

complaints in that country have been from radicals who think the people too conservative.

In our own Oregon the measures passed under direct legislation have not been especially radical. The only measures adopted in Oregon that could be called radical are these: Popular nomination of Senators with instructions to the legislature to vote for the popular choice (and we can hardly blame them for wishing some new way of choosing Senators when we study the history of their elections previous to the adoption of the amendment); and proportional representation, which is an experiment and may be repealed if not satisfactory.

"Violent changes" do not seem to have taken place anywhere under direct legislation.

+

Of course "the people should be led to show greater care in the selection of their representatives." No one interested in good government denies that. But there is nothing in direct legislation which contravenes it. Rather the opposite. Almost always, when two or more candidates are in the field, one is brighter or of better character than the others; but perhaps the one in whom the majority have the most confidence personally, or the one they feel is better qualified in many respects, does not represent the same policy or policies they desire to have enacted into law. Under direct legislation they would be free to vote for the best man, feeling sure that if he, or some other representative, did not secure the desired legislation, they could have the measure submitted by means of the Initiative, directly to the people for their consideration.

It seems to me that many who oppose direct legislation do so because they do not understand it. Any one who clearly understands its principles and their relation to the fundamental principles of our Republic ought not to object to it on the ground of danger to republican institutions. Our government was certainly founded on the "consent of the governed," and the nearer our laws approach the desire of a majority of the governed, the surer shall we be that "the old landmarks will be preserved and the Republic be permitted to work out the high destiny planned by its founders."

GEORGE H. DUNCAN.

+ + +

Say nothing more to thyself than what the first appearances report. Suppose that it has been reported to thee that a certain person speaks ill of thee. This has been reported, but that thou hast been injured, that has not been reported.—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London, June 2nd, 1909.

"The Finance Bill consists of 74 clauses, and of these no fewer than 28 relate to land taxation. This fact is most significant."—The Times, May 29.

The above extract from The Times should suffice to show that at last the great political struggle foreshadowed and championed by the late Sir Henry Campbell has begun in Great Britain. The great budget of 1909 clearly draws the line of demarcation which in the political struggles of the future will separate the sheep from the goats, the true Progressives from the Reactionaries, no matter by what high-sounding name they may call themselves.

The secret enemies of our movement, those who under all manner of pretenses would have the great Liberal Party deal with any and every question save the Land Question, must necessarily soon be driven out of the Liberal ranks, or remaining there will sink into impotence. Old-fashioned Whig politicians, like Lord Welby (see "The Contemporary Review" for June) may loudly argue that "the super-tax on incomes is undoubtedly the most important proposal in the Budget," but the facts cry out more loudly still that, not the super-tax, but the land taxation proposals are the most important proposals, and are the main cause of the vituperative bitterness with which the budget has been greeted by all upholders of privilege and monopoly, masquerading as "property."

+

Mr. Lloyd George, who is a past-master of the art of coining phrases which stick and tell, closed his long budget speech with the words: "This is a war budget! It is a budget for waging implacable war against poverty!" And, whatever its shortcomings, there can be little doubt that its innovations have been made possible by the growing discontent with the persistence and deepening of poverty amidst a superabundance of wealth, which haunts the mind of every thoughtful man.

For almost the first time in the history of the British Parliament it has been laid down there, practically unchallenged, that property in land differs both in its genesis, its properties, and its moral justification from property in products, or even from property in those monuments of past misgovernment, national debts. For the first time the value of land, which for over three centuries has formed the main source of the unearned wealth of the great aristocracy of the country, has been declared to be in a special sense a fit and proper source whence public revenues can equitably be derived. Yes, it is the commencement of a long and implacable war against privilege and poverty, and Lloyd George has had the honor of leading the first attack.

+

As you have already realized, the attitude of the British land reformers is a somewhat reserved one. It may perhaps best be compared with the attitude of the man who at a concert appealed to the audi-

ence not to shoot at the singer, for he was doing his best. Our movement is a growing one, every day adds to our ranks thoughtful men capable of grasping our principles in all their fullness and of defending our practical proposals. Still we dare not overrate our strength; and we feel that the discussion that is now raging throughout the length and breadth of the country can only strengthen us, and necessarily tend to force the proposals for the taxation of land values on to sound and defensible lines.

Whatever their shortcomings from our standpoint,—and there was no reason to attempt to distinguish between developed and undeveloped land, nor between land-values and land-values,—the Government proposals are admirably framed to secure a universal and uniform valuation of the whole of the land of Great Britain; and this necessary first step the Government are evidently determined to secure. The rest will follow in due course. That no one need doubt for a moment.

The Tory press does not leave their readers in doubt on this point. Thus, "The Outlook," a Tory weekly, devoted to the proposal to tax our people through customs duties, under the hollow pretense of "making the foreigner pay," reminded them last week that "there was a time when the income tax stood at two-pence"—it is now over one shilling. Whilst the most ably conducted "Morning Post," the organ of solid and respectable conservatism, commenting on the proposal to tax future unearned increment, says: "Granted that there may be no increment of site value to tax, the valuation will, the socialists think [and today it is fashionable to designate all who are not conservatives as socialists], identify that which has been stolen from the community, and which may be recovered hereafter by means of further taxes." In the face of such warnings it is somewhat saddening to remember that though a twenty shilling in the £ tax, or less, would once and for all stop any further stealing from the community, it would not restore to them anything that has been taken from them in the past.

However, "Let the dead past bury its dead"; to-day the people are demanding neither punishment nor restitution, but they are commencing to demand that a distinction should at once be made between social values, values created and added to by the presence, needs and activities of the whole people, and individual values, values created and added to by the labor of individuals—and that the latter should as far as possible be exempt from taxation, and the former appropriated for social use, for public purposes.

+

Is there on this side of the water the necessary knowledge and the necessary public-spirit to carry through such a policy, now the Liberal policy, to its logical conclusion. Yes, I am inclined to believe that there is, or will be, for we are creating and increasing it day by day.

Have we the right sort of men in politics and on the Liberal side to lead such a movement, and not to be bought, bribed, cajoled or frightened? Yes, I think we have.

When Home Secretary, Asquith did not hesitate to risk his whole future career as a radical politician by manifesting his determination to maintain the

established "law and order" even at the cost of the shedding of blood. "Remember Featherstone," is a cry that might easily have put an end to the career of the man to whom it was applied. But on the whole we are a law-abiding race, we Britishers, and even those who suffer from the prevailing "law and order" do not withhold their meed of sympathy and admiration from those who boldly uphold it, more especially when they are taking sides with those who are demanding its due and constitutional alteration in accordance with changed conceptions of morality, of what is "right" and what is "wrong", of what is social and what is anti-social.

As I have written before (vol. xi, p. 344) Asquith is not a man easy to read. But personally I believe in him. He is continuously vilified, even libelled, in Tory circles, and they know the men they have to fear. To my mind Asquith "willed the budget", if I may use the expression, and Lloyd George, now his right-hand, carried it out, and devoted to it the brilliant energy that characterizes all his activities.

Of Lloyd George's pluck, courage and determination there can also be no question. He practically took his life in his hands when at the height of the war-fever he went to Birmingham to express his opinion of the war and of the man mainly responsible for the war, the idol of the Birmingham mob, who would have killed Lloyd George if only they could have laid hands on him.

The youngest of the prominent Liberal politicians, now President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Winston Churchill, is also brilliant and courageous, and, I think, far-seeing. When in earnest he reveals a realization of the true social problem and a grip of political principles which give both character and force to his speeches. His reply to the leader of the opposition, Mr. A. J. Balfour, during the great budget debate gave forcible expression to sound democratic principles. After boldly emphasizing the view that "land cannot be regarded as an ordinary commodity," he concluded his remarks as follows:

We believe that if Great Britain is to remain great and famous in the world we cannot allow the present social and industrial disorders, with their profound physical and moral reaction, to continue unabated and unchecked. We propose to you a financial system; we also unfold a policy of social reorganization which will demand sacrifice from all classes, but which will give security to all classes. By its means we shall be able notably to control some of the most wasteful processes at work in our social life; and without it let the Committee be sure that our country will remain exposed to some fatal dangers against which fleets and armies are of no avail.

It is such speeches that are giving Winston Churchill a hold on the thoughtful democracy of the country which, if life and health be preserved to him, may take him to the foremost place in the political world in the near future.

In truth, our people are outgrowing the un instructed talk, animated by vague communistic leanings, enforced by appeals to ignorance and prejudice, which had such a hold of them some twenty years ago, and which characterizes both the utterances and the work of that most disappointing man, now the head of the Local Government Office, Mr. John Burns. They want something better, more satisfying and more convincing; and only those who can satisfy this

growing want will have any chance in the Liberal party to-day in course of formation.

And if we look at the younger men rallying around the party we can see plenty already capable or rapidly learning to respond to this call. Mr. Alexander Ure, the Lord Advocate for Scotland, Mr. Hemmerde, and our staunch and ever active friend Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood are already doing fine work, laying firm the foundations for future progress, and teaching ever-growing audiences to look for something better and more elevating than mere political party talk, uninspired by any real conviction. That the land question is necessarily the bottom question, the root question, in which the key to the labor problem, the social problem, can alone be found; and that the taxation of land values offers the master key to its effective solution, is the theme of all their utterances.

And their views are being echoed and upheld with ever increasing knowledge and zeal by the more prominent members of the Labor party, whose advent into the political arena was so bitterly resented by old-fashioned Liberals, but which has done so much to breathe a more earnest and more strenuous spirit into both Imperial and local politics.

+

Yes, the logic of facts, supplemented by some real hard and consistent work during the past twenty years, has brought our question into the very forefront of the political struggle in the "Mother of Parliaments," and with its advent we can see the gleam of the dawn of a better day for the disinherited and impoverished industrial masses of the world. The struggle for social justice, equal opportunity, and true economic freedom has begun in real earnest; and though it will doubtless be a long and a bitter one, those of us who have helped to sow the seed need not now doubt the ultimate harvest.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FROM A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Westminster, June 4.

This is just a line of thanks to you for your sympathy with us over here at our success in the budget. Hughes is right (p. 486). To us "of the Religion" it is all one whether our cause goes forward in England, America, Australia or Germany, for we are bound together by something more than the ties of nationality.

Do not fancy, however, for one moment that we are singing—or going to sing—the "Nunc dimittis." We have only got a pulling infant as yet. It must be not only protected from the forces of reaction ranged against it on all sides in the House of Commons and House of Lords; it has also got to grow.

Our Budget is pretty radical all round, but the natural way in which all propertied opposition is gravitating towards and concentrating on the land clauses should act as a lesson for all time to all radicals and socialists, that the road, and the only effective road, to smash the present industrial system lies in these doctrines of Henry George.

JOSIAH C. WEDGWOOD.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.®

Week ending Tuesday, June 15, 1909.

The Cleveland Traction Situation.

The traction question in Cleveland (pp. 563, 564) will come before the people of that city in July or August, when they will be afforded an opportunity to vote on the Schmidt ordinances which are intended to divest the old monopoly interests of traction control.

+

It was at the Council meeting on the 7th that the preliminary steps were completed, after the Cleveland Railway directors had voted not to accept the ordinance adopted by the Council on the 4th (p. 564). Although Judge Tayler had washed his hands of the whole matter (p. 563), he subsequently prepared a settlement ordinance acceptable to Mr. Andrews and his group and to the men in the Council who have all along supported that side of the controversy, and it was introduced as soon as the Council came to order. It was immediately referred to the street railway committee, to the Council as a committee of the whole, and to the City Solicitor; and the Council proceeded to consideration of the Schmidt grant of a twenty-five year franchise (p. 564) on Payne avenue from Superior avenue to East Fifty-fifth street. After debate on this franchise, which is subject to referendum, the Council adopted it by a vote of 24 to 7. When that had been done, Chairman Koch of the street railway committee called a meeting of the Council in committee of the whole for the 8th to take up the pending ordinances granting Schmidt extensions to the Payne avenue grant all over the city. The effect of the adoption by the people of these franchises will be to transfer the whole traction system of Cleveland (except a few franchises expiring in three years), within the next seven months, to the Payne avenue grantee, Mr. Schmidt, on a straight 3-cent fare basis, with municipal ownership rights as soon as the law of the State permits and the people of the city desire. Just before the Council adjourned on the 7th, Mayor Johnson said, as reported in The Plain Dealer:

As long as the street railway question is not settled by a referendum vote on any of the pending propositions, I purpose to urge a popular vote for