

by those crime-creating laws, and do you therefore stand by them, either with a loud voice or in silence? How much better then are you than the Beckers, who also are grafters? Are you not worse than the McNamaras, who, criminals though they be, are at any rate not sordidly criminal?



Negro Capability.

"Nigger haters" who excuse their ill-will with absurd "scientific" on the inferiority of the Negro, should read of the career of Tom Walker. It is interestingly told in "The World's Work" for October—Tom Walker of Gloucester County, Virginia. This region, reduced by the Civil War from reputable disorder to disorder of ill-repute, has been in great measure redeemed under the leadership of a "squat, thick-lipped and kinky-haired" Negro who has qualified himself in the face of difficulties that few white men ever triumph over. This Negro is Tom Walker. He drove whisky out of the county when the leading white men said that "every man in the county, white and black," would vote wet. He farmed scientifically, taught school effectively, took care of a lawyer's office so as to study law by the way, studied law—all this at the same time and over a period of years,—and won his admission to the bar against intense professional prejudice, but by the permission and with the cordial admiration of the prejudiced lawyers themselves. He was elected to the board of supervisors "by the votes of Southern-born white Democrats, Walker himself being a Republican;" and so effectively did he serve that a reduction of the county tax rate from 40 to 27 cents is conceded to his efforts during his first term. With it all, he led his own race in Gloucester county from idleness, improvidence and crime, to industry, thrift and orderly living.



Yet there is one dark spot in the story, relieved only by the fact that it is not the Negro's fault. Here is the way the story runs at one point: "There is now scarcely a Negro cabin to be found in all Gloucester, save where one used as a storehouse or barn stands in noteworthy contrast to the modern home which supplanted it. *Land values rose steadily from an average of \$10 an acre to \$25 and \$30.*" We do not mean that the rise in land values is the dark spot in that story. This is in itself a bright spot. Increase of land values with improving civilization is in the natural order. It is one of the great facts that go to show that Nature has provided for all a fund which grows with social growth, and there-

by offers just opportunity for common participation in common progress. The increase in those Gloucester land values is stronger testimony to the efficiency of Tom Walker's leadership than any man's testimony or any magazine's assurance. But right there, nevertheless, lurks the black spot in this otherwise splendid tribute to Negro competency. Those higher land values find their way, not into the common treasury of Gloucester county where in justice they belong, but to the owners of Gloucester county land,—and to them, not as users, but as *owners* of the land. This is robbery of all for the enrichment of a few. No reference to custom, no appeal to the doctrine of vested interests, no quibbling confusion of conventional law with the moral law, can make it anything less than robbery. Though the beneficiaries themselves be not robbers—no more are they robbers than were individual slaveowners under the robbing slave system,—yet the thing itself is robbery, just as the slave system was. And be it never so legal, robbery makes a black spot in the best of stories.



ANALYSIS OF THE THREE PLATFORMS.

A comparison of the Democratic, Republican and Progressive platforms shows that, although each platform is considered as embodying certain distinctive principles, yet, in their ultimate analysis, the differences in many cases are only apparent.

On some questions the three parties maintain *exactly* identical positions; on others, *apparently* identical; on some, only one or two of the parties define their positions; on several questions they are *diametrically opposed*.



The things on which the attitudes of the parties are identical, and which they desire to accomplish are as follows:

(1) Prevent Mississippi floods. (2) Improve inland waterways. (3) Revive the merchant marine. (4) Secure safety at sea. (5) Compensate injured workmen. (6) Avoid delay in legal procedure. (7) Secure public health.

The three parties agree that the nation should perform at least a part of the work necessary to prevent the floods of the Mississippi River, which destroy both life and property.

They favor a systematic policy for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

The Democrats and the Republicans believe in

the revival of the merchant marine. The natural implications of their platform show that the same is true of the Progressives, although they do not speak directly on this question.

The old parties favor the enactment of laws protecting seamen from involuntary servitude, and desire that greater precautions be taken to secure life and property at sea. The new party is generally in favor of safety for all persons.

The three parties favor the enactment of a law which will enable an employe to receive compensation for injuries sustained without being compelled to experience the uncertainties of litigation.

They favor, also, such laws as will abolish the prevalent tendencies of useless delays and costly appeals in legal procedure.

They favor the adoption of systems that will be productive in extending the interests of public health.



The things on which the attitude of all the parties is *apparently* identical, and which they desire to accomplish, are as follows:

(1) Utilize Alaska coal. (2) Maintain efficient navy. (3) Limit campaign contributions. (4) Extend the civil service merit system. (5) Build post roads. (6) Reclaim swamp and arid lands. (7) Establish rural credit.

The three parties desire to utilize the large coal deposits of Alaska, but under such conditions as will prevent monopolies from acquiring control. The Democrats offer no definite plan to avoid such danger. The Republicans and Progressives favor the retention of title in the United States.

All desire to maintain an adequate navy, but differ somewhat as to the best method of doing it. The Democrats favor the creation of a Council to determine a naval program. The Republicans desire to build additional ships. The Progressives urge the building of two battleships each year until naval forces are limited by international agreement.

All favor the publicity of campaign contributions. The Democrats desire to prohibit corporations from contributing to campaign funds and individuals from contributing above a reasonable amount. The Progressives demand publicity before as well as after primaries and elections.

All favor the extension and enforcement of the civil service law. The old parties urge that the benefits of the Employers' Liability Law be secured for all civil service employes. The Republicans and Progressives favor continuous service during good behavior and the equitable re-

tirement of superannuated members.

All favor the extension of the Postal Department. The Democrats urge the construction and improvement of post roads. The Republicans and Progressives favor the establishment of a parcels post, with rates graduated in proportion to the length of carriage.

All favor reclamation, the Republicans emphasizing a combination of swamp drainage and channel improvement while the Democrats wish to extend the time of repayment of reclamation projects by the land owners. The Progressives suggest reclamation within the Mississippi basin incident to the control and improvement of that river.

All favor the development of agricultural credit. The old parties suggest an investigation of agricultural societies in other countries, with the view of establishing a system for the purpose of lending money to farmers. In this connection, the Democrats favor the enactment of legislation which will permit national banks to lend funds on real estate security.



The things mentioned in the Republican and Progressive platforms only, and on which their positions are similar, are as follows:

(1) International Court of Justice. (2) Federal trade commission. (3) Woman and child labor. (4) Immigration.

Both these parties desire to come into closer contact with other nations, and believe that international disputes should be referred to an international court for settlement.

They favor the creation of a Federal administrative commission to regulate corporations engaged in interstate commerce and to enforce and administer the laws governing such commerce.

They desire to regulate the conditions under which women and children may be employed. The Progressives desire to prohibit child labor, to provide an eight-hour day and a living wage for women.

Both advocate legislation to destroy the evils of undesirable immigration. The Progressives urge action to assimilate and educate worthy immigrants.



The things mentioned in the Democratic and Progressive platforms only, and on which their positions are similar, are as follows:

(1) Panama Canal. (2) Alaskan government. (3) Railway regulation. (4) Department of Labor. (5) Pensions. (6) Useless offices. (7) Income tax. (8) Direct election of U. S. Senators. (9) Presidential primaries.

Both these parties urge that American ships engaged in coastwise trade be allowed to pass through the Panama Canal exempt from tolls. They wish to forbid the use of the Canal to those ships which are owned by railroads competing with the Canal.

Both desire to give the people of Alaska the rights of a Territorial form of government.

Both recommend the valuation of the property of railroad companies engaged in interstate business, and favor effective means for the supervision of those companies and the regulation of their rates. The Democrats believe that this should apply, also, to express, telephone and telegraph companies.

Both desire to create a Department of Labor in the President's cabinet, which shall have general jurisdiction in influencing the conditions of labor. The Democrats desire to include in this Department such duties as will promote the interests of mines and mining.

Both favor a liberal pension policy.

Both recommend that the number of useless offices supported by the government be reduced.

Both favor the ratification of the pending Constitutional amendments which give the government power to tax incomes and provide for the direct election of United States Senators.

They indorse Presidential primaries.



The Democratic platform alone, mentions and opposes gambling in agricultural products.



The questions considered only in the Progressive platform are as follows:

(1) Easier amendment of Constitution. (2) Equal suffrage. (3) Inheritance tax. (4) Legislative publicity. (5) Business development. (6) Industrial justice. (7) Supervision of investments.

They favor a more simple method of amending the Federal Constitution. They pledge themselves to secure equal suffrage to men and women. They advocate the enactment of a Federal graduated inheritance tax law which will return to the States a part of the amount collected. They urge that lobbyists be compelled to register; that votes in committee be recorded; and that committee hearings be made public. They recommend that the Federal government and business men co-operate in an effort to increase both the efficiency and amount of business. They demand that one day out of every seven be a day of rest; that an eight-hour day be instituted in all industries operating continuously day and night; that their fami-

lies be supported out of the earnings of prisoners; that wage scales and the conditions of labor generally be made public. They favor such legislation as will protect small investors and guard them against the agencies of fraud.



The platforms express no direct opposition on the questions thus far considered. There are, however, some questions on which the parties are divided, as follows:

(1) Single Presidential term. (2) Recall of judges and decisions. (3) Philippines. (4) Conservation. (5) Banking. (6) Trusts. (7) Tariff.

The Democrats favor a single Presidential term.

The other parties are silent on this question. But the fact that each has presented a candidate who has already been President, clearly shows that they are not in sympathy with such a proposal.

The Republicans and Progressives maintain directly contrary positions on the recall of judges and decisions. The former believe that unquestioned integrity of the courts is essential to an orderly government; the latter believe that the people, by a popular vote, should determine whether they desire to retain a judge in office, and whether to retain a court precedent as a part of the law.

The Democrats are opposed to any policy which will reduce the Philippines to a colonial condition, and favor their independence as soon as they are able to govern themselves. The Republicans, on the other hand, believe that the United States should protect and educate the people on those islands, rather than throw them upon their own resources. The Progressives do not mention the Philippines in their platform.

The three parties favor the policy of conservation, desire to prevent monopoly control, and advocate a system for the use of natural resources to benefit all the people. The Democrats, however, severely criticize the forestry service of the present Administration for withdrawing from settlement much land on which there is no tree growth. The Progressives favor the retention of title to all natural resources, except agricultural lands, in the United States government, and believe that the public should be compensated for the water power rights which it grants.

The Republicans favor the revision of banking arrangements to meet the required conditions of today. The Democrats oppose a central bank, and they criticize the practice of the Republican administration for not depositing government funds under competitive bidding. Both the Democrats and Progressives strongly condemn the

Aldrich bill, passed during Republican administration. The Progressives desire to prohibit the issuing of notes through private agencies.

The old parties believe in the enactment of legislation supplemental to the anti-trust law which will define and punish attempts in restraint of trade as criminal. The Democrats denounce the Republican administration for compromising with the Standard Oil and Tobacco companies. They favor the dissolution of trusts and the prevention of private monopoly; the Republicans favor methods that will control them. In the regulation of interstate commerce the Democrats are opposed to the substitution of Federal for State remedies, believing that each should be kept distinct and placed upon an equal basis with the other. The Republicans, however, favor Federal remedies. The Progressives agree with the Republicans, both as regards regulation rather than dissolution, and as regards Federal rather than State control.

The parties are in direct opposition on the tariff question. The Democrats maintain that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, the nation having power to tax for revenue purposes only. The Republicans argue that a protective tariff should be considered just as constitutional as are bank, corporation, income and inheritance taxes. The Democrats favor a reduction of the tariff on the necessities of life, for the purpose of directly benefiting the consumer. The Republicans favor a protective tariff for the purpose of indirectly benefiting the consumer. The Democrats believe that products competing with trust-controlled articles, and those sold more cheaply in foreign markets than in the United States, should be put on the free list. The Republicans admit that some import duties are too high, but believe that the report of an expert commission is essential to a proper adjustment. The Progressives agree with the Republicans for tariff revision and for the establishment of an expert commission. The Republicans favor an adequate protection of American industries, while the Progressives believe in a protective tariff equalizing the competitive conditions of the United States with those of other countries.



Closely connected with the tariff question is that of the high cost of living. The parties differ as to what causes it, but all desire to abolish the evils from which it results.

The Republicans favor a scientific inquiry into the causes and, after thus learning them, immediate demands of their platform to remedy artificial diate action to change those things that are re-

sponsible for it. The Progressives advocate the causes; to remove other causes they favor, as do the Republicans, an expert inquiry.

The Democrats believe that the high cost of living is caused by the tariff, and favor a material reduction on the necessities of life.

HARLEY W. NEHF.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SINGLETAX CAMPAIGN IN OREGON.

Portland, Ore. October 29.

We have startled the Beast in his den.

There have been four debates between W. S. U'Ren and Charles H. Shields. In all of them U'Ren frankly told where he got his money, and how the Joseph Fels Fund was raised. In a most adroit and quiet manner he demanded that Shields tell who supplied his funds, and how they were spent.

At the Bungalow Theater over 800 people rose in their seats and seconded the motion vigorously. But Shields refused to tell. He refused to tell in Hood River the next night; and in Salem last night he refused 1,500 people the information. Fact is, he dare not tell, for two of his principal backers are well known millionaire real estate speculators and tax dodgers.

The debates have made many converts for us, and none for the opponents. I never saw a man so cleanly exposed and mortified as when Shields was asked to tell the audience "Who pays you?"

Our wagon goes up and down the main streets bearing the sign, "Death Knell of Big Land Monopoly in Oregon, 364 X Yes; Graduated Single Tax 364 X Yes."

In front of the wagon is a great bronze ship bell that the driver strikes with a wooden hammer at intervals of perhaps a minute. It sounds for blocks, and the opponents cuss it and discuss it in groups.

At noon we hold street meetings. J. W. Bengough draws pictures; I shout through a big megaphone all sorts of short wordings to draw a crowd. Then we have a big map of Oregon, 7 feet deep, with the land grants marked in colors on it, and from it we preach some great sermons. It is very exhausting work. H. D. Wagnon, our candidate for assessor, has broken down his voice, but the crowds he has spoken to have been enormous. Some times 700 or 1,000 will gather in a few minutes.

Of course the other side is rustling. Cards and literature and lies piled on lies. They may beat us this time, and they may not; but they will know they have been in a fight, and that there is another battle coming on the same battle ground. If we win, then the very earth will be shaken by renewed battle, for the Beast is not going to stay whipped, and neither are we.

If the weather were good we would be all dead with public speaking; but fortunately it rains—real Oregon showers—and we get a little rest. We are distributing thousands of ballots marked as we would like to have them voted.

Bengough is a remarkable artist and splendid talker. F. E. Coulter is a whirlwind of energy and