

legislature by over 11,000 votes, about double the vote of either of the other two successful candidates in his senatorial district. He will thus have an opportunity to force upon the attention of the legislature at its approaching session the overwhelming vote of the people of Chicago last Spring for municipal ownership of public utilities and the equally overwhelming vote of the State this fall for an enforceable initiative and referendum for the cities and for the State. A local labor party is now forming in Chicago with a view to making Darrow the next mayor of Chicago. This movement will be encouraged by a large proportion of the Democratic party.

Another extraordinary outcome of the election will be especially gratifying to single tax men. It is the triumph of ex-Senator Lucius F. C. Garvin, who was elected governor of Rhode Island on the Democratic ticket by 6,000 majority. Gov. Garvin has for years been the leading single tax man of New England. His election is a triumph for home rule, and an indication of what is in store for the Republicans of Ohio when the people of that State realize the significance of the board rule code bill which Hanna, Foraker and Cox have just enacted. The Republicans of Rhode Island had presumed upon their power to undertake to govern Democratic cities by the "board" and "boss" system, and the result is a complete reversal of the politics of the State, with a single tax leader like Johnson at the head of the poll.

One other triumph for democratic Democracy is the election of Robert Baker to Congress from a New York district. Mr. Baker has long been known in New York State as a single tax man and this was made the principal ground of opposition to him. He was elected by 500 plurality. Another single tax man who made a brilliant campaign was Franklin K. Lane, of California. He is defeated in that strong Republican State by less than 2,000. Still another is Western Starr, who reduced the ma-

jority of the notorious Humphrey for Senator from the Seventh Illinois district from 7,000 to 250.

Still another election victory for a democratic Democrat must be noted. We refer to the election of William R. Hearst for Congress from a New York district. What makes his election notable is not the fact that he has been elected, for his district is normally Democratic by 5,000. The notable thing about it is that Mr. Hearst multiplied this plurality by three. He was elected by a plurality of 15,000.

A satisfactory explanation of the defeat of the Liberals at the English election in the Liberal constituency of Devonport (p. 471) has been furnished. The defeated Liberal turns out to have been a Liberal of the Rosebery brand. Rosebery Liberals in England and Cleveland Democrats in the United States are much alike. As the Cleveland Democrat supports Republican candidates against democratic Democrats, so the Rosebery Liberal supports Tory candidates against democratic Liberals; and as the democratic Democrats are learning to return the compliment here, so the democratic Liberals are learning to return it there. Just as in the United States there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Democratic party to defeat Democratic candidates of the Cleveland type, those who are Republicans in all but name, so there are enough thoroughgoing democrats in the Liberal party of England to defeat a Rosebery candidate when he gets hold of the party nomination. That is what happened at the Devonport election.

President Butler, of Columbia university, makes an excellent distinction when he contrasts collectivism with anarchy, condemning both, and seeks for middle ground. But one might question the middle ground which he describes as "institutionalism." As reported, at any rate, he does not make it very clear. To say that institutionalism "stands for freedom of speech, a free press, pro-

tection of private property, respect for individual rights, and liberty for all," as President Butler does, hardly distinguishes it from either anarchy (individualism) or collectivism. The crucial question with reference to private property still remains open, namely, What is private property? As far as individualists insist upon the sanctity of private property in what is justly individual property they are right; so far as the collectivists insist upon public property in what is justly common property they are right. But in so far as the one ignores public rights in common property and the other denies private rights in individual property they are both wrong. The principle of property yet to be learned and enforced is this, that titles must rest in justice and not merely in institutions. That is the principle that is being worked out, and which will be the issue of the future. The quicker collectivism progresses the sooner will it measure strength with the principle of moral righteousness in public matters. The faster those men advance in political power who would abolish the idea of "mine and thine" in favor of "ours," the earlier will they come into decisive conflict not with those who cling to "mine and thine," but to those who stand for "mine, thine and ours."

The Federal judges sitting in the United States court of appeals at Chicago, with Judge Grosscup in the lead, have been manufacturing more law. It goes almost without saying that they have done it for the protection of one of the great interests. To use the language of the opinion of Judge Grosscup, it is to protect the "great news agencies," the "great newspapers" and the "great telegraph and cable lines." Such little interests as those of authors have long appealed to the courts for similar protection; but they have appealed in vain. The courts have told them that they must go to the legislature for their relief, for the precedents do not