

Certainly, the Sherman law is working justice, as Mr. Taft has all along been insisting!



In the meanwhile, although the Standard Oil trust no longer exists, and we have free competition, we may note that the price of oil is going up, and the price of gasoline has been increased two dollars a barrel.

And now we find that all the other trusts, instead of trying to run away, are eagerly awaiting their turn to be dissolved. The question is no longer, as of yore, "Is there any danger of this concern being attacked under the Sherman law?" Now the eager inquiry is everywhere being made, "What hope have we of being attacked?"

A cry has gone up, within recent months, which is resounding throughout the length and breadth of trustdom: "Annihilate us ere we perish; dissolve us before we die."

JOHN MOODY.



THE ENGLISH TORY ATTITUDE.

Pembroke College,
Oxford University, England.

Professor Tuckerman of the University of Nebraska (who introduced me to *The Public* and the Singletax) warned me that in going to Oxford I was going into the hotbed of Tory conservatism. Except that "hotbed" is rather a vigorous term to use of Toryism, he was right. He was afraid that my wholesome radicalism would suffer in this atmosphere. There he was wrong. Young Americans who are reactionaries at home become staunch Liberals in England. Among the ninety odd American Rhodes Scholars, I know of not a single exception.



Sometimes the ideas of political economy possessed by these Tories—they are not real conservatives—are ridiculously funny. They are so solemn in their colossal ignorance. For instance, in the course of a discussion on Non-conformity one man remarked, "Well, of course, you know, it's all very well, but after all these tin Bethelites and other Non-conformists are only here in England on sufferance." Of course they are, even though they number half or nearly half the nation, even though more than half the wealth and business of the country is in their hands, even though in politics such leaders as Balfour and Bonar Law on one side and Premier Asquith and Lloyd George on the other are Non-conformists. Still they are here on sufferance. I hate to think of what would happen in Britain if anyone should try to remove that sufferance.

Then take their ideas on property. I never knew that thinking people could be so blind. They accuse America of being money mad, and so perhaps it is. They do not pursue wealth, I admit, with American energy, but their admiration—nay worship of it—is greater. It is not, as in America, the possessor of great wealth whom they worship—which is, by the way, only perverted hero worship with us—it is the eternal sacredness of property as such.

As nearly as I can see, they think this is the only substantial right with which the Creator endows a

man. True, they are ready to admit every man's right to life and liberty, but the means to these rights they would reserve to a ruling class. For, the right to work, at least for wages, is a gift from a beneficent employer; the right to vote is another gift unwisely extended to the lower orders by a foolish Liberal government. And yet without means of subsistence and without the suffrage, life and liberty are but shadows.

When you come, however, to property—ah! that is something different. The right of those who have property, especially in large amounts, to keep it—that smacks of the divine. And the way they berate the Liberal government for their wicked, sinful attack on the holy institution of property is really pitiful. If you suggest that after all property is an expedient dependent upon government and revocable by government, they stare at you in amazement.

Well, take an easier position. Point out that community-made values in land can be justly taken by the community. They haven't learned yet, even though Lloyd George brought in his Budget in 1909, to answer this argument. They repeat that a man's property is his own and that it is nothing less than legalized robbery to take any considerable part of it from him by taxation. They can not understand what community-made values means. So, when the Liberal government takes a part of these, where it might take all, it is "socialistic" and that is, of course, the *ne plus ultra* of depravity.

Of course, the leaders do not talk quite like this and there are intelligent conservatives; but one has only to talk with the average Oxford man—undergraduate or professor—to see how firmly grounded these prejudices are.

When you come to think of it, things could scarcely be otherwise. Nine out of ten Oxford men never have associated with any but their own class. (The tenth man is almost invariably a Radical.) With no conception of the needs and aspirations of workingmen and women, seeing only their own interests and those of their comrades in the same class, it is inevitable that they should struggle when they see these interests threatened.

But that doesn't quite excuse their violence. I was prepared to find mud-slinging absent from British politics. In its place, I find half-brick slinging. Of course, the sedate Tory of aristocratic lineage does not throw bricks. Never! But when a man severely wounds Lloyd George, you hear them say, "Good job, too."

When Mr. Churchill was about to go to Belfast, I heard the hope more than once expressed that some Ulsterite would kill him. That really riled me; European opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, Americans are law-abiding.

Said I, "You call me a Socialist; why you are blooming anarchists, nihilists." That made them very angry. Yet I can't for the life of me see where their position differs materially from that of a Russian nihilist's; each disapproves of the government and fights it by force. If anything, I prefer the Russian, who is really suffering under genuine grievances.

My parting shot was "the most unkindest cut of all;" for I said, "I've always supposed that Englishmen were sportsmen enough to be good losers, but in politics apparently they are not." That nearly strained my friendship with them.

It is, however, no use to argue with them. They won't see it and never will till they come into contact with the working people and learn to sympathize with their ideals and aspirations, until they see that there are other interests than those of their own class. And as long as the idea prevails, "Only a servant" or "Only a workman," this can not well come about. At the best, we can hope for only a Platonic love for the "lower orders."

David Lloyd George once remarked to a Welsh friend: "In all my career I do not remember a hand being held out to me from above and a voice saying, 'Dring i fyny yma' (Come up higher, climb thou up here). But don't misunderstand me," he went on, "there have been thousands of hands which have pushed me up from behind." Of course, the real secret of his success, as always, lies within, but in his struggle upward he and Ramsay Macdonald and all of that type must struggle against great odds.

HORACE B. ENGLISH.



HENRY GEORGE IN DENMARK.*

Roskilde, Denmark, March 12.

Denmark being a fairly democratic country, a new movement here, especially such an important and far-reaching one as the Henry George movement, must be based upon the understanding and approval of the people at large; and as long as no definite step has been taken by the government, the work of the movement must for this reason, too, be largely educational and agitational.



The chief weapon used in this agitation and education in Denmark is public meetings and lectures. The more we can have of them the better, and during the years I am speaking of, the number of meetings has been growing faster than ever. Not only that, but the number of people present at each meeting and the interest of those present, may be said to have grown quite as fast. This is to a great extent due to the Fels Fund, through the assistance of which in 1910-11 alone, 470 lectures or meetings were held.

This year that kind of work has been further extended, especially by courses of lectures given by Dr. C. N. Starcke in about fourteen different places (mostly towns). Dr. Starcke has often had big and everywhere steadily increasing audiences, consisting of eager listeners, keen on asking questions.

I might here add that Singletaxers are more and more commonly asked by different societies, political and non-political, to give lectures on the Singletax; people want to know what it means and to discuss it.

Not a few of the lectures arranged by the Fels Fund are held in small-holdings societies; and we have found among the small-holders an ever growing interest and understanding, these people seeing that the taxation of land values is the only way of securing them cheap land and an easy admission to it.



But the small-holders seem also to make the fight for the taxation of land values a matter of their own societies. Last January the united leaders of all the United small-holdings societies sent a message to the

Danish small-holders asking them to keep a watchful eye on the present economic situation and to consider the question of the taxes and of the land from what must no doubt be characterized as the Henry George point of view. They were further asked to discuss these questions at their spring meetings, and the result has been the passing (often unanimously) of resolutions deploring the direct and indirect taxes now proposed by the Government, deploring further that the Government has not been wise enough to propose a reform of the taxes which could be of real benefit to the people at large—namely, a taxation of land values, of the values created by the public, and not by the individual.



As for literary agitation, it seems easier to get Danish people to hear than to read. But a good deal of interest is paid to newspaper articles, and especially to discussions between Singletaxers and others in the very widely spread provincial papers. The sale of books is meanwhile growing, people asking for Henry George's own works as well as for shorter pamphlets, which have been given out through the help of the Fels Fund; as examples may be mentioned L. Larsen's—"Taxation of Land Values in Foreign Countries," and T. L. Bjorner—"Facts and Figures for Working Singletaxers," both of which seem very useful and much asked for.

During the year 1910-11 the number of members of the Henry George Society rose very considerably—from about 2,000 to about 3,000; but, as will be understood from the above, the progress could not be measured by that only.



In the direct political fields Singletaxers have made themselves felt in different ways. The Radical-Liberal cabinet sitting in 1909-10 succeeded in arranging a sample land-valuation* in order to satisfy Singletaxers within the party. It has been going on since 1911 and is now nearly finished. Mr. S. Berthelsen, the well-known Singletaxer, has taken an active part in that valuation and done most helpful work.

The Radical-Liberal party has had a Commission within the party on the question of the taxation of land values; and the present leader of the Henry George Society, Jacob E. Lange, being on this commission, it has reported most favorably on the matter considered, 14 out of the 15 members strongly advocating taxation of that kind. The result was that the party at its last conference (May, 1911) pledged itself to advocate a certain (comparatively small) amount of taxation on land values.

ANDERS VEDEL.

*See The Public, vol. xiv, p. 370.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

DEMOCRACY IN MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

Hermosa Beach, California.

One of the purest examples of democracy in local government prevails here. To be sure, this "city of the sixth class" is only what would be called in the East a village, but the principles and methods used

*See The Public, volume xiv, pages 542, 584, 1192.