

refuge for Republicans disgusted with their own party. Nor is it difficult to understand why Democrats who have borne the stench of their party with almost perfect patience, should turn toward the Progressive Party of Illinois with a long drawn breath of relief. Yet it is possible for both, by following this course, to disappoint by their own inconsiderate action their own highest hopes.



In so far as there may be no choice, or not much of a choice, between Republican and Democratic candidates, the impulse to have a good clean political picnic of a time during the campaign, no matter what happens at the election, may be indulged with good conscience. But when the choice is between a Deneen and a Dunne, as is the case with the next Governorship of Illinois, the propriety of that kind of self-indulgence may be fairly questioned.



Edward F. Dunne is worthy the support of democratic Democrats and of democratic Republicans alike. It is reported that he was weak as Mayor of Chicago; his weakness consisted in a conscientious inability to yield to the temptations that were thrust before him. It is also reported that he is a Catholic, and therefore under ecclesiastical influence. Well, there are Catholics and Catholics; and Mayor Dunne was never dominated by the ultramontane machine. His defeat for re-election as Mayor was attributable more to that very machine than to any other single influence, the cause of it being his refusal while Mayor to yield political obedience to it. The other enemies he made as Mayor should make his election as Governor sure. They were spoils politicians to whom he refused allegiance where public interests were at stake. They were the newspapers whose shameless orders he refused to obey. They were the "underworld" exploiters whose filthy bribes he spurned. They were the Big Business combines whose destructive graft he exposed. Trace any of the assaults upon Mr. Dunne's administration as Mayor, any of the attacks upon his ability or his character, and if you reach the true source you will find it in the directors' rooms of big monopolies and the sanctums of parasitical newspapers.



For the public interests, Dunne was the best Mayor Chicago has had for many a year. For the public interests, he is a man to make the best Governor since Altgeld. Shall the slanders of

disappointed private interests defeat him? Whatever "bolting" Republicans may do, will democratic Democrats aid those private interests? The election lies between Dunne and Deneen. Those who do not vote for Dunne will in effect be voting for Deneen. If they really want Deneen, this is well enough—is at any rate not to be condemned. But if they do not want Deneen, it were well for them to take a lesson from *those who don't want Dunne*. As those who don't want Dunne intend to vote for Deneen, those who don't want Deneen will get Deneen unless they vote for Dunne.



### Mixing Religion and Politics.

An example well worthy of wide imitation has been set by the North Shore Congregational Church of Evanston, Illinois. Under the supervision of a church committee, meetings are to be held in the church building for the orderly discussion of live political questions. This is indicative of the true relation of religion to politics. It is a very intimate relationship. So intimate is it that the religious or the political organization which separates religion from politics, thereby puts a question-mark upon its own genuineness. But the true relation is not one of command and obedience. It is such a relation of intelligent intercourse between religious-hearted and civic-minded men and women as this Evanston church has undertaken to promote.



### Federal Taxation.

Here is an inquiry from Frederick Z. Marx, the Chicago lawyer, which may not improbably have occurred to other readers of The Public. Quoting from The Public of September 20th at page 890 as the text for his inquiry, Mr. Marx writes:

You say, "If you support Wilson's policy of tariff for revenue only—the furthest point possible in the direction of international free trade without amending the Constitution," etc., etc. I do not know why a Constitutional amendment is necessary in order to have international free trade. Can you find time to enlighten me?

This Constitution does not forbid international free trade in precise terms. Neither does it in precise terms require the taxation of imports. Consequently, no Constitutional amendment is necessary as mere matter of Constitutional expression. But it has long been considered necessary as a practical matter.



By the Constitution, paragraph 1 of Section viii, Congress has power "to lay and collect taxes,

duties, imposts and excises." This clause, considered by itself, creates all the authority needed for raising revenues in such manner as to establish free trade as absolutely with other nations as it exists between our States. But by paragraph 4 of section ix Congress is forbidden to levy any kind of direct tax except "in proportion to the census" provided for decennially by paragraph 3 of section ii, which requires that "direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers." The taxing power of Congress is therefore limited (1) to *indirect taxes* such as imposts or duties on imports, and excises on domestic production; and (2) to *direct taxes* apportioned to each State according to its population. Now, it is believed, and not without reason, that indirect taxes on home productions sufficiently high to yield the necessary Federal revenues would be economically impracticable, or at any rate as objectionable as indirect taxes on foreign productions. If that be true, then Congress is limited, under the Constitution as it is, to a choice between (1) imposing direct taxation per capita, or (2) interfering with international free trade to the extent that a tariff for revenue on imposts would do so.

But what direct taxes would yield the necessary revenue? There is probably only one kind. Land value taxes would undoubtedly do it; and these taxes would not obstruct trade at all, but would make it freer by loosening the power of the great land-monopolies—mines, pipe-line and railroad rights of way and terminals, city spaces, etc., etc. Two difficulties, however, stand in the way of Federalizing land value taxation. Even if the Constitution permitted its untrammelled adoption, national sentiment in favor of it is not yet strong enough to override the hostility of the Interests. Local demonstrations must be made, and national thought be thereby and otherwise stimulated, before Federal revenues can tap that inexhaustible and steadily increasing fund of publicly earned wealth. This, of course, is not a Constitutional obstacle; but even if public sentiment were fully ripe for land value taxation, the contention that it is Constitutionally impracticable would be plausible and strong. For, if the land value tax be regarded as *direct* in law, as it undoubtedly is in economics, it would have to be levied not in proportion to all the land values of the country, but in proportion to the land values of the several States with reference to their proportionate populations. That is to say, the landowners of a State of large

population relatively to its land values would have to pay higher taxes for Federal purposes than the landowners of a State of small population relatively to its land values. This would probably be as difficult a barrier to surmount as the most stringent Constitutional inhibition.



### Direct Legislation Work in Ohio.

In assigning credit to individuals for the victory for the Initiative and Referendum in Ohio on the 3rd, we could not name as many as we wished, but the fact must not be ignored that George F. Burba, editor of the Dayton News, and Congressman Cox, the Democratic candidate for Governor of Ohio at the coming election, gave Mr. Bigelow steady and efficient support. They were among the prominent men without whose aid his own work might have been inadequate.



### "Letters to the Editor."

A friendly correspondent, Mr. Joseph H. Fink of New York City, protesting against the reference to the New York Tax Reform Association in our editorial on Allen Ripley Foote of Ohio, which appeared at pages 866 and 867 of The Public of September 13th, writes:

From the reports in The Public one is only able to know one side of the story, that is The Public's side, as it will not publish letters on the subject. The readers of The Public take sides, and of course a great deal of hard feeling will be created. I would suggest, therefore, if the position of The Public is right, that it will allow its readers space for answer or criticism.

Mr. Fink has been misinformed. No denial, explanation or defense of Mr. Foote's activities or affiliations has been refused publication in The Public.



As to our correspondent's suggestion that space be allowed for answer or criticism, we accept it in the fair sense in which we presume it to have been made. Space for uninformed or irrelevant criticism, or for unverified statements of fact by uninformed persons, should not and will not be published merely because their writers wish it. Such publications would be useless to readers, and readers also have rights. But authentic denials or explanations will be accepted as a basis for editorial retraction, if convincing; if not sufficiently convincing for that, they will be given reasonable space. The Public is not an open forum for multifarious controversy. Neither has it a department of "letters to the editor," nor any substitute for