

I warmly sympathize—while we were in London last month. Such outbursts are occasionally to be expected when feeling runs high. But these proceedings were not encouraged, and were not sanctioned at headquarters; the Budget League, when charged with winking at them, instantly and indignantly repudiated and condemned them. The St. James Hall women, on the other hand, not only sanctioned the throwing of stones at Mr. Asquith through the windows of his own country home, the assault upon his train with brickbats, and all the violences at the great Birmingham meeting, involving not only danger to the speakers but indiscriminately to the innocent thousands present—I think our people do not know the lengths to which this thing has gone—but gloried in it, and when the perpetrators were locked up called them “martyrs.” Right or wrong, the leaders are responsible.

To one who realizes how the various progressive political causes hang together, it is a source of double disappointment and chagrin that the Ministry which these women have elected to hinder and harass is precisely that which is at this moment in a hard and heroic struggle for the greatest measure for liberty and equality which has been submitted to the English people for almost a century. It is not strange that, in the face of this, and of the fact that the particular bill which they propose would confer suffrage only upon a limited privileged class of women and probably strengthen the Conservative vote, the charge that they are a tail to the Tory kite should be as common as it is. The charge is a slander; there is not, I believe, a shadow upon the disinterestedness and singleness of purpose of Mrs. Pankhurst and her associates. But the disproportion of it all, if these women are real Liberals at heart, is melancholy.

The Transcript published last Wednesday the truest account of the present Budget campaign in England and its deep significance which I have read in any American newspaper, from the pen of Herbert W. Horwill; and at almost that very moment we were reading of a flock of women trying to assault the leader of this great campaign, a sincere woman suffragist withal, Mr. Lloyd-George, at his Newcastle meeting.

This new policy of violence is to be sharply distinguished from the “militant” measures of the preceding years, the pressing of petitions and the breaking up of meetings. But even for this last is anything really to be said by serious and sensible people? I think not. It is a policy which cannot be reduced to a virtuous general principle; and I have no right to resort to tactics for my cause which I am not willing another shall adopt for his. The general exclusion of women from suffrage is a rank injustice; the present industrial inequities, condemning thousands to such undeserved and hopeless suffering, are yet more flag-

rant; the waste of the people’s money on great battleships which are chiefly a menace and not a defence is an appalling thing; and in England especially I am always tempted to say that the unlimited toleration of the dramshop is worse still, but shall I say that so long as Congress goes on voting big battleships I will help break up every meeting where an Administration man speaks? Shall my temperance brother say it? Shall the labor leader? It would be the end of free speech; it would mean the wanton destruction of the painfully evolved machinery by which we have made our political progress; and it would mean the rapid return toward anarchy and barbarism. There is just one road for us all in democratic countries like England and America, however dear and cardinal our causes, and however hard to brook defeats and delays. It is the road to the minds and consciences of the masters, of Prime Ministers and Congressmen; the road lighted by Lincoln’s confidence that, although you can fool some of the people all the time and all the people some of the time, you cannot fool all the people all the time or permanently.



THE WORLD’S ONE PHILANTHROPIST.

William Marion Reedy in the *St. Louis Mirror* of
November 11, 1909.

A man named John Stewart Kennedy, of whom no one ever heard before, died in New York the other day, leaving a fortune of \$70,000,000, of which he bequeathed \$25,000,000 to various charities, religious missions and so forth. Upon his memory is poured forth much praise. And for honesty of his motive one can only speak praisefully. A man has a right to do as he will with his own, provided his disposition of his wealth does not harm others.

It is in order though to state that gifts like those of the late Mr. Kennedy, well-intentioned though they be, do not reach the conditions the donors wish to ameliorate. Charity does little good. What the people need is justice. I am aware that pending the establishment of justice there are many who cannot wait. Their charity may help some, but never much, permanently. The spread of education and of religion is a desirable end, too, but, alas, education seems not to be efficacious towards morality or to making a living, and religion puts off too many people seeking happiness here and now, with the promise of felicity in a very uncertain hereafter. A great deal of the money given to philanthropic ends in these days is wasted upon the symptoms, not upon the disease of poverty and wretchedness.

The one man in the world who seems to me to have the right sort of philanthropy is Joseph Fels,

the Naphtha millionaire of Philadelphia and London. He is devoting his wealth to the propaganda of a philosophy that has for its end the restoration to the people of the opportunity to get along in the world. He does not aim first to educate people, or to make people pious. His idea is that if men were made truly free of poverty they would seek education and they would become, as we say, "good." Give a man a decent living, a decent home, decent clothes, and he will be decent clean through. This isn't Socialist doctrine either, for Rev. David S. Phelan, of the St. Louis Watchman, a "frumious" opponent of Socialism and exponent of Roman Catholicism, expressed this very thought the other day in a sermon to an organization of Roman Catholic women.

Mr. Fels has established funds in England, Australia, Denmark and the United States for the propagation of the Henry George remedy for poverty. That remedy consists in the institution of a governmental system of taxation that will tax nothing but the land values of each community. All wealth other than land value is the creation of individual effort. Land value is the creation of community effort. As the result of community effort it should be taken to pay the expenses of conducting the community. As land values under existing systems are taken by the individuals who have been able to secure land the tax would simply transfer those land values to the public treasury from private purses. If all such land values were taken from the people who now have them, there would be no object in holding land save for use, and all the land now privately held but unused would be released to use by the people now kept from using it. If there were no tax upon anything but land values all labor would be free, because the results of labor would be the laborer's own. And if land were free to all who would use it, the earth would be more productive of wealth for everybody. And if everybody had his proper share of the wealth he produces, and had not to surrender part of that wealth for the right to live and work upon land held by others, there would be more time in which all could procure education, attain to culture and be good and decent and happy.

Mr. Fels' money, therefore, is given to get at the roots of poverty, disease and crime. Instead of taking care of the poor, the diseased, the vicious and the criminal, Mr. Fels' philanthropy would prevent the manufacture of the poor, the diseased, the vicious and the criminal. The Fels proposition is prevention rather than cure.

But it is impractical, says some one. Not at all. In this country we partially apply it in separating land values and improvement values in taxation. In New Zealand the idea is farther advanced. In Germany the system of taking the community value for the community is in process

of inauguration, and in Great Britain the landlords are to be taxed on the values of their holdings, to the creation of which they have contributed nothing.

But, says some one, this means spoliation of the rich. It means no such thing. It does not mean the taking from anybody of anything that rightly belongs to him. It takes for all only the wealth created by all. It puts an end to the spoliation of the many by the few. It does not take from any one any land he uses. It simply taxes away the land value that the landlord puts in his pocket without having created a penny of it. Mr. Joseph Fels would reinstate the people at large in the possession of the values they create, and leave the individual in possession of the last *denarius* and every *drachma* that he wins from the earth by his own toil.

Compared for efficacy and purpose with the gifts of Rockefeller, Carnegie, Sage and other philanthropists the gift of Fels is infinitely superior. It is designed to show the people the way by which they may come back into their own. It will pauperize nobody. It will bring about independence instead of manufacturing dependents. It will enable people to educate themselves and make themselves good, instead of being lifted into sycophantic comfort by "the scruff of their necks."

Mr. Joseph Fels doesn't use his money to do this for any one class of people or in any one country. He wants nothing more than the earth for all the children of men. He is a Jew but he wants opportunity made free for all races and creeds. For him there are no "lesser breeds without the law." His gifts are devoted to showing men how to help themselves to comfort, to education, to goodness. The Fels funds aim at the destruction of a system, which until it shall be destroyed, will continue to produce such a crop of poverty, disease, vice and crime as not all the stupendous donations of thousands of Rockefellers, Carnegies, Sages, Kennedys and their kind will ever be able to deal with. The system must be annihilated ere its product can be stopped. Poverty, disease, vice and crime flower from the system as effect follows cause. The Rockefeller, Carnegie, Sage and Kennedy gifts only conceal the cause of the need of such gifts. The Fels philanthropy goes direct to the cause of all the things these other philanthropies vainly battle with. And those other philanthropists do not strike at the cause because that cause gives them millions belonging of right to the very people to whom those philanthropists would dribble them out in charity.

Of all the world's philanthropists, Joseph Fels, of Philadelphia and London, is the only one who knows what he is driving at and is driving in the only way to attain his purpose. All the others, by their efforts, are no more effective than a soap-and-sugar poultice on a wooden leg.