

"where there is room to spare." The land market would be glutted. But this which would manifestly occur under those extreme circumstances would occur also where the tax was lighter, provided the tax were not so light as to fall considerably short of the increase in values.



Recurring to Victoria and Vancouver, if the Singletax works to the advantage of home owners in the residence sections there, "where there is room to spare," but to the advantage of big investors in the business sections, "where the area is limited," the reason is not far to seek. It will be found not in any variation of principle, but in the fact that the same rate of land-value tax is heavy in the former section and light in the latter, *as compared with the intensity of the land monopoly in each*. "Where there is room to spare" a light land-value tax will discourage land monopoly, because values are likely to advance too slowly to make an investment in tax bills "look good"; but "where the area is limited," payment of the same pro rata tax may amount to a reasonably good bet that the land values will rise so much faster than the tax as to leave "a wide margin of profit."



If the facts about Victoria and Vancouver are as the California Outlook reports them—and its report certainly accords with what Henry George taught and Singletaxers believe, the California Outlook's hint to the contrary notwithstanding—then the harvest which business-section land monopolists may be reaping in Vancouver and Victoria is not because those cities have got the Singletax. It is because they haven't yet got enough.



### The Singletax in Ohio.

As a rule, the editorials of the Saturday Evening Post of Philadelphia are as accurate as they are compact, and no higher tribute could be paid to their customary accuracy than that. But one of them in the issue of October 19, 1912—the one on recent amendments to the Ohio Constitution\*—is an exception. We refer to this part of it:

Singletaxers in Ohio, however, had been agitating for Initiative and Referendum. It was feared they might initiate by popular petition and pass an act embodying Singletax principles. So the new Constitution provides that Initiative shall not be used to classify property for the purpose of taxation or for laying any single tax on land values. This new Constitution is, indeed, a radical and democratic

document. It permits the people of Ohio to govern themselves, within certain limitations, pretty much as they may see fit—thus marking a great advance over most State Constitutions; but it carefully specifies that they cannot govern themselves to the extent of taking back, for the uses of the community that created it, the unearned increment in land values, or of appropriating for the public benefit further unearned increments.

This is a mistake insofar as it implies that the Initiative cannot be used in Ohio in behalf of the Singletax.



Precisely those powers of self-government which the quoted editorial says the people of Ohio are denied by the Initiative for which Singletaxers agitated, are in fact conferred upon the people of that State by the Initiative that has been adopted there. What is denied them—and this probably accounts for the error in the Post's editorial—is the power of adopting the Singletax by legislative Initiative. There are two kinds of Initiative in the new Constitution—one for legislative laws and the other for Constitutional amendments. Under the former, nothing can be initiated which the Constitution forbids the legislature to adopt; under the latter, anything can be initiated which the prescribed percentage of petitioners demand. The only difference between the two, so far as Singletax measures are concerned, is a difference of 4 per cent in the number of petitioners prescribed. The legislative Initiative requires 6 per cent, the other 10 per cent. Once initiated, the popular vote required for either is the same—a majority of the votes cast on the question itself. The Saturday Evening Post has so large a circulation, and is so seldom in error, that it may be reasonably asked to examine into this matter anew.



### Political Hysterics.

If Mr. Taft or Mr. Wilson or Mr. Debs or Mr. Chafin or Mr. Roosevelt had been bitten by a mad dog while on his way to make a campaign speech he would have been an object of friendly sympathy with everybody, and properly so. No matter how one might regard him or his party, or what one might believe and have said of his previous conduct and future purposes, every person of decent mind would have been sincerely sorry for his misfortune, sincerely hopeful for a speedy recovery, and sincerely sympathetic with his followers in their loss of leadership. But what would any self-respecting person have to think, of the Republican or Democratic or Socialist or Prohibition or Progressive candidate if

\*See Public of September 13, page 867.

when bitten by a mad dog, he had proclaimed that his political adversaries were responsible for that dog and its madness and the bite? We ask this question because that in substance is what Mr. Roosevelt did. Instead of being bitten by a mad dog he was shot by a madman, but what is the difference so far as his charges of personal responsibility against his political critics are concerned?



If the uninjured campaign manager of an injured candidate tries to "work the indignation racket" in those circumstances, he may perhaps be excused, since it is all in his day's work. For that reason Senator Dixon's indignation may be ignored. So may Mr. McCormick's and all the rest who have echoed them. But here is what Mr. Roosevelt himself said—we quote from the Associated Press report of his speech after the shooting at Milwaukee, as that report was published in the Chicago Inter Ocean of October 15th:

It is a very natural thing that weak and vicious minds should be inflamed to acts of violence by the kind of foul mendacity and abuse that have been heaped upon me for the last three months by the papers in the interests, not only of Mr. Debs, but of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Taft. Friends, I will disown and repudiate any man of my party who attacks with such vile, foul slander and abuse any opponents of any other party. Now I wish to say seriously to the speakers and to the newspapers representing both the Republican and Democratic and Socialist parties that they cannot, month in and month out, year in and year out, make the kind of slanderous, bitter and malevolent assaults that they have made and not expect that brutal and violent characters, especially when the brutality is accompanied by a not too strong mind, they cannot expect that such natures will be unaffected by it.



There is something especially reprehensible in Mr. Roosevelt's making such an accusation. Against what other Presidential candidate in this campaign would the charge of abuse more justly lie than against Mr. Roosevelt himself? Who so much as he has poured forth abusive epithets? If those quotations from him had been uttered the day before the Milwaukee shooting, and with identifying names omitted, whom would any intelligent person have guessed that they were intended for? Could any other guess than Mr. Roosevelt have been reasonably possible? Whose career among all the Presidential candidates would tend so much as Roosevelt's own to inflame the insane to acts of violence? Has he not denounced as "liars" those who do not see

facts as he assumes to, until his "Ananias Club" has come to be commonly recognized as an institution? Has he not denounced as "thieves" those who defeat him by his own methods in political combat? And what of his "big stick" diplomacy and his martial enthusiasms? There is a familiar maxim about "coming into court with clean hands." Under that maxim Theodore Roosevelt has of all public men the least right, to complain of "inflaming" the weak of mind to "acts of violence" by abusive speech. His interviews, speeches and writings—his misrepresentation of Debs's followers, for instance, his rowdiness toward Taft, his denunciation of Wilson as a falsifier—abound in instances. If that madman had been inflamed to his act by any one's abuse, the person most probably responsible, in the absence of positive proof, would be Mr. Roosevelt himself. Is it not reasonable to suppose that a madman's outbreak may take the abuser rather than the abused for its object? And who so conspicuous in the role of abuser as Mr. Roosevelt?



For Mr. Roosevelt in his suffering, the people of the United States can say, regardless of his record, and they do say, to quote the legend of a sympathetic cartoon, "We vote unanimously for your quick recovery." But the citizen who should vote for Mr. Roosevelt for President *because* of a madman's assault upon him—or a mad dog's bite if that had happened to be the misfortune—would deserve one of the choicest out of Mr. Roosevelt's own collection of abusive epithets. The man who asks a vote for him *for that reason*, is a demagogue playing upon the public nerves. The sanely human and patriotic thing to say on such an occasion was said by Mr. Bryan in his speech at Franklin, Ind., two days after Mr. Roosevelt was shot:

I would rather occupy the time in denunciation of the deed and in expression of sympathy for him and hopes for his speedy recovery, but the issues of this campaign should not be determined by the act of a madman. They must be settled by the sane rather than the insane. . . . A maniac, however cowardly and dastardly his deed, is not the arbiter to whom to submit a Presidential contest.



### Congressional Candidacies.

We wish it were possible to name all the candidates for Congress whose election this year would be of public benefit; but lack of space would make it impossible even if we were apprised of the facts. There are some, however, in addition to such as