

The bane of political reform is the existence of classes indifferent to government, indifferent either by reason of great wealth or great poverty. If we are to allow things to go on and get worse a revolution may come and the present order be destroyed, but in its place will come a more ruthless despotism. This is the lesson of history. A revolution to be desired is a revolution worked not in passion but in intelligence. Do not let things get so bad that resentment and anger will alone possess the people, but seek to instil a spirit that will be constructive, that will result in the people "knowing what they want and how to get it." Mexico with its great ignorant population is not near so good a field in which to sow the seed of economic betterment as communities where the average of intelligence and comfort is higher. The slums are the wards where heavy majorities are returned for candidates representing the plutocracy. Real democracy gets more votes in the suburbs and the well-to-do downtown districts. Strive then to make things as good as possible if you hope to make them better.

All this is very decent politics and at the same time very practical politics for Single-Taxers.

---

## PROGRESS AND POLITICS.

### An Outlook Upon Current Home and World Politics

(For the Review.)

By FRANK C. WELLS.

Just and scientific tax laws and really democratic government can be made actualities instead of theories only through the slow and awkward processes of practical politics. If we shall ever get, in nation, states and municipalities, the legislative majority, the executive and the courts all at the same time on the side of progress as we conceive it, things may go forward fast enough to suit the most impatient; but till that millennial day imperfect victories and sporadic advances are all that can be had. Success in one place will be offset by defeat in another and backslidings will counterbalance conversions.

None the less, the combats of the political gladiators are not without interest even when the success of either side stands for nothing but party spoils. When some real bearing this way or that on the trend of human progress can be read into them the interest deepens into fascination. When England chose her long Parliament, when revolutionary France elected her States General, when the United States smashed Federalism in 1800, when the North defied the slave power in 1860, when Russia sent representatives to her first parliament last year, national sentiment found an expression which involved the most indifferent inhabitants and which reached and will reach generations to come.

#### THE FALL ELECTIONS.

Not with such contests can those of 1906 in the United States be ranked. They have resulted in little besides marking time, and they afford no reason either for jubilation or for discouragement to the believers in progress in general or the adherents of the Single Tax in particular. It has been made clear that President Roosevelt still maintains his extraordinary popularity in the nation. The overwhelming Republican majority in the House of Representatives has been cut in two, but it still remains very large, and the President's person and policy having been made the issue by the Republican managers, the

result is a triumph for him rather than for the party to which he belongs. William J. Bryan's leadership, too, has been confirmed by Democratic gains in the West and by the defeat in the East of his one formidable rival among the generals of the radical Democracy. To Mr. Bryan's unselfishness and sincerity unneeded attestation has been given by his unhesitating support of Mr. Hearst, and the preposterous contention of corporation newspapers that "the people" would take fright at his views on government ownership of rail-ways has been exploded, if in such a tenuous theory there was anything to explode.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan represent what is best in their respective parties, and in the confirmation of the leadership of each against the forces of reaction there lies an encouragement that cannot be felt over the results in some individual Congressional districts. That a populous Brooklyn district, for instance, should prefer to be represented by a gentleman whose name no voter is likely to see in print between elections rather than by Robert Baker, to whom because of his aggressive honesty, his determination and his ability there came the rare achievement of a national reputation in his first term, is strange. The district is normally a Republican stronghold but one would think that even those who have no sympathy with Mr. Baker's radicalism would feel a certain pride in having him at Washington to prove that there are men not nonentities whom the great city borough can have to represent it. Apparently there are not enough Brooklyn Republicans built that way.

The defeat of Dr. L. F. C. Garvin in Rhode Island is also to be deplored. One right man elected is worth three wrong men defeated; so that the consolation derived from the failure to be re-elected of prominent "standpatters" in Iowa and Minnesota and of such men as Babcock in Wisconsin and Wadsworth in New York is quite inadequate.

#### IN NEW YORK STATE.

At last Euclid has been in danger of confutation and the part has loomed larger than the whole. All over the Union interest in the Congressional election was subsidiary to interest in the election in New York State. The result in that State is as extraordinary as was the contest, not a prophet having arisen bold enough to predict that William R. Hearst would go down to defeat and the rest of the Democratic and Independence League ticket achieve victory. It is probable that most Single-Taxers supported Hearst; yet few of them will regard his failure to be elected as a disaster. They could take at their true value the bitter attacks made upon the candidate by his opponents, remembering that Bryan and Henry George himself—and for that matter Jefferson and Lincoln—were each in his time attacked with equal virulence, by the same men and the same newspapers as by their prototypes. But they could not get away from the weaknesses of the candidate that stuck out from his own newspapers as distinctly as did their circus headlines. Let Mr. Hearst be credited with ability, earnestness and great liberality; let it not be forgotten that he, a multi-millionaire, seeks to further his ambition by real service to his fellow citizens and not in the hundred devious ways that are open to men of great wealth. None the less, he has written himself down as one careless of truth, given to bragging and abuse, and jealous of his allies, and he has shown a readiness all too great to fight Satan with fire. The latter characteristic may possibly offend only the more puritanical among us. Others may think the end in view to justify deals with party bosses and unseating of opposing delegates. But no Single-Taxer can quite forgive Hearst's betrayal of George in 1897, and no radical Democrat can forget his recreancy to the cause of freedom when the Republicans were waging their shameful war of conquest in the

Philippines, or his clamorous advocacy of a gigantic navy, or his antediluvian belief in protecting "infant industries."

Mr. Hearst is not too old, however, to grow mentally and morally. His utterances since his defeat have been creditable to him, and it is possible that he may yet vindicate the admiration of his hosts of followers. His successful opponent, whose nomination by the Republicans testified eloquently to the shrewdness that so seldom fails them, has before him a magnificent opportunity to prove that he is more than an estimable citizen and a lawyer in whose clever hands the tangled threads of "frenzied finance" become clews that lead straight to the heart of the labyrinth where sit the modern Minotaurs who rule over Wall Street and count their victims by the tens of thousands. It cannot be said that Mr. Hughes's pre-election speeches displayed any profound understanding of the sources of the power of these monopolistic ogres. They indicated, rather, a proneness to content himself with Rooseveltian platitudes. But his December speech at Rochester showed real insight and discrimination and affords ground to believe that he will not make the mistake of allowing his devotion to the master politician of his party to lead him in paths of mere imitation—that he will attack his problems as Hughes, not as a minor and milder Roosevelt.

Not very much can be expected from the Democratic State officials by whom Mr. Hughes will be surrounded. But if the Attorney General shall have the courage to reverse the disingenuous course of his predecessor and to bring about a recount of the New York Mayoralty vote of 1905, thus letting the citizens of the metropolis know whether or not they really have a fraudulent Mayor, not only Mr. Hearst's supporters but surely also every believer in fair play and republican institutions will be gratified.

#### IN OTHER STATES.

"The Hearst of Massachusetts," as he has been called, John B. Moran, who had captured the Democratic party in the name of the radicals and secured the nomination for Governor, also went down to decisive defeat. Here as in New York the disappointment of Single-Taxers will be a tempered one, for Mr. Moran has in common with the New Yorker a difficulty in distinguishing between his own personality and the cause of reform or a disposition to think himself, in the language of the street, the whole outfit. Nor has he so far achieved in his present office of District Attorney the great things for which he led his supporters to look. He appears to be a man of much fighting power and boundless ambition, and he will doubtless be heard from again.

In Pennsylvania the violent spasm of reform is playing out, and its forces, unaided in Philadelphia by the overpraised Mayor, were unable to overthrow the Republican machine. So short-lived are inevitably reform movements based on sudden public indignation against specific acts of wrong and not on public conviction that laws and fundamental political methods are in need of change.

The re-election of Governor Johnson, Democrat, in Minnesota and of Governor Cummins, Republican tariff reformer, in Iowa, the triumph of Democrats for Governor in North Dakota and Rhode Island, and the narrow escape of the Republican Governor in Kansas are worthy of note, as are also the gains made by the Democrats in many State legislatures. Unfortunately the latter were not great enough to overthrow the Republicans in their strongholds, and consequently an accession of Republican strength in the United States Senate is inevitable—an accession which is sure to add to the plutocratic and "stand-pat" sentiment in that body.

## THE JUDICIARY.

Our friends the Goo-Goos are deploring the defeat for the State Supreme Court in the district comprising New York County of what was called the Judiciary Nominator's ticket—composed of lawyers of high social and professional standing who had been selected by a committee of the Bar Association and endorsed with one exception by the Republicans. But to eyes that do not use the Goo-Goo glasses the result does not appear a calamity. For years all legislation against monopoly has been rendered farcical by just such judges as the men on the Judiciary Nominator's ticket would be sure to make. They have used their legal skill to split hairs and twist phraseology in the interest of the big fellows and have appeared often to be rather corporation attorneys than people's judges. They have not taken this attitude because they are corrupt men, but because they are by environment and training monopoly men. A hundred professional and social ties that they cannot break unite them to the class of men who profit by monopoly. The voters are at last finding this out and are beginning to realize that Jefferson's dread of the courts was well founded and that the judiciary is as important to them as are the legislatures and the executives. Three of the judges elected are Hearst radicals from whom something different may be expected. One of them is Samuel Seabury, whose election is gratifying to every Single-Taxer. Even the Tammany lawyers on the successful ticket are men much nearer to the people than their silk-stocking opponents, and we can forgive them a lack of legal subtlety if they will endeavor to enforce the laws in their spirit rather than to exercise upon them that destructive ingenuity that in the opinion of some constitutes high judicial attainment.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The paternal image is stamped so deeply on all the papers and speeches of the President that a blind man reading them backwards could not mistake them. In his annual message to Congress he strikes his usual school teacher's attitude and piles up as usual Alleghenies of preaching on Rocky Mountains of platitude. Once more we learn that to serve the cause of peace we must go about with warlike port and armed to the teeth; and those of us who dispute this Rooseveltian axiom will at least agree that employers and employed have reciprocal duties, and that honorable dealing between nations is a desirable thing. Not a word is breathed against the sacrosanct tariff by the former member of the Cobden Club; he indorses the projected ship subsidy robbery, and he is as far as ever from grasping the real significance of the trust and railroad issues. But the bulky message contains some good things. Race prejudice, for instance, as it touches the Japanese at least, is combated, albeit in the interest of federalism; The seal butchery in Alaskan waters is denounced; a law prohibiting corporations from making campaign contributions is advocated, as is legislation to provide for the withdrawal from sale or entry of all public lands containing coal; some more or less desirable laws affecting labor are recommended, and the unfortunate Porto Ricans—truly a people without a country—are declared to be entitled to American citizenship.

Perhaps, however, the most remarkable features of the message are its lecture to the judges against pretending to immunity from criticism and its indorsement of an income tax. When one remembers the torrent of denunciation poured on the Democrats in 1896 because of their desire to find some way to change that overnight majority of one in the Supreme Court against the constitutionality of an income tax, and then hears not a whisper against Mr. Roosevelt for his implied advocacy of the same court reversal, one cannot

but reflect on the change ten years have wrought. Surely when Democratic doctrines are borrowed by Republicans they do

Suffer a sea change  
Into something rich and strange.

Recklessness becomes prudence and anarchy statesmanship.

#### A GLANCE ABROAD.

No present-day Galileo can look around without having his faith in the earth's motion confirmed. In Asia, under the stimulus of Japan's achievements, China is bestirring herself and the next "cycle of Cathay" may give an unwonted theme to Western laureates; in Persia a parliament meets, and even India rubs her eyes and shakes her chains a little less apathetically. In Europe, though Russia still reels through chaos and reaction has momentarily the upper hand, the German Reichstag has given an unlooked-for black eye to the Kaiser's policy of conquest and savagery in the section of Africa that he calls his; France has severed the bonds with which Napoleon a century ago reunited State and Church after the Revolution had separated them, and Spain may follow in her steps. Ecclesiasticism is too firmly seated in England for disestablishment to become speedily an issue there, but at least the jingo frenzy of a few years ago seems as dead as the corresponding sentiment in America; the Liberal Government pushes public education and social reform, and before the pendulum swings back again abolition of the obstructive House of Lords may come within the range of practical politics.

Altogether, despite the dark background of terror and famine in the East, the outlook in both hemispheres is more cheerful than for years. No considerable war is waging. The sinister trinity of cant, greed and militarism no longer carries all before it. Brummagem Joes and hell-roaring Jakes have gone into eclipse. No puny republics are being butchered to make an Anglo-Saxon holiday, and those pious folks who a few years ago strove so earnestly to make rapine and massacre jibe with the Sermon on the Mount are now engrossed in the much more seemly employment of denouncing Congo atrocities and tugging at the motes in the eyes of the King of the Belgians. Perhaps if this state of affairs lasts long enough the practical men who run the nations—those of them who with whatever blunders are really trying to serve the cause of democracy—may come to realize that butting their heads against stone walls is not after all a tremendous achievement in the line of "doing things," and may pause in their capricious undertakings long enough to hear what mere theorists and idealists have to say, and so, if by good fortune they incline their ears in the right direction, may learn things undreamt of in their philosophy—even the way to throw down the walls.

---

## THE SCOPE OF THE SINGLE TAX.

(For the Review.)

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE.

In my articles for the Review during the past year, I have endeavored to demonstrate, briefly, the advantages which I think would inure to our movement if it were promulgated as a phase of limited socialism rather than as ultra individualism—the kind of individualism which is exclusive and strongly imbued with that form of incipient paralysis known as *laissez faire*. In doing