

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.

Champ Clark, in a recent speech in Kansas City, thus described Mr. Roosevelt's course this year:

"In Kansas he was an insurgent, in Missouri he was a progressive, in New York a standpatter, and in St. Louis he went up in an airship."

The fact remains, however, that notwithstanding all his inconsistencies, Mr. Roosevelt has not failed anywhere this year, or any other year for that matter, to advocate the election of the straight Republican ticket. At Osawatomie he assumed the leadership of the progressive wing of his party, and denounced the Payne tariff bill. True, however, to his crooked political instincts, he returned to New York and struck a bargain with the reactionary Taft administration, whereby the President assisted him to capture, for his own selfish purposes, the New York Republican machine. In return for the administration support he breathed a benediction on the administration in his Saratoga speech, and connived at the indorsement of the Payne bill by the Saratoga convention.

Mr. Roosevelt pleaded for Beveridge in Indiana as a true blue progressive. Then he went into Massachusetts and declared Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the most hardened Tories in public life, to be a true friend of progress. It is this sort of thing that will absolutely destroy the progressive movement, if Mr. Roosevelt is to remain its acknowledged chieftain.

+

Of Mr. Cummins better things were expected. His course in the Senate has been one of manly defiance of his party organization and administration bossism. He braved party ostracism and endured the loss of patronage in order to maintain his self-respect, and his speech at the Des Moines convention, after Congress had adjourned, was a splendid defiance to the Standpatters and an invitation for war to the bitter end.

For some reason best known to himself, Mr. Cummins has seen fit to change his tactics, to eat out of the hand of the men whom he has hitherto denounced as enemies of the people, and to get back on the old reservation. If his Des Moines speech was that of a patriot, his Chicago speech, delivered less than three months later, was the utterance of a demagogue. That Cummins, of all men, speaking in a State where Joseph G. Cannon is a candidate for office, should advise the election of the straight Republican ticket sent the cold chills down the backs of thousands of his admirers. That he should insultingly notify the rank and file of the Democratic party that their services are not wanted in the progressive struggle, unless they are willing to accept the protective theory and join the Republican party as orthodox members thereof, jarred the confidence and dashed the hopes of thousands of men who have looked to him for better things.

+

Neither Roosevelt nor Cummins is essential to the ultimate triumph of real democracy. Either, however, may retard that triumph temporarily. The effect of their present attitude is to strengthen party ties at a time when, in the interests of better politics, they were being weakened. That attitude, if persisted in, will alienate from the cause to which

they profess devotion the entire independent vote.

Both Roosevelt and Cummins mistake the temper and sentiment of the average intelligent voter. The appeal for "party solidarity"—the time dishonored "yellow dog" political exhortation—has lost its force and power. The man who thinks at all nowadays knows that by listening to such appeals in the past he has helped fasten the grip of special privilege upon the government in its every branch. He is in no mood, therefore, to respond to such an appeal, whether it be made by the shameless Joe Cannon or by the immaculate Albert B. Cummins. The man who makes such an appeal merely discredits himself.

It must be said in fairness, though, that other progressive leaders have not fallen into the errors of Roosevelt and Cummins. La Follette, Bristow, Poin-dexter and their fellows have sounded no "yellow dog" appeals. It is well for the permanency of the movement with which they have identified themselves that they have refrained from such utterances.

+

The case of Mr. Roosevelt, of course, is hopeless. He is utterly and incorrigibly selfish, and never in his life has he cherished a political principle which he was not willing to sacrifice for personal advantage. There are many hopeful indications, however, that he has struck the political toboggan, and the sooner he reaches its bottom the better for real reform in this country.

There is still hope for Mr. Cummins, however, because he instinctively thinks right. If the progressive movement has reached a stage where it is able to discipline its members, the distinguished Iowan ought to be called on the carpet by his colleagues, and warned that pleas for "party solidarity" at the cost of political principle are as reprehensible and as unpatriotic, coming from him, as they were when President Taft fulminated them at Winona.

D. K. L.

+ + +

## POLITICS IN THE ALDRICH PRIVATE-WEALTH.

Lonsdale, Rhode Island, Oct. 26.

It may be of interest to the widely scattered readers of *The Public* to hear something from Rhode Island on the eve of this unusually interesting and important national election.

+

In the Republican party of this State not a breath of insurgency is visible or audible. True, the claim of Progressiveness is heard, but it is merely lip-service. Standpatism is the order of the day.

Not but that there are many Republicans here who sympathize with the Insurgents of the West; they are, however, with scarcely an exception, keeping their own counsel.

At one time it looked as though an Independent Republican, a Progressive in the best sense of that word, would be put into the field for United States Senator. This spirit of revolt was strongest when it was supposed that Senator Aldrich would be a candidate to succeed himself. But when that famous Standpatter withdrew from the race, the spur to In-