

could not abandon our business and property, and yet this seemed the only alternative unless some extra judicial procedure could be evolved. The courts and the police could do nothing but arrest and try these men, which they were doing; but the invasion must be stopped." After the above statement Mr. Ferris asked: "What would you have done under these circumstances had you been in my place?"

The fault with Mr. Ferris's statement is that no serious necessity existed in the first place for restricting the street speakers. The animus behind the restriction was that the speakers displeased the merchants and real estate sharks. The speakers had denounced various forms of graft and had threatened to put the real estate men out of business. The desire to protect traffic was merely an excuse. However, the citizens were right at the start, as they had the forms of law on their side. Now, however, the I. W. W. are invoking the law.

It was from this serious and embarrassing situation that certain adventurous and energetic men began to club and in various other ways assault the I. W. W. armies. Men brutal enough, however, to undertake this sort of work would naturally place no limit to their actions; so, as they began to realize their power, it came to pass that they extended their rule beyond the I. W. W., and considered it an affront for any man even to comment upon the situation except in terms of praise of these "Vigilantes" as they styled themselves. The police would arrest a man, just to secure his firearms; he would be released after a few hours, and then be immediately grabbed up by the "Vigilantes" who waited at the prison door for his appearance.

During an afternoon I got into a crowd around an automobile accident. I started to comment on the "Vigilantes" and denounced them with all my energy. One man who had been rather friendly called my attention to a person who had listened attentively and stated that he belonged to the detective force of the "Vigilantes." I was in danger of being arrested or assaulted as a "suspicious character," which is the legal form employed by the police when they desire to hold an obnoxious person.

The Weinstock report, made at the request of Governor Johnson, denounced the "Vigilantes" to a finish and seemed to inspire a great many with a new lease of manhood. It was evident that it greatly embarrassed the "Vigilantes" movement. It made them fear martial law and the advent of the militia. But there is likely to be more violence because the "Vigilantes" are insane with anger. They have lost self control. If this happens, a reaction will set in. The people will weary of the strain and excitement. Eventually those in confinement who were not tried during the heat of passion will be released, their cases being dismissed. Then the ordinance that has caused the trouble will either be repealed or will by common consent become a dead letter. The speakers will acquiesce in some trifling and reasonable restrictions and will go on as before. The snobs of San Diego will learn a good lesson; namely, that the "riff-raff" have resources of their own and that their method of resistance can be made effective.

Mr. Fred Moore, attorney for the I. W. W., and the brains of the local movement, impressed me as being a cool, calculating, earnest and able fellow.

I feel, of course, that he is wrong in his general theory, but he possesses the elements of success. Unless he should be assassinated, which has been threatened, before his work is finished, he will win because he is nearer right than the "Vigilantes," and he can now denounce the suspension of the ordinary Constitutional guarantees and gradually win public support. Any small event will turn the tide his way. He does not need to act. He can stand pat. Every act of the "Vigilantes" strengthens his position.

I cannot see wherein the San Diego incident is serious. The fact that an ordinance that merely seemed to abridge free speech would cause such an outburst as has been witnessed in this case shows that the people are awake. Gen. Harrison Gray Otis will not catch them napping. The referendum petition on the ordinance might have won had it been properly handled before excitement got too high.

F. H. MONROE.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

PROFESSOR HOLLANDER—ANOTHER CORRECTION.*

Brooklyn, N. Y.

In The Public of May 24, Dr. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, is quoted as saying that I advocate the Singletax "as a social panacea." This seems to me far more clearly and certainly "a surprisingly inaccurate report" than was Mr. Ogle's sincere (though, as it seems, mistaken and exaggerated) description of the Doctor's very courteous and effective supplement to my lecture before his class, as in effect an endorsement of the Singletax.

In full accord with Henry George as to this point, I deem the Singletax not "a social panacea" (i. e., "the remedy for all social diseases or evils"), but the best practical cure for the basic evil, land monopoly, the curing of which is a "sine qua non" to the really effective and successful utilization of other needed remedies for social ills. It is not all that must be done, but it is one thing without which nothing else will be of use. Bailing out the boat may be advisable, but to stop the leaks is the first need.

Dr. Hollander is of course entitled to his own label for his own attitude, but the fact remains—startling as its announcement may be to him—that both Mr. Ogle and myself (militant Georgites, both) were delighted with his comment, and deemed his terse and graphic use of local instances in concrete illustration, a far more telling vindication of our policy than my more general remarks. I suspect the Doctor does not fully realize how nearly the implications of what he said approximate to the essence of Singletax premises. His impression of his aloofness from us may be wholly due to such misconceptions of our view as his notion that we claim a "panacea." From men of his responsibilities we cannot now expect more than "the principle of utilizing some part of future increments in urban rental values, as a fiscal experiment." Let him ask himself, and then tell us,

*See The Public of May 24, 1912, page 487.

why only "some part," only "future" increments, and only "urban" values?

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 4, 1912.

The Labor War.

In connection with the London transport strike, a manifesto in behalf of the strikers was issued on the 27th, protesting against the use of police and troops in the interest of employers and warning the public authorities of extreme measures if this policy continues. The number of strikers was estimated on the 29th at 140,000; and they had posted pickets everywhere around the dock entrances in London. In an interview with the Home Secretary the leaders offered to co-operate with the Government in facilitating transportation of necessary food supplies for London; but the Government, regardless of this offer, gave assurances of protection to shippers of food supplies. These assurances were regarded at that date as having made the probability of a national strike more imminent. Even then the port of London was paralyzed—not a truck wheel moving in the streets,—and the shipping companies of Glasgow, Hull and other centers trading with London had been compelled to suspend their sailings. A conference with the Government was scheduled for the 31st, at which representatives of the strikers agreed to be present but which the employing interests announced their unwillingness to attend. The latter met, however, with members of the Ministry on the 30th. Lloyd George presided, and the other Ministers present were Sydney Buxton, John Burns, Reginald McKenna and Sir Rufus Isaacs. This meeting was adjourned to the 3rd. The proposed joint conference of the 31st—the employers, pursuant to their announcement, having refused to attend it—was held with the strikers' representatives alone. It here developed, as reported by the dispatches, that the crux of the controversy is the "closed shop," the organized employers insisting upon employing unorganized men, and the organized men refusing to work along with those that are not organized. [See current volume, page 512.]



Indications of a renewal of the garment workers' strike at Chicago were reported on the 27th. [See current volume, page 369.]

The causes of the Chicago freight handlers' strike produced a supplementary one in Minnesota on the 27th, when the freight handlers at Minneapolis and St. Paul to the number of 1,800 went out. The situation at Chicago on that day was reported as "about the same, with the railroads unable to handle the freight and the shippers and merchants becoming more restless because of the inefficient railroad service." [See current volume, page 487.]



The newspaper strike in Chicago shows no further outward signs, except that it is still somewhat difficult to obtain on the streets any of the evening papers other than the evening edition of the *Daily World*, which has taken the place of the *Daily Socialist* and begun a serious attempt to establish itself as a newspaper. Reports in the other papers to the effect that the striking stereotypers are coming back to work are the only present indication that the larger papers are crippled—the inference being that if they were not crippled there would be no work for the striking stereotypers to go back to. The extent, however, of this return to work does not appear in the reports. Judge Brentano refused on the 27th to enjoin the city authorities from allowing newsstands on the street, deciding that the plaintiffs in the suit had no property interest in the question. A statement in opposition to the pressmen and stereotypers was presented to the Chicago Federation of Labor on the 2d by the Typographical Union. [See current volume, page 512.]



A strike of hotel waiters in New York has extended from the one hotel in which it began, the Belmont, to several others, and has been reinforced by other hotel employes. The Hotel Knickerbocker, for instance, was crippled on the 27th by the unexpected walking out of all the men employed as waiters, cooks, pantrymen, and silver men. At a signal previously agreed upon they stopped work wherever they happened to be and the patrons of the hotel sat helpless at their unfinished meals. Then the men paraded into the street and, joined by other members of the International Hotel Workers' Union, they created excitement in the vicinity of Broadway and Forty-second street which brought on the police reserves, although there were no indications of violence. On the 29th the waiters walked out of the Waldorf-Astoria, the Gotham, the Breslin, and Rector's, in the midst of the evening dinner hours, leaving hundreds of hungry patrons in the lurch. At its meeting on the 29th, the Hotel Men's Association had unanimously voted to increase the wages of all employes 20 per cent and upwards, to abolish fines and make other improvements in working conditions, but protested that this action was