

many inequalities and absurdities in the present method of assessing property in the District of Columbia, he intimated that he was withholding some startling facts for a larger audience. "The country at large," he said, "had been generous in its expenditures on the District, but under the present system of taxation, every dollar which the Federal Government pays toward the District expenses only serves to make it harder for the poor to live here."

Mr. Charles Adair of Illinois, Mrs. Mariette L. Johnson of Fairhope, Alabama, and Rev. Chas. E. Granger were the formal speakers at the Tuesday morning session at the New Ebbitt.

Mr. Adair's subject was "The Makers and the Takers." He showed how the introduction of inter-urban railways, or other improved means of transportation, every application of human ingenuity to labor, every improvement in methods of production or distribution, result in increased returns to the man who owns the land instead of the man who performs the labor. "When we are all thoroughly aroused to these wrongs," he said, "we will preach to society what we now preach to individuals, 'Thou shalt not steal,' and we will change the laws which rob the makers and give to the takers."

Mrs. Johnson gave a very interesting address on Fairhope and on Organic Education. In closing her address, she said: "Children should be given stories, games, singing, nature study, gardening, etc., but not have books forced upon them or even given to them until they become interested in them—when they will want them naturally. High schools and colleges should ask, not, 'What do you know,' but, 'What do you need?'"

The Rev. Mr. Granger, whose subject was, "The Church and Social Service," said: "That churches are failing to give the people what they need is strikingly indicated by the fact that the Presbyterian church has increased but 3 per cent, and the Methodist church but 1 per cent during the past year. Many members of my own church oppose the preaching of the larger message and clamor for the old gospel—some from motives of greed and selfishness, fearing it will hurt their business, and some honestly opposing it, not realizing that social service is really the old gospel, rightly understood. And shame on that preacher who, having the vision and knowing the need, is too cowardly to voice it."

On Tuesday evening the annual national banquet of the League was held at the New Ebbitt. The President of the League, Mrs. John Sherwin Crosby, acted as toastmaster, and five-minute responses were made as follows:

"Immediate Effects of the Singletax," by Dr. Mary D. Hussey.

"The Female of the Species," F. L. Siddons, Esq.

"What Is Speculative Value?" Miss Amy Mall Hicks.

"The Wise Farmer and the Fool Mule," Mr. Herbert J. Browne.

"The Innate Love of Freedom," Miss Jennie Rogers.

"The Parcels Post," Hon. David J. Lewis.

"The Truth Is Marching On," Miss Grace I. Colbron.

"The Way Out," Hon. Henry George, Jr.

The closing session of the convention was held at the Ebbitt House on Wednesday morning. At this session it was unanimously agreed to change the form and character of the League, turning it into a national committee, with chairman, vice-chairman,

secretary and treasurer, and one woman's representative from each singletax club. Mrs. Henry George, Jr., gave a reception to the ladies of the League on Wednesday afternoon at her residence, 1931 Biltmore street, and on Memorial Day, in the afternoon, a picnic and reception was held at the suburban residence of Colonel H. Martin Williams.

Among the delegates were: Mrs. Maude E. Pearson, British Columbia; Mrs. Mariette L. Johnson, Alabama; Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, Dr. E. E. Bowen and Dr. Mary D. Hussey, New Jersey; Mrs. J. A. Rogers, Miss Jennie A. Rogers, Dr. M. C. Hollister, Mrs. E. Louise Arnim and Miss M. B. Havens, Brooklyn; Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, Miss Amy Mall Hicks, Mrs. John Sherwin Crosby, Mrs. C. M. Hibbard and Mrs. Margaret Hughan, New York City.

D. S. LUTHER.



## THE ANARCHY IN SAN DIEGO.

San Diego, Cal.

As nearly as I can ascertain there were about 200 active "Vigilantes" under arms, and subject to immediate call. This group was divided into about 20 companies of 10 men each and led by a captain. In case of unusual excitement this battalion would, they thought, be able to summon several thousand men to its assistance, should they desire to tar and feather any I. W. W. whom they found off his guard, or to storm the jail. The jail was guarded by deputy sheriffs or other officers unfriendly to the I. W. W. These officers were perfectly willing to relinquish their prisoners at the first show of strength on the part of the "Vigilantes." Never have I been in a city where such a reign of terror prevailed.

At every possible opportunity I denounced these "Vigilantes" as cowards, thugs and assassins. No one would join in my denunciation. In the hotels and on the streets men would walk away, refusing to be even in a company where anything but sanction was shown.

The situation was interesting in that both sides were in the wrong. One of the leading druggists—a Mr. Ferris—put the matter before me about as follows: "The growth of business required that crowds be not permitted to congregate in certain districts. The I. W. W. refused to recognize the ordinance prohibiting street speaking in certain congested districts, and as arrests were made the I. W. W. proceeded to rush to San Diego hundreds of their unemployed members which soon filled our jail and those of the surrounding cities. The I. W. W. announced their plan to rush 10,000 men to San Diego, and it looked as though they would succeed. While the county could feed a few hundred, to be forced to feed several thousand men would bankrupt the locality in time. In addition to this the business of the courts was being clogged, for every man demanded a separate trial and one by jury. The time that would be required from our citizens even to meet the jury requirements was a serious problem. We could not repeal the ordinance, for the people were for it. An attempt to secure a referendum petition failed miserably, indicating that the great majority of the people approved of the ordinance. We who lived here and enjoyed the climate and scenery and had established ourselves in business,

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.