

says the land taxer, and to a degree the cogency of his arguments cannot be gainsaid.

What you or I think, however, of different theories of revenue production matters little; the seizure of part of the so-called "unearned increment" is coming, and no individual opinion can stop it. Those who read the signs of the times aright will not ignore the inevitable, but will labor to the end that when the land tax comes its course shall be guided by reason and moderation, not by passion. Zealots for the single tax may be found who preach the confiscation of even existing land values. Fortunately, such extremists are few in number. Their influence will remain negligible unless a conflict is aroused by a stubborn and uncompromising attitude on the part of vested interests. David Lloyd George does not seek in England to confiscate existing values; the program of his party is to fix values now by competent authority, leaving the already existing unearned increment to be enjoyed by landowners, and seizing for the use of the state one-fifth merely of the future unearned increment.

Were the readjustment already accomplished, there would be little opposition to future application of such a system. The difficulty arises from the unfortunate fact that the past and the future cannot be marked off by a definite line. A considerable part of the present value of our provident investor's \$25,000 lot is due to the prospect that it will be worth \$50,000 in a few years; if that reasonable expectation were destroyed, the market value of the property might be cut down by half. Any tax, therefore, which seeks to take a part of the future increment necessarily destroys a large fraction of present values. This is the menace which property owners have to face.

How easy it would be to achieve ideals if society were not hampered by its past. Every industrial readjustment on a large scale involves financial ruin to thousands of individuals, even though the progress of society is calculated to save in the long account far more than it destroys. Mechanical invention and the operation of economic law must levy their daily toll of victims just as certainly as nature, "so careful of the type, so careless of the single life," destroys her thousands of victims that one favorite may survive. New methods of taxation cannot prevail without causing individual distress.

Chattel slavery had to go in this country. If slave owners had been open-minded enough to read the lessons of history, they might have obtained compensation for the value of their slaves. The cost of a necessary and inevitable reform might have been distributed over the whole country, instead of being added to the ravages of war as part of the burden of the South. A considerable readjustment of property in land is sure to come in this generation or the next, and no vested

interests will be able to stop it. The important matter for the individual owner to realize is that real estate interests need to combine now for the formulation of a wise policy with respect to the coming invasion. A spirit of prudent compromise is indispensable to the safeguarding of their rights, and the sooner they take counsel together in that temper the better it will be for all.

* * *

SUFFRAGETTE VIOLENCE.

From an Editorial in *The London Nation* (Radical) of September 25, 1909.

We hope that the general body of women suffragists will pause before they give their leaders full authority to pursue the tactics of violence which have been formally adopted and acted upon at Birmingham and elsewhere, and are avowed and excused in a remarkable letter to the "Times" by Miss Christabel Pankhurst. It is necessary to see what these methods are. They include gross personal assaults on the Prime Minister, and other members of the present Government, who cannot resent them physically on the ground of personal dignity and the feeling which forbids a man of refinement to strike a woman who attacks him. They also involve the throwing of stones or "metal missiles" into the private houses of Ministers, into crowded public meetings, into street throngs, and into railway carriages, without regard to the fact that physical injury, even death, may be the result. One of the women who threw a "metal missile" into Mr. Asquith's train, said that "she wished he had been in it," and the station-master at Birmingham added that she admitted to him she had aimed at a certain carriage because she thought it contained the Prime Minister. Presumably, therefore, she wished to injure him, and, indeed, it does not seem to us that between "metal missiles" and bombs, with wild girls excited by a vehement propaganda to throw them, a very considerable interval exists. . . .

No such likeness exists [to the Irish agrarian agitation]. We are not thinking of the distinction—and it is a very real one—between the character of the quarrel between the Irish people and their landlords and the five-year-old agitation for securing the Parliamentary vote to some women. What we have specially in mind is that though "village ruffianism" played a part in that agitation, the central directing body took the line, we think with perfect honesty, of discouraging outrage, and successfully repelled all charges and insinuations based on the belief that violence was promoted or favored by the headquarters of the movement. The case of the Women's Social and Political Union is very different. The government of this body is autocratic, and its leaders have, wisely or unwisely, refused to conduct it on the basis of an average self-ruled body of political

reformers. Its policy is dictated and controlled from the center, and according to Miss Pankhurst, it is a policy of physical force. A few months of constitutional agitation in a free country have convinced its directors that there is nothing for it but recourse to the "time-honored political weapons" which presumably did the first murder. Cobden gave up a good part of a life-time to "agitating" free trade; nearly all the Chartists and the Radicals of the early nineteenth century died without coming into their kingdom, or after seeing but a very faint vision of it. Women, having succeeded notably in the not unimportant business of vividly interesting a part of their own sex in political business, and of converting a great number of men to the suffrage, must take to the one course of public action for which they are unfitted, and in which they are bound to fail. We suppose they will persist in it. But it is the action of a friend to point out that under the form in which they have resorted to force, they have laid themselves open to the most severe form of retort, and have left their leaders convicted, by their own words and by the form of political association they have adopted, of a responsibility which was never sought by Mr. Parnell, never brought home to him, and never justly attributed to him.

Now let us examine the effects of the official resort to violence in the women's campaign. That the movement in its earlier and more innocent phases has quickened the political interests of many hundreds of women we do not doubt. But while it has conquered some new territory it has lost much of the old. We do not consider the practical exclusion of women from Liberal and free trade meetings and their partial exclusion from Parliament to be light matters. Nor do we concede that the exciting, sentimental, passionate side of the work of the Women's Social and Political Union, with its central appeal to women of leisure and property, offers a good kind of political training or provides a preparation for that fruitful and happy intervention of women in our public life which we sincerely desire. But what can they gain if they succeed on the violent side? . . . Even if this measure of progress were achieved, the country, or, let us say, the mass of male voters, with whom the issue lies, would not endorse it.

. . . What are the evidences of a change of opinion on this subject, in a sense unfavorable to the women's cause? We can only judge by the feeling in the House of Commons. The election of 1906 yielded a majority of votes—for the most part a careless and unthinking majority—for some kind of a suffrage bill on democratic lines. Where is that majority now? A shrewd member of the House of Commons, personally favorable to the suffrage, assured the writer of this article that he did not know more than half-a-dozen of his colleagues who both believed in and would press a

suffrage bill. The Tories have drawn back from their earlier coquetting with the movement. The Liberals have been scandalized and affronted by the persecution of their leader. The Labor men disagree as a body with the limited bill, and for the most part dislike its propaganda. As practical politics the cause has gone back. . . .

We do not expect that these arguments of ours will appeal to the "militant" section. They will go on, as men and women go on in wrong courses, because they do not know how to draw back. It is, therefore, a case for the general body of women suffragists to intervene before it is too late. They must have been grieved and affronted by much that has been said and done in their behalf, and they cannot, we think, any longer conclude with reason that their cause has been promoted by it. The idea of women declaring war on men is repulsive, because in such a conflict the best men know that the meanest and least imaginative "sex view," and that which is most unjust to women, will prevail, and that the innumerable benefits and graces that flow from harmonious relationship between men and women will be ignored or despised. This is really the calamity of a wrongly directed political movement for women, and it is one which women themselves are best fitted to repel. In spite of the unfavorable appearances of the hour, we hope to see a women's suffrage bill carried into law, though we cannot put our fingers on the statesman in either party who has the will or the power to do it. But many of the most powerful friends of such a policy are reduced to silence and to shame; they can only leave it to women to put themselves and their sisters right with a world which, on the whole, is still, we hope, willing to do them justice.

* * *

DREAD NOUGHT.

Guy Kendall in the London Nation of October 23, 1909

Dread not the power of kings who have kings to brother,

And truly have none other.

Dread not the captains whose far-killing art
Pierces their own hard heart.

Dread not the lords who pay not; they shall pay
Their own heaped dues some day.

Dread not the craft of priests, for priests are fed
Upon man's baser dread.

Dread not for iron or anger or the loud cry
Which is of them that fly.

Dread not though foes thine earthwork's weakness
find,

Strong soul entrenched behind!

Dread God: if even Him thou canst not dread,
'Twere well to love instead.

* * *

Every man as an inhabitant of the earth, is a
joint proprietor of it in its natural state.—Thomas
Paine.