

candidly with the few who enjoy more than they produce and against the many who produce more than they enjoy? That party would suffer ignominious defeat and deserve to suffer it. Does any political party want a copyright monopoly of the proposition? That party would be a base pretender. That the Democratic party of Ohio has unreservedly made this declaration, and committed itself to specific measures in furtherance of it, is an honor to the party in Ohio and a sign of promise for its future throughout the Republic.

* *

The Tax Question in Oregon.

Early in June the Oregon referendum on taxation (p. 122) occurs. This question is heralded as a single tax question. It is a single tax question, but not *the* single tax question. That is, it is in the direction of the single tax, for it would abolish the taxation of homes and industry in a good many respects, and cast tax burdens to that extent upon the monopolizers of valuable land in proportion to its value. It differs from the single tax, therefore, only in the fact that the single tax would cast not merely some tax burdens but every tax burden, upon monopolizers of valuable land in proportion to its value, exempting industry and thrift altogether.

*

Maybe it would have been better to present the question absolutely in its fullness, so as to draw a square vote for or against the single tax, even in the expectation of overwhelming defeat. Maybe it would have been better to present the principle on a single concrete issue, such as the exemption of the personal property and improvements of small homes and small farms, and go in to win. But these points are not for the present debatable. The question has been formulated, the official argument for it has gone out, it will be on the official ballot, and in hardly more than two weeks it will be voted upon by the people of Oregon. Its promoters believe that if they had a fund of \$10,000 with which to send out speakers and distribute literature, so as to overcome the effect of the misrepresentations of the great land monopolists and their newspaper allies, the measure could be carried.

*

If this measure were carried, the victory for good government would be great; and the opportunities for labor in Oregon—with untaxed farms and factories, and with highly taxed lands now held out of use for higher prices—would immensely multiply. Such defects as there might be in the law could be rectified easily, and the adoption of the

complete single tax in Oregon would not be far away. Toward the necessary campaign fund to accomplish this purpose, some contributions have already been made. Daniel Kiefer, of Cincinnati, has procured a good many more or less modest ones, and Joseph Fels of Philadelphia and London has, in addition to his previous contributions, just sent on a thousand dollars. Although the time is short, a few such contributions might assure the triumph of the measure.

* *

The Socialist Party in America.

In making their platform more opportunistic, in harmony with the Milwaukee policy, the Socialist convention at Chicago last week has placed the party in position to get the votes, under certain possible circumstances, not only of those socialists who do not take kindly to side-party voting, and of non-socialists whose sympathies are in many respects with the socialist movement, but also of a large contingent of radical-minded voters who are neither socialist nor socialistic.

*

To predict the figure the party will cut in the election returns would be less in the nature of prophecy than of logical inference from plainly observable facts. If put in the alternative with reference to important facts not yet developed, the inference might have great certainty. It would amount to this, that the vote of the Socialist party will largely increase, or largely sag, according to the action of the Democratic party at Denver. Should this be progressive, the vote of the Socialist party will probably sag; should it be reactionary, the vote of the Socialist party will probably increase.

*

The reasons for that conclusion are clear enough to any student of American politics. They should be clear enough to any student of human nature, whether he has studied American politics or not. It is not in human nature, as a rule, to support repeatedly what obviously has no chance of winning, if by doing so the interests of a second choice may be jeopardized. This is true of everything, from betting on horse races to voting at Presidential elections. Some men will "vote for a principle," as they say, again and again and again. But what they are really voting for is not a principle but a pet organization; no one really votes for a principle who uses his vote repeatedly in such manner as obviously not to promote the general acceptance of his principle or of some part of it. These voters follow the usual rule of human na-