume as an allusion to those great religious

*"Progress and Poverty," p. 555.

forces that prophets have revealed and science is beginning to sense, and out of which the natural laws of political economy and of democracy spring,—whoever does this with reasonable attention, be he learned and rational or rational without much learning, will find the reading of "Progress and Poverty" easy and its message clear and convincing.

+

Even in the economic chapters of "Progress and Poverty,"* its author saw the possibility of society's approaching "the ideal of Jeffersonian democracy, the promised land of Herbert Spencer, the abolition of government. But of government only as a directing and repressive power." At the same time and in the same degree of approach, he regarded it as possible for society also "to realize the dream of socialism."†

This aspect of Henry George's message is often so little understood or appreciated by friend and adversary alike, that a larger quotation may not be amiss: "All this simplification and abrogation of the present functions of government would make possible the assumption of certain other functions which are now pressing for recognition. Government could take upon itself the transmission of messages by telegraph, as well as by mail; of building and operating railroads, as well as of opening and maintaining common roads. With present functions so simplified and reduced, functions such as these could be assumed without danger or strain, and would be under the supervision of public attention, which is now distracted. There would be a great and increasing surplus revenue from the taxation of land values, for material progress, which would go on with greatly accelerated rapidity, would tend constantly to increase rent. This revenue arising from the common property could be applied to the common benefit, as were the revenues of Sparta. We might not establish public tables—they would be unnecessary; but we could establish public baths, museums, libraries, gardens, lecture rooms, music and dancing halls, theaters, universities, technical schools, shooting galleries, play grounds, gymnasiums, etc. Heat, light, and motive power, as well as water, might be conducted through our streets at public expense; our roads be lined with fruit trees; discoverers and inventors rewarded, scientific investigations supported; and in a thousand ways the public revenues made to foster efforts for the public benefit. We should reach the ideal

*"Progress and Poverty," books I to IX.

†"Progress and Poverty," book IX, chapter IV, pages 453-454.

of the socialist, but not through governmental repression. Government would change its character, and would become the administration of a great co-operative society. It would become merely the agency by which the common property was administered for the common benefit."*

+

It was those glimpses of democracy that his economic query afforded—a more comprehensive and profound democracy than the political alone,—that led the author of "Progress and Poverty" on to a survey of this wider field, when his economic inquiry had come to an end. Democracy, fundamental and constructive, was the "larger generalization" by which he offered to test the correctness of his conclusions in the narrower field of economics.

In the economic chapters, the specific inquiry had been, "Why, in spite of increase in productive power, do wages tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living?"† or, as we have paraphrased it, Why does poverty persist with progress? But in his larger generalization, in those chapters on democracy that are comprised in book X, this is the specific inquiry: "What is the law of human progress?"

And in five magnificent chapters, which every politician above the huckster grade ought to know almost by heart, Henry George finds the law of human progress to be "association in equality."‡

In that conclusion "Progress and Poverty" sounds the depths no less of economic than of political philosophy. "Association in equality" is the law of progress on every plane of human life.

Defiance of that law brings social reaction with barbaric splendors at one extreme of society, and barbaric miseries and barbaric revolts at the other.

Allegiance to it promotes further and higher developments of civilization.

+

And "association in equality," what is this but *fundamental democracy*? Democracy in economic or industrial relationships; democracy in political relationships; democracy in that religious sense of responsibility, that feeling of human brotherhood connoting creative Fatherhood, to which the last chapter in "Progress and Poverty" is devoted.

+

But democracy cannot resist the multiplicity

*"Progress and Poverty," book IX, ch. IV, page 454.

†"Progress and Poverty," chapter I of book I.

‡"Progress and Poverty," page 505.

of diseases that monopoly of land germinates. And though all the other social parasites were destroyed, democracy would nevertheless wither away if land monopoly were undisturbed; for all its vitality would then be sapped by the demands of land monopoly itself.

"Association in equality" being the law of human progress, inequality spells retrogression. And "the great cause of inequality," says "Progress and Poverty" in its democratic inquiry,* "is in the natural monopoly which is given by the possession of land. The first perceptions of men seem always to be that land is common property; but the rude devices by which this is at first recognized—such as annual partitions or cultivation in common—are consistent with only a low stage of development. The idea of property, which naturally arises with reference to things of human production, is easily transferred to land, and an institution which when population is sparse merely secures to the improver and user the due reward of his labor, finally, as population becomes dense and rent arises, operates to strip the producer of his wages. Not merely this, but the appropriation of rent for public purposes, which is the only way in which, with anything like a high development, land can be readily retained as common property, becomes, when political and religious power passes into the hands of a class, the ownership of the land by that class;" and "inequality once established, the ownership of land tends to concentrate as development goes on."

Let those words be read, however, in the full light of the quotation already made from another book† by the author of "Progress and Poverty," to the effect that even when rent is appropriated for public purposes, "much will remain to do." But let the author's supreme contention also be clearly grasped, that "whatever else we do, so long as we fail to recognize the equal right to the elements of nature, nothing will avail to remedy that unnatural inequality in the distribution of wealth, which is fraught with so much evil and danger."

*"Progress and Poverty," chapter III of book x, page 514.
†"Social Problems," chapter xviii, page 201.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

ROOSEVELT AND CUMMINS.

Progressive Republicanism needs to be saved from the folly of some of its accepted leaders. If the spirit of that movement is faithfully represented by Theodore Roosevelt and Senator Cummins, then the movement is foredoomed to extinction. Independent

voters will shun it as they have learned to shun the regular Republican organization.

The attitude of Roosevelt and Cummins has done and is doing much to impair popular confidence in the sincerity of the progressive leadership. Their public utterances betray a willingness to subordinate progressive principles to the perpetuation of the Republican machine. If their ideas are to prevail, the hopes of those who believed that Insurgency was to usher in an era of political independence have been builded upon the sand. They must look elsewhere for the inspiration that will regenerate American politics and bring to an end the reign of special privilege.

The specific offense of which both Roosevelt and Cummins have been guilty is their advocacy of "straight voting." In every public utterance during the present campaign they have belied their own professions by urging the election of the straight Republican ticket, regardless of whether the candidates on that ticket were reactionaries or progressives. Roosevelt, in one instance at least, has vouched for the "progressiveness" of a notorious hardshell Standpatter, knowing that his indorsement when given was untruthful, while Cummins has declared that "any Republican is preferable to the best Democrat," and has outdone President Taft in his plea for "party solidarity" at the expense of what his lamented colleague, Senator Dolliver, termed "party integrity."

Such political gymnastics on the part of men who have hitherto posed as the incarnation of political independence has amazed and shocked hundreds and thousands of men who were anxious to follow them in an independent political movement. They have played into the hands of the reactionaries. They have discredited a movement that was gaining ground with marvelous rapidity, and threatening to undermine the corrupt and rotten machines of both parties. They have driven back into the Democratic ranks nearly every Democrat who was almost persuaded to join hands with the progressive Republicans, and have retarded genuine political reform.

The Indianapolis News, a paper which has supported the Insurgent movement from its inception, senses the situation in a recent editorial. After warning the Insurgents to avoid the treacherous leadership of Colonel Roosevelt as they would the plague, the News says:

"Let it be known that it (Insurgency) is a mere attempt to 'save' the Republican party by promoting a false harmony, and the movement will collapse. Based on principle, it cannot win by trading and political bargaining."

‡

Nobody who has followed Mr. Roosevelt's political career carefully is surprised, of course, at the more recent exhibitions of his innate political dishonesty. The trouble is, however, that the average man has hitherto accepted Roosevelt at his own valuation, until now the real Roosevelt, made incautious by his unprecedented run of political luck, is carrying on his liason with the Mammon of Unrighteousness in the sight of all mankind. The result is that some of his idolators are really beginning for the first time to see their idol in all his nakedness.