

of British democracy—the farthest advanced and most advancing democracy, political and religious, to be found anywhere on earth today—those gorgeous emblems of mediæval monarchism and paganistic pieties had a wholesome human meaning. There was a toy throne, a toy crown, a toy king and consort. They were surrounded by toy aristocrats in a curio church-edifice, and there were toy ecclesiastics to officiate at the toy crowning. Outside, for the entertainment of commoner and the commonest crowds, which lined the streets with only purchasable places for distinction, there was a procession of more or less animate toys skilfully arranged in sets and brilliantly costumed. Expensive it all was, and the expense was wrung from the sweat of labor; yet it was less expensive than dreadnaughts, and it exacted no toll of human life besides the sweat. It was archaic, yet interesting and instructive if only for that reason. But above all it was suggestive, sublimely suggestive. That which made it so was its function of symbolizing the submission of the despotic past peaceably to the democratic future. It was the Tenth Century stretching a friendly hand across the interval to bid the Twentieth Century godspeed.

+ +

Regenerate Mexico.

Most of our information about Mexico under the new regime is gratifying. The leaders seem in the main to be brainy men and honest. But they have a difficult task before them. The moral stamina of the country was sapped by the Diaz dynasty. Greed and graft were so long and steadily triumphant as to take on a flavor of legitimacy the taste of which survives. "Where's our share?" is an unasked question but a potent sentiment with which Madero, Gomez, Rodriguez, Gonzales and others among the new leaders may have to cope, and possibly to their undoing. Many will "want theirs," and failing to get it as the supporters of Diaz did, may turn back from following the leaders who have put Diaz out. It looks like our own familiar spoils story in a southern and latin setting—that perennial post-election story of ours in which the "appointed" and the "disappointed" are most conspicuous. It is a sentiment, too, of which Big Business in the United States will avail itself. Mexicans had better watch John Hays Hammond, the Guggenheims, the Gallingers, and their underground and overhead connections.

+

But there are reasons to hope that Madero may

prove right enough and strong enough to shake off the parasites. If that is his disposition, the circumstances are with him. His government will need greatly increased revenues, and the people much help that will necessitate still greater need for revenues. Where shall these revenues come from? Where shall the increased taxes fall? The common people were exhausted under Diaz, and Madero must go elsewhere for taxes or go to political ruin himself. If he does go elsewhere, tapping the only source of public revenues that Diaz left untapped, he will get his revenues abundantly, and at the same time "swat" the parasites—all of them, native and foreign. Let him tax the estates, giving the workers a rest from taxation, and he will win. By making it easier for the owners of big and unused tracts to let go than to hold on, which is what a heavy tax upon the estates would do, he will drive the parasites out; by taxing the estates on the land value basis, and as users come into them exempting improvements, he will stimulate legitimate business and fill the public treasuries. But does Madero see and understand the power of this policy? and if he does, will he have the nerve to adopt and pursue it?

+ +

Tom L. Johnson's Tax Report.

In his recollections of "Nine Years' War With Privilege," which began in the July number of Hampton's Magazine, Tom L. Johnson tells of his efforts in Congress to destroy the graft of land monopolists in the District of Columbia. He had been "shelved" as a Congressman upon the then obscure committee for the District, but Tom Johnson never staid "shelved." On that committee he left no stone unturned to get his associates to see that the public treasury of the United States, drawn upon to the extent of fifty per cent for District expenses, was not thereby benefiting the people of the District or of the country, but was enriching local landowners; and that these, not satisfied with that lawful graft, were augmenting it with unlawful graft by tax-dodging.

+

Mr. Johnson's reminiscences in Hampton's tell how the efforts of his committee to secure fair land value assessments in the District "were met with opposition by those landowners who were paying less than their share of taxes;" but what he rightly regards as the greatest result of the committee's report, was its exposure, for the first time comprehensively and specifically, of "the low assessment of valuable property, the high assess-