

Banishment of a citizen not only removes him from the limits of his native land, but puts him beyond the reach of any of the protecting clauses of the Constitution. In other words it strips him of all rights that are given to a citizen. I can not believe that Congress intended to provide that a citizen, simply because he belongs to an obnoxious race, can be deprived of all the liberty and protection which the Constitution guarantees, and if it did so intend, I do not believe it has the power to do so.

+

The majority decision in this case, in effect reenacts the infamous Alien law of the early Adams administration, under which any person too frank in his criticism of a corrupt administration might find himself stripped of citizenship and in exile. The first subject of experiment in the enforcement of that law was an "obnoxious foreigner," but the white citizen soon followed as legitimate prey.

Washington bureaucrats, already emboldened by the Ju Toy doctrine, have thrown into jail and held incommunicado, one De Lara, in spite of his claim of citizenship; and the charge that De Lara's real offense was that he made himself obnoxious to Diaz by aiding in the exposure of the Mexican slave traffic, has not been satisfactorily explained.

While Brewer's opinion is a minority one, and hence not law today, the fact that it is enduring truth gives us hope that it may be law tomorrow.

STERLING E. EDMUNDS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

HENRY GEORGE, JR.'S, OBSERVATIONS IN THE EAST.

New York, April 23, 1910.

The old order changeth. The new economic and political forces in the country are at work.

The announcement from Washington that United States Senators Aldrich and Hale, of Connecticut and Maine respectively, will retire from active politics, is the strongest proof of the strong radical tide that is running in New England. Subsequently to my Western speaking tour (p. 344) under the management of Mr. F. H. Monroe of the Henry George Lecture Association, I went on a brief tour under the same management into New England. I spoke once in Boston, twice in Cambridge, once in Lynn, Mass., once in Manchester, New Hampshire, and once in Portland, Maine. In all of these places I heard the same kind of "insurgent" talk I had heard in Iowa and Minnesota.

+

My addresses in Portland and Manchester were before the Economic Clubs of those cities. Clubs of this kind are of recent date in New England. They are the outgrowth of the spirit of inquiry which is stirring the whole country. They are composed

largely of the leading progressive men of their communities, who get together once a month or so during the cooler weather to listen to discussions of current economic questions by men of various points of view.

The subject for consideration before the Portland and the Manchester meetings was "The Cause of the Increasing Cost of Living." The most significant thing about these two meetings was the personnel of the speakers and the radical nature of their utterances. At the first meeting I found myself associated with Henry B. Gardner, of Providence, R. I., and Mr. Byron W. Holt, of New York. Professor Gardner has the chair of Political Economy at Brown University, Providence, R. I. He teaches the Single Tax as applicable for local purposes. Mr. Holt is chairman of the Free Trade Committee of the Reform Club of New York and is an untiring advocate of the Single Tax.

I spoke first and contended that the rapid growth of monopolies of various kinds and their increasing exactions would sufficiently account for the very high and increasing general prices, and I took pains to describe the tariff and the privately owned railroads as the chief causes of these rising prices, pointing out, however, that even were these removed by the declaration of free trade and the taking over of the railroads as public highways into public hands, the landlords would reap the benefit of freer production. Speculative rent would rise and absorb all the advantage, unless the single tax should be applied to land values to prevent this speculative rise.

Professor Gardner contended that while I had explained high prices, I had not explained increasing prices; that the latter was to be explained by the greatly increased output of gold, the measure of prices, relatively to other things; and that this increase of prices would probably continue for a decade, owing to the probable continuance of this relatively increased output of gold.

Mr. Holt supported Professor Gardner with an ably written paper, in which he presented statistics and authorities.

It is not because of the gold or anti-gold argument that I speak of this meeting, but because of the fact that three men pronouncing themselves against the tariff and for the Single Tax should be listened to with interest and applause by an organization of the leading banking, business and professional men of the leading city in Republican Maine.

It explains why Senator Hale of that State now pleads advancing years and delicate health as reasons why he should not again stand for the Senatorship. Rebellion against the present order of things that discourages business at every turn and that has so much to do with the high cost of living reveals itself in general discontent. I heard much of it while I was in Portland—the most open and direct opposition to Senator Hale and to his son who is out as a candidate for the Congressional seat formerly held by Thomas B. Reed in Portland; and most of this came from men who had always been Republicans.

+

In Manchester I found the same private radical talk. The town's chief activity is in the manufacture of cotton goods. Manchester has long stood fast

to the tariff. Not so now. The mill managers contend that there has been an appreciable increase in the rate of wages paid in the mills, but the operatives point to the intensified conditions of labor and more than that to the increased cost of living, so that it is now hard to keep soul and body together. The feeling is that the tariff is largely to blame, and there is a strong reaction against it.

This feeling in the Manchester cotton mills showed itself in the meeting of the Economic Club, of which, however, only financial, business and professional men are members. I delivered myself in the same radical style against the tariff in toto, for the public taking over of every function of a public highway, and for the application of the Single Tax. I had the honor to divide the time with Professor Thomas Nixon Carver, one of the several professors in the department of Economics in Harvard University, at Cambridge. He revealed himself against the tariff and leaning toward the Single Tax, but, like Professor Gardner at Portland, he declared for the increased output of gold as accounting in the main for increasing prices by the cheapening of gold and the relative advance of everything else. The significant aspect of this occasion was manifest approval of most of the hearers of Professor Carver's indirect and of my direct assault upon the tariff. It was plain that even among these conservative men, the tide of radical thought was running.

+

And as if to leave no room for doubt as to his own radical leanings, Professor Carver next morning as we traveled together to Boston, invited me to visit Harvard and address one of his more advanced classes in Political Economy. I gladly accepted for that afternoon, and for the space of an hour made an address and answered questions on the Single Tax.

This was in Harvard House, one of the oldest of the University buildings. Just a stone's throw outside the high ornate iron fence, and not far from the oak under which George Washington assumed formal command of the colonial army in the Revolutionary War, I had two days before made an address on the moral aspects of the British budget fight before the Unitarian congregation of Rev. Dr. Crothers, which is said to be one of the finest congregations in Cambridge.

This address was arranged by Professor Lewis J. Johnson, of the Department of Engineering at Harvard. Professor Johnson reports the very rapid headway of radical ideas in and about Cambridge—not alone for free trade and the Single Tax, but for the Initiative and Referendum and Recall. He himself has drawn up and presented to the legislature for its action a new charter for the city of Cambridge based upon the latter ideas.

+

In Lynn, the center of the shoe industry, I met Mr. Fay Aldrich, president of the "Wage Earners' Political Club," the newly organized political end of the trade unions of the town. He was outspoken against protectionism. And in Boston, where I spoke briefly before the Twentieth Century Club, it was evident that "insurgency" had made deep inroads.

Indeed from what I heard there, in Cambridge and in Lynn, Senator Lodge may have to fight hard for his Bourbon Republicanism and re-election to his seat at Washington. The current that has forced Aldrich and Hale out of the running may force him out, too. At any rate, it will probably give him a hard battle—a thing that seemed least likely but a short time ago.

+

At Washington, D. C., where I went a day or two after returning from my excursion into New England, I found the Democrats confident and the Republicans correspondingly doubtful of victory in the Congressional elections this fall. Hon. Champ Clark, the minority leader in the House, gave it as his judgment that if the elections were to be held now the Democrats would have a majority so big as to be unmanageable.

Senator LaFollette believes a tremendous reaction is imminent against all the exploiting of the people during the recent years, and he reads in current events the most pronounced confirmation of his own Insurgent operations.

In some quarters I heard urgent demands for the establishment of an information bureau at Washington, especially as to tariff information, which is now very hard to get since President Taft has issued an order that no departmental information shall be furnished to members of Congress—either Senators or Representatives—except through the Cabinet head of each Department. The Cabinet stands pat on the tariff and other measures and policies which the President has originated or approved—that is to say, is not furnishing any anti-administration information. I think myself that a small bureau of information for the supplying of facts on the tariff and other advanced subjects would be invaluable for the next four or six months to many of the active Democrats and most of the Insurgent Republicans in Congress. The men to get up the information could be found if the expense money was forth-coming.

+

Finally I wish to report that I found not a few Democrats in Washington in a prayerful mood. They are offering up supplications like that which appeared in the Houston Post, which runs:

O Lord, now that everything is coming our way, purge every Democratic soul of hot air and vain-glory, and insert large installments of common sense in every Democratic cranium; and oh, remember, Lord, our proneness to make fools of ourselves just when we have the world by the tail and a downhill pull, and see that we don't get in bad this time.

HENRY GEORGE.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

SOCIALISTS AND SINGLE TAXERS.

New York, April 18th, 1910.

I do not entirely agree with Mr. Harry George (p. 344), that debates with Socialists are, on the whole, injurious as creating a division between reform forces. I think I have done as much work as anyone