Ohio leadership for Direct Legislation fell upon his shoulders and the crisis came.

❁

But he has apparently come now into a generally recognized and justly earned victory. That some Singletaxers will grieve over the inhibition of Singletax legislation in the compromise amendment for Direct Legislation that Bigelow secured from the Ohio Constitutional Convention is probable, so prone are we all to value cherished names and plans above substance and results. But in truth the enemies of the Singletax have forced into the Ohio Initiative measure what is likely to serve the Singletax cause with excellent effect. If the proposed amendment to the Ohio Constitution had not inhibited the use for Singletax legislation of the legislative Initiative, a Singletax law could be voted on if petitioned for by 4 per cent of the voters; but this would have been useless without many more favorable voters than 4 per cent. The Singletax must have public opinion behind it to be worth while. As it is, the new Constitution can be amended by Initiative so as to strike out the inhibition as soon as public opinion is behind the Singletax; all that will be needed being 8 per cent of the voters to petition for such an amendment. For Bigelow to have opposed that inhibition would have been to jeopardize the Initiative and Referendum, and this without benefiting the Singletax movement. By accepting the inhibition, he disarmed the black horse cavalry of the Ohio State Board of Commerce and its allies, and, defeating them, won his principal present fight. He also thereby allowed them, all unconsciously to themselves (for they were not so very shrewd), to lay a basis for Singletax agitation, out of which an overwhelming Singletax sentiment in Ohio, especially in the farming regions, is almost certain to spring at no distant day.

❁

This inhibition of the Singletax, written as it is into the Constitution of Ohio, will be a perennial object of public curiosity, wonder, discussion and debate all over the State. It advertises the Singletax better than posters could. Why is the Singletax inhibited? What is the Singletax that it must be inhibited? In whose interest is the Singletax Constitutionally barred? These are types of inquiries that will be discussed wherever and whenever any man, woman or school pupil chooses to raise the question. And then the answers. In the interest of farmers, for instance! But how? When that question once comes under discussion among farmers, it won't be long before they see into the bunco game of their Big Business protectors. They will speedily realize—for farmers are not the fools their Big Business guardians take them to be—that the Ohio Constitution prohibits their voting to reduce their own taxes.

❁

Considered without reference to inhibitions upon any specific question, the Initiative and Referendum provisions of the proposed new Constitution of Ohio seem to be, on the whole, equal to any and superior to most of those of the other States. The direct Initiative is available for Constitutional amendments on a 12 per cent petition; the indirect Initiative through the legislature (quite as good if not better) is available for Constitutional amendments on an 8 per cent petition; the indirect Initiative is available for all legislation except the Singletax and classifications of property for taxation on a 4 per cent petition; and the Referendum is well secured, as are both the Initiative and Referendum for municipalities. There is no weak point that we detect, unless a Governor's veto of legislation Initiated by the people and adopted by the legislature *might* be obstructive. It probably would not be so; and even if it were, the defect could be easily cured. The present Constitutional Convention of Ohio has given promise of taking a high place in the history of that State.

❁ ❁

The Supreme Court and the Oregon System.

A curious line of comment has followed the Supreme Court's decision in the Oregon Initiative and Referendum case. It proceeds upon the theory that the Court "side-stepped" the question by leaving its decision to Congress. That view is of course without foundation. The decision of the Supreme Court in this case was direct and unqualified. There was no "side-stepping." There was no creation of any new problem for direct legislationists to encounter. If the Court did not decide the question of "republican form of government," it did as it ought to have done. To have decided that the Oregon system is unrepublican in form would have been judicial usurpation; to have decided that it is republican in form would have been to assume its right to decide the other way. By deciding unanimously that the whole problem is not judicial but political, and therefore refusing to pass upon the question of what constitutes republicanism, the Supreme Court took a long stride backward from its old tendencies to usurp legislative power. When it held that the question is one for the legislative department of

the government, it did not hand over to Congress any function of its own; what it did was to refuse to invade Congressional functions. It is true enough that Congress *could*, in conformity with that decision, declare the Oregon system unrepublican and refuse to admit Representatives and Senators from that State, or take drastic affirmative action to abolish the system there. But it is not less true that no Congress will attempt anything of the kind.

Toward the Light.

Everywhere there is a growing perception of the primary cause of all social disorder, monopoly of the land; and with it a feeling for the basic principle of all workable social solutions, community ownership of land values. To specify would be to catalogue. One would have to point to the new fiscal policies of powerful nations like Great Britain and Germany, to reawakening peoples like the Chinese, to American States like Oregon and to autonomous dependencies like Australia and New Zealand. One would have to cite also Canadian cities like Vancouver and her neighbors and American cities like Houston, which have made an effective beginning, and Seattle which has made an effective effort to begin. We have seen that Mexico has been touched by this influence, and word comes up from Uruguay that the President of that country is making a valuation of the land with a friendly eye toward land values taxation. But one of the most significant expressions we have seen is this comment on the British coal strike: "Great Britain is getting a great shaking up; she will never be quite the same after the coal strike; public opinion will be more open than ever to the doctrine of the land for the people; the old order is coming to an end with a rush, and some of Henry George's bricks will be laid in the rebuilding."

The Primaries in Illinois.

Before another issue of The Public goes to press, direct primaries will have been held in Illinois for the nomination of Presidential, gubernatorial and other candidates to be voted for at the election in November.

The contest for the Presidential nomination on the Republican side will probably be between Senator La Follette and ex-President Roosevelt. President Taft is likely to stand aside in this State, as he did in North Dakota; and here as in North Dakota Mr. Roosevelt is likely to get most of the Taft support that votes at all at the primary. Consequently, although Mr. Roosevelt may carry a considerable Progressive vote which ought to go to Mr. La Follette, the contest here will be essentially between reactionary Republicans under the Roosevelt flag, and progressive Republicans under La Follette's. The Republican who in this State votes against La Follette votes for Taft.

On the Democratic side, the Presidential contest in Illinois will doubtless be between Speaker Clark and Governor Wilson. Some democratic Democrats have already made one or the other of these two men their choice, while other democratic Democrats have made no definite choice as yet. The Public counts itself among the latter. But so far as the Illinois primaries of next week are concerned, the necessity for a choice is at hand, and it does not turn upon preferences regarding those two men. Something much more important than any such preference is involved. At this time and in this State a vote at the primaries for Speaker Clark is not so much a vote for him as it is a vote for William Randolph Hearst. Mr. Hearst has taken complete possession of Speaker Clark's candidacy in Illinois, and unfortunately Mr. Clark has done more than passively submit. Yet everybody who knows Mr. Hearst and his political entourage in Illinois knows full well that the candidate between the lines in his Illinois papers is not Speaker Clark but Mr. Hearst himself. The democratic Democrat of Illinois who cannot vote for Governor Wilson, had better (unless he wishes to endorse Mr. Hearst) vote for some other candidate than Speaker Clark, or else vote for none.

For the Governorship, the progressive Republicans who are genuinely what they profess to be and who understand the trend of political currents within their party, will vote for Walter Clyde Jones, whose record as State Senator and in the field as Republican candidate for Governor, proves him to be of the type of La Follette, alike in political apprehensions, vigor and fidelity.

The Democrats have three leading candidates for Governor, among whom Edward F. Dunne is clearly the superior in every quality which the progressive thought of the party demands. What his two principal contestants may be saying on the stump, only their respective audiences know;