

# The Public

DEC 8 1909

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &  
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR  
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Massachusetts  
L. P. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware  
HERBERT QUICK, Iowa  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand  
W. G. EGGLESTON, California.

Vol. XII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1909.

No. 609

Published by LOUIS F. POST  
Eileworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents      Yearly Subscription, One Dollar  
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1908 at the Post Office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

## EDITORIAL

### Out Where the Bullets Sing.

Take it easy, ye knight errants of true blue reform! Take it easy when you feel like slugging the Bryans and La Follettes and Heneyes and Cummins for not being right enough or going far enough. They may not fit into any doctrinal pigeon hole that you or we happen to own; but maybe they see more than they let on they see, when they have the leisure to look. They haven't much leisure though, for they are on the firing line! Don't you realize, it? On the firing line men are awfully busy shooting and dodging bullets. Bullets, understand, bullets! Did you ever hear a bullet sing? It sounds very important, so we are told; as important as your own best beloved doctrine of righteousness—while it's in the air.

\* \*

### The British Suffragette Question.

The Public's editorial on the campaign of violence which the militant suffragettes are carrying on in England (p. 1108), is replied to by the Woman's Journal in its issue of November 27. Although many points are made in that reply, there is but one which seems now to be at once pertinent to the issue raised in our editorial and not therein sufficiently anticipated. To this point we confine our response.

+

The contention of our editorial was that the demand of the militant suffragettes for suffrage

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

Out Where the Bullets Sing.....	1153
The British Suffragette Question.....	1153
Old New England's New Message.....	1154
The First "Insurgent" Battle.....	1155
Subsidizing Forbidden Trade.....	1155
An Interesting Debate.....	1155
The Graft Exposures in Chicago.....	1156
How to Agitate.....	1156
The "Sweating" of Prisoners.....	1156
The Ballinger Case.....	1156
Another British War Scare.....	1157
Unpaid Officials (R. B. Brinsmade).....	1157

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Proposed Land Values Congress (Johan Hansson).....	1158
Fiscal Questions in Canada (J. Z. White).....	1159

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The British Land Question.....	1160
The Land for the People.....	1161
The Irish Land Bill.....	1161
Just Taxation in Cleveland.....	1162
Status of the Gompers Case.....	1162
The Nicaraguan Situation.....	1163
News Notes.....	1163
Press Opinions.....	1164

### RELATED THINGS:

Patience (Geo. E. Bowen).....	1166
The Rearing of Pheasants as a Social Service! (L. Willoughby).....	1166
The Security of Property.....	1167
Suffragette Violence (Edward D Mead).....	1167
The World's One Philanthropist (Wm. Marion Reedy).....	1169

### BOOKS:

A Fine Exposition of Ethics.....	1171
Books Received.....	1173
Periodicals.....	1173

for women on the terms on which it is conferred upon men, would place highly restrictive property qualifications upon woman suffrage in Great Britain. Under those qualifications, most workingmen's wives could not vote though their husbands did, nor could any unmarried working woman unless she individually occupied lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished. This was our inference from the laws regulating male suffrage in Great Britain. We based it upon the statement of British suffrage statutes made by President Lowell in his work on English government. But the Woman's Journal disputes either President Lowell's statement or our inference—one or the other, we are not certain which. Of course, if the statement falls, the inference falls with it. But does the Woman's Journal really think that either statement or inference is disposed of by merely saying that its fallacy "has been shown over and over again by Keir Hardie, Philip Snowden and other well informed English suffragists"?

+

As we hold Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden in high esteem, both as citizens of the world and as public men, we should readily accept any statement of fact they might make of their own knowledge, and should rank high any opinion or inference of theirs from the facts they stated. But the Woman's Journal quotes no statement of theirs, no opinion of theirs, and does not even vouch (except in the vaguest way, and apparently not on personal knowledge) for their having authoritatively or deliberately said anything at all on the point. We submit that its vague and unverified reference to some possible expressions by Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden (and others unnamed) is inadequate. In our editorial, we cited for our basic facts the elaborate treatise by President Lowell, "The Government of England," specifying pages for reference; and we have not now the slightest reason for doubting President Lowell's accuracy. From those facts we drew our inference, and we see no reason yet for altering it. Our inference may, indeed, have been erroneous, but the Woman's Journal does not show wherein nor how. If that paper, which we regard with undiminished respect, or any other paper or person, will cite authorities proving President Lowell wrong in his summary of the British suffrage statutes, or point out definitely by reference to his summary or any other authoritative document a fatal error in our inference, we will gladly make a complete retraction of that phase of our suffragette criticism. But unless President Lowell is wrong in his statement of the

British statutes, or we in what seems to us to be a very obvious inference from his statement, Mr. Hardie, Mr. Snowden and the other Englishmen are mistaken if they have said anything to warrant what the Woman's Journal attributes to them.

+

With reference to a point raised by the Woman's Journal regarding the same phase of the subject, let us suggest that if it investigates with an open mind it will probably learn that the proportion of workingwomen in England who individually (not in couples but individually) occupy lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished, is by no means so large as in its comment upon our editorial it ventures to imply. Even in this country, how large a proportion of unmarried workingwomen occupy lodgings for which they individually pay \$50 a year unfurnished? And, then, what of workingmen's wives? Are they, or are they not, a negligible factor in the movement for equal suffrage?

+ \*

#### Old New England's New Message.

In a recent speech in his home city, James J. Storrow, one of Boston's leading men, and deservedly so, gave out his conception of New England's message to the country. "Liberty" was the word with which the Fathers were deeply concerned, he said, and they showed that they were not only ready to preach the gospel of liberty, but to die for it. Those days are past, Mr. Storrow proceeded, but the present New England generation must remember that the Declaration of Independence does not stop with the word "liberty"; it goes on to say that every human being has the inalienable right not only to life and liberty, but also to the pursuit of happiness. It is on this basis that Mr. Storrow's conception of New England's message of the present rests. Listen to him:

Behind every human activity there must be a moral idea if the activity is to be of real consequence. What are we New Englanders thinking about to-day? We have passed on from the word liberty, having attended to that little matter, to the word "happiness." We have been studying conditions of human life. We know more about it than our fathers did. We know that the ordinary boy or girl born into the world is fitted to enjoy a healthy, happy life, and yet we see in a great city hundreds and thousands of boys and girls, through no fault of their own, but due to their unfortunate environment, condemned to the prison cell of unhealthy and unhappy lives. I believe that the moral idea New England is formulating to-day, and that lies perhaps unexpressed in the minds and hearts of us New Englanders, is that we are going to do our utmost to solve successfully the problem of so organ-

izing our political conditions, our social conditions and our industries, that a child born into the world is not to be robbed by circumstances for which it is in no way responsible, of the health, morals and the ability to earn a decent living which will give that boy or girl the happiness coming next after the word liberty in the Declaration of Independence.

Is that indeed the message that New England is formulating? If it is, does New England realize the full import of those words—"a child born into the world is not to be robbed by circumstances for which it is in no way responsible," of "ability to earn a decent living"? Does Mr. Storrow himself realize their revolutionary content? Since it is as easy to be platitudinous in that way now as it was in the '50's with apotheoses to "liberty" at Fourth of July celebrations in Richmond, or Charleston or New Orleans, we hesitate at taking Mr. Storrow's inspiring words at face value. But if he does use them with profound meaning and conviction, if with all that they imply those words are truly New England's new message in the forming, then all hail, Mr. Storrow! and God bless old New England!

+ +

#### The First "Insurgent" Battle.

It must be confessed that the defeat of Barnes, the "insurgent" Republican candidate for Lorimer's vacant seat in Congress, is not at all encouraging to Republican "insurgency" in Chicago. Although he rolled up a large vote, over 8,000, it was barely more than 25 per cent of the total vote; and although he came in ahead of the Democratic candidate, the vote of the two together was only 154 more than the vote for the regular Republican candidate.

+

We must consider, of course, that Roger Sullivan, the Democratic leader, was probably working in couples with Lorimer to elect Lorimer's man, and that this purpose was aided if not actually accomplished by throwing Democratic machine influence and votes over to the Republican machine candidate. But that is a factor which the "insurgent" Republicans must reckon with every time and everywhere. If Roger Sullivan of the Democratic machine and William Lorimer of the Republican machine could combine to elect a machine Republican over an "insurgent" Republican at a by-election in Chicago in 1909, their affiliated Jim-Jims all over the country may very likely be able to do enough in 1910 to make another Jim-Jim Congress.

+

They will find the opportunity for this ready at

hand. Just as but few insurgent Republicans broke away from the Republican machine to help Bryan overthrow the machine of both parties, so but few democratic Democrats will respond to the call of Republicans who strike no higher political note than the insurgent Republicans are dwelling on. That a higher note is no easy feat for insurgent leaders is true enough. It is very likely impossible. They cannot yet lift the insurgent movement to as high a political plane as the democratic Democrats have reached. This, then, is the difficulty. The mass of insurgent Republicans will not join the democratic Democrats on the higher levels, and the mass of democratic Democrats will not join the insurgent Republicans on the lower ones. Hence a dead-lock, of which the Jim-Jims of the two machines take advantage, as Roger Sullivan and Senator Lorimer did in the recent by-election in Chicago.

+

To reformers who pin their faith to immediate political victories, rising exuberantly with these victories and sinking hopelessly under defeat, there is little encouragement in the present political outlook. But history testifies that "present outlooks" are usually opaque.

+ +

#### Subsidizing Forbidden Trade.

One rubs his eyes when he sees in a protection paper an editorial under the head "Opening the Way for Trade." For, of course, the way to open "the way for trade" is to abolish the restraints and restrictions upon trade, to remove the obstructions to trade. But we are told by the protection paper that the way for trade to be opened is by permitting ship owners to put their hands into the public pockets to get "ship subsidies"! Would it be more expensive to pay foreigners to come and take our goods?

+ +

#### An Interesting Debate.

The Society for the Preservation of National Prosperity caught the culprit, removed his clothing and bound him to a rail. Then the "stand-patters" and the "progressives" held a joint debate to decide whether the mixture of tar and feathers should contain 57 per cent of tar or 75 per cent. They finally compromised on 77½ per cent of tar. "Thank you, gentlemen," said the victim. "Your interesting discussion has given me much light—and happiness. At last I understand how a protective tariff is revised downwards. Hurrah for Prosperity!" But a certain large gen-

tleman, with a judicial smile, said the tar was all right, but that he wasn't satisfied with the feathers.

+ +

### The Graft Exposures in Chicago.

Why all this pother about vulgar grafting through the Chicago city hall, which the Inter Ocean is exposing so vigorously and the Merriam Committee (some of them) are inquiring into so diligently? Wasn't the present city administration elected expressly for grafting purposes? Nice clean graft, to be sure—traction graft on approved business principles; but the tail always goes with the hide, when you come to graft. You can't enjoy nice business graft without enduring nasty political graft. If you doubt it, read Judge Lindsey's articles in "Everybody's." The "boys" simply won't stand for your Big Business graft, good gentlemen, unless you wink at their little graft on the side. Having elected Busse for *your* purposes, you must let the "boys" run him for *their* purposes. Better call off the Merriam Committee before its relentless chairman and some of its curious members damage the good name of the city by drifting into exposures of the bad doings of Big Business. If you doubt us, ask your lawyers—or your clergymen.

+ +

### How to Agitate.

To other earnest folks than socialists, Bernard Shaw has given good advice, with socialists for his text. It was at the convention of the Progressive League at the City Temple, London, in October. The Progressive League members are what we of this country would call "mixers." Instead of segregating themselves as leaven from the lump, rather than working as leaven in the lump, they make it their business to "permeate" other people. Alluding to this characteristic Mr. Shaw said:

I belong to a society called the Fabian Society. In many ways it is a feeble and ridiculous society, but it owes a great deal of the work it has been able to do to not making certain of the initial mistakes of many other societies. Other socialist bodies almost always began with this position: they called themselves the United Socialists of the World, or something of that sort, and then their programme was—"We will explain our good intentions and our sound economic basis to the whole world; the whole world will then join us at a subscription of a penny a week; then, the whole of society belonging to our society, we shall become society, and we shall proceed to take the government of the country into our hands, and we shall inaugurate the millennium." Now, what disabled them was that the world wouldn't come in, and whilst the world remained

outside they treated the world more or less as the heathen, and consequently they made no sort of headway. Now the Fabian Society set its back against that from the beginning. The Fabian Society said that its sound should go out into all lands, but it did not say that everybody else's sound should come through its own little penny trumpet. The Fabian was a man who was never urged to join the Fabian Society; in fact, when he first tried to do it he usually found some difficulty, but once he was in it, then what he was told to do was to join every other society on the face of the earth he could possibly get into and make his influence felt there. Now, that is what you have got to do. If you once begin to run your Progressive League in a spirit of hostility to all other leagues whatever, and assume that all the people outside your league are heathen—although you will probably be entirely right in that belief—the assumption will not be a good assumption for you, so you had better not make it.

Good advice to anybody is very likely to be good advice for everybody.

+ +

### The "Sweating" of Prisoners.

There is a movement in France against the continuance of the practice of "sweating" prisoners in courts of first instance. "The extra-Parliamentary commission to revise procedure in the criminal courts of France," says a Paris dispatch of the 27th, "today formally voted to recommend the suppression of the interrogatoire, or the practice which has permitted magistrates and presidents of assize courts to examine accused persons." We might recommend to France as a substitute our own "sweating" practice before irresponsible police detectives, who frighten prisoners with ghastly dramatics, confuse them with lies, cajole them with promises, unbalance them with threats, and sometimes persuade them with blows. All this is in the teeth of our laws, but as our "law and order" classes excuse it if they don't actually demand it, France might borrow it as an approved American institution.

+ +

### The Ballinger Case.

The indictment in Collier's, by L. R. Glavis, directly of Secretary Ballinger of Mr. Taft's cabinet, and inferentially of Mr. Taft himself, cannot be disposed of with a mere plea of "not guilty." Circumstantial and precise, it is convincing unless refuted as precisely and circumstantially as it is made. Neither will Mr. Ballinger's plea of "former acquittal" operate to shield him. His former acquittal was by President Taft, who reached his conclusion against Mr. Glavis' accusation, without giving Mr. Glavis an opportunity to be heard in rebuttal (pp. 921, 969, 985). The effect of Mr.

Taft's verdict, under those circumstances, is not to acquit Mr. Ballinger. It is only to bring Mr. Taft himself into the case as possibly an accessory after the fact.

\* \* \*

### Another British War Scare.

On the eve of the Parliamentary elections in Great Britain the Protectionists and the Tories see again great danger of a war with Germany. The more reason, then, for adopting the land clauses of the Budget, so as to lay the foundations for making the landed interests pay for preventing German trespasses on British estates. For all British wars heretofore the common people have done all the paying, as well as nearly all the killing and getting killed, while the landed interests have reaped most of the benefit. If only for the novelty of the thing, it would be interesting to see the British landed interests do at least some of the paying for the next British war.

\* \* \*

### UNPAID OFFICIALS.

The commission plan of city government is becoming so popular in American municipalities that it may be interesting to consider one of the probable reasons for its success—adequate payment of the commissioners.

\*

Is this payment an innovation or merely an extension of an already prevalent policy?

The government of a New England town by selectmen, or of a Western county by commissioners, resembles the new municipal scheme in that the governing body in each case is few in numbers and has both legislative and executive functions which have to be performed in the responsible manner that generally insures good conduct. The remuneration of selectmen or county commissioners, while not large, is generally as much as they could earn in the same time, and is usually sufficient to secure competent men for the simple duties required.

But it is the large class of really unpaid or underpaid officials to which attention is here especially invited. Among unpaid officials may be classed trustees of State or local institutions, such as asylums, hospitals or schools; while State legislators and city aldermen may be considered as underpaid when the ability and knowledge properly required for such service is taken into consideration.

\*

The argument that the honor of the position

is a sufficient reward for the energy gratuitously expended (as in the case of church or lodge service) has not accorded with the results of experience, as the volumes of testimony recording the corrupt acts of underpaid officials clearly indicate.

How does it happen, then, that we attempt to conduct public business with unpaid officials? Why should certain citizens be asked to perform gratuitous service for the government? Is the custom a survival from the different conditions of a former epoch, as is generally true of the political evils of mankind?

\*

Pursuing the last query we find that though the Græco-Roman influence was strong in our national Constitution, it played little part in our local polity, which was mainly transplanted from England. In the mother country we find even now not only the same unpaid official classes as here but also such other unpaid and underpaid groups as members of Parliament and army and navy officers.

As is familiar to even a tyro in history, the English political organization descends from feudal times. The feudal officials belonged to the class of landed gentry who held their lands on condition of returning certain payments to the hierarchy above them who were really trustees for the community. Not only did the gentry pay from their rents the expense of local government and make contributions of money and men for the national service, but they rendered much gratuitous service to the state. This service was only nominally gratuitous, as the gentry were really compensated by their land rents. Even today they fill most of the unpaid English offices, though many of their other feudal obligations have long since been thrown on the landless class through the device of indirect taxation.

The new world reflected the customs of the home land, and unpaid officials were a feature of the English colonial administration. It was only natural that the same class should continue in the subsequent independent United States.

\*

As long as life remained rural, there were two reasons why our unpaid service was satisfactory. First, the officials were generally chosen from the American counterpart of the English gentry, the farm-owner; and second, they were well known to their constituents and performed their comparatively simple duties in the full light of rural publicity.

With the growth of cities the similarity in the personnel of American and English unpaid officialdom vanished, and with it the efficiency of the system. Unpaid appointments ceased to be perquisites of prominent farmers, and began to be filled by the unprivileged or landless class who had already secured most of the adequately paid government positions. With the growth of the spoils system after Andrew Jackson's administration, unpaid offices became desirable even to the honest, as a means of keeping in the public eye, while they yielded large profits to the dishonest through the graft on payrolls, contracts or franchises.

However such a condition may be deplored, any community which accepts unpaid service from its politicians may expect no better return.

+

If we wish to abolish the chief temptation to speculation, extinguish feudal relics and make our system consistently democratic, we must adequately remunerate all public servants from the proceeds of taxation. And here is one of the advantages of the Des Moines idea. While it would be ruinous to give to each of a large aldermanic body a sufficient salary to secure competency, the Des Moines system, with its small governing commission, renders it not only feasible to obtain an honest but also a trained personnel.

Lack of training is often as disastrous to efficient administration as is positive dishonesty, and the failure to sooner recognize this fact in American public life may be explained in this way: Until recently it has been assumed that any intelligent American could not only turn his hand to any occupation, but could fill any official position without special training. Under the simple conditions of the rural office-holding of previous generations, this doctrine seemed true, especially as frontier conditions had produced great versatility and resourcefulness in the national character. The fallacy of the doctrine as of general utility was only demonstrated by its attempted application to the complex needs of industrial cities and States. Though it is now well understood that the success of a youth in private business requires special preparation; the old idea still largely holds as to public life.

+

Passing from city to State government, we find the situation similar. Whatever may be said for the bi-cameral system in the national Congress, its application in State legislatures not only fails to add to the representative character of those

bodies, but greatly increases their size and irresponsibility. It is only by greatly decreasing the number of legislators, so as to increase their pay and responsibility, that we can secure the beneficial results of municipal commission government.

A small body of well-paid and trained legislators, subject to the initiative and referendum and controlled by the recall, will not need to be fettered by a voluminous constitution, or prevented from enacting a plethora of foolish laws only by the present device of holding short sessions as far apart as possible.

In the case of philanthropic State institutions, a central board of paid experts, giving their whole time to the service like the civil service employes of any other bureau of administration would be in every way preferable to retired business men seeking this kind of intellectual recreation without pay.

+

The proper payment of officials would do away with one of the last survivals of an undemocratic administrative system. The way should then appear clearer for the attack on that perverted feudalism which still controls industrial life, and which can only be abolished by the collection of public revenues solely from land values, instead of confiscating private earnings through indirect taxation.

ROBERT B. BRINSMADE

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### PROPOSED LAND VALUES CONGRESS.

Filopstad, Sweden, Oct. 27, 1909.

According to the secretary of the Cobden Club the second international free-trade congress will be held in Antwerp (Belgium) from the 9th to the 12th of August, 1910.

At the last conference of this kind in London, last year, several radical land-values reformers were present; but if I am correctly informed—I was in Australia at that time—their views did not have a hearing. At the next congress there will, I hope, be a greater number of followers of the Georgian philosophy, not only from English-speaking countries, but also from other European countries, attending the conference, and that these most consistent free traders will organize.

We should not miss the opportunity. The free-trade policy, even in the limited British idea of it, is a promising step towards land-values socialization. And as free trade cannot successfully be kept up without land reform, the followers of Henry George have much to tell the average free trader.

No doubt they have something to tell themselves too, and will find pleasure and encouragement in

meeting one another. Therefore I propose at an early date to ask the American land-values reformers to consider if they are likely to attend the free-trade conference, and also if they will, either before or after, attend a special meeting of land reformers with the view among many other things of considering the formation of an international organization to promote their cause.

Among Scandinavian friends there is very much interest in the possibility of such a gathering; and at the annual meeting of the Henry George Society of Norway, September last, the executive was ordered to appoint a representative of the League if an international meeting is held.

JOHAN HANSSON.

✦ ✦ ✦

## FISCAL QUESTIONS IN CANADA.

Vancouver, B. C., Nov. 23.

Edmonton, Alberta, does not tax improvements on land, nor does Nanaimo, B. C., nor Summerland, B. C. A small municipality just outside Victoria has adopted the same policy. Many small places are administered on this plan or are about to try it.

✦

Edmonton, however, is the better example because it is the larger place. It has, in the past five or six years, increased from about 5,000 to 25,000 in population. This rapid increase has caused a tremendous rise in the value of land, a tendency that has been assisted by the public ownership of street cars, gas, water, lighting and telephone systems—the latter a general government concern.

The tax on land values is not heavy, in view of the large influx of population, and there is every reason to believe that the growth of the city will continue, for two or more railroads will soon reach Edmonton and more and more land is being brought under cultivation by incoming settlers. Edmonton is the natural distributing point for an immense territory.

Meanwhile, a poll tax of \$2.00 is collected. Many lines of business are licensed, and a floor space tax is laid. Under the latter businesses are classified, and taxed at from 50 cents to \$5.00 per given unit of space occupied. Banks and jewelers are taxed at the maximum rate, while furniture stores, carpenter shops, etc., that necessarily occupy more space in proportion to value, are laid under tribute at varying less rates.

This results of course in business or industry being burdened with taxes in a form somewhat different than is common in the States, but having the same general effects—that is, relieving the land owner and making a livelihood more expensive.

Building, however, is encouraged, and to some slight degree speculation in land is checked. Public ownership of public utilities is the universal rule in Edmonton, and is universally satisfactory. There is little complaint of graft in city affairs. There is much more of what may be called civic spirit than can be observed in cities that continue the old practice of privately owned utilities and the taxation of improvements.

In short, so far as applied, the measures of progressive democracy promote building, good feeling, public honesty.

At Kamloops, a place of 3,000 people, land just beyond the occupied portion of the city is selling at \$800 for a lot of fifty feet frontage. Such condition is but a repetition of the land booms that have brought distress to the people of so many cities in the United States. It is simply preposterous.

✦

Vancouver is growing with most astonishing rapidity. They claim 100,000 present population, and the effect on land values is startling. Property is selling for more than similarly situated lots in Chicago. Great will be the fall thereof!

The papers of course are all boomers. Lots that are miles from the center of the city are selling at fabulous prices, and very few seem to have the slightest realization of its meaning. The whole crazy performance is of course sustained by the nonsensical taxation maintained in the States, for if we did not tax industry, but taxed land instead, living conditions would be so much easier that men would not remove from the more to the less settled regions.

✦

One curious matter may be noticed throughout Western Canada. It is that many who have come from the other side of the line, and so obtained, as it were, a reverse view of the tariff, are, for the first time in their lives, able to understand it. If it were not for our silly tariff the whole trade of the prairie provinces of Canada would flow through Minneapolis.

A tariff beggar is a queer specimen anyhow. According to his story he can't make a living unless his neighbors will tax themselves for his support, and because of that very fact he considers himself especially patriotic. Maybe he is right, but for the life of me, I cannot see why his scheme is not an inversion of some of the homeliest virtues. As, for instance, "thou shalt not steal." All that tariffs give to one they must take from others, so where does the country gain? In addition there is friction in the system, or in other words, expense for revenue officers, etc., and so a distinct loss. "Beggars" is too gentle a term. They will yet become acquainted with harsher speech. More truthful, too.

✦

Appended is an extract from an editorial in a Vancouver paper, the Daily News-Advertiser. It reads like the extreme outer outside—usually called "the limit." Just think that in this Province of British Columbia, not even claiming more than 350,000 people all told, although many times the size of Illinois, able editors are striving to establish the very condition of which the British people at home are struggling to rid themselves, under the leadership of Lloyd George. Possibly some one will say of the editors, "Forgive them, they know not what they do." The extract reads as follows:

"The locking up of money in land is the safest form of investment in any country commercially and constitutionally on a stable footing. . . . Vancouver, in a century's time, should show a crop of landlords more numerous than and as richly endowed as the great estate-owners in the Old Country. And it is

within every man's gift to qualify for a place among the first who by fee simple from sovereign enterprise may create homes for their children and their children's children no less lovely and of no less intrinsic worth than many ancestral English seats."

And of course there will be the correlated beauty spots known as slums. The privileged will be equivalents of the dunderheads that constitute the great majority of the House of Lords. Set over against them will be the peasant laborer, whose vote is won by a sweet smile from "my lady." And this is the appeal made to the so-called free blood of the far West.

British Columbia bids fair to be a back number. The prairie Provinces, however, are awake; for which let all lovers of freedom be devoutly thankful. And the U. S.? Well, a bit of silence is judicious.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, November 30, 1909.

### The British Land Question.

On the 30th the House of Lords adopted Lord Lansdowne's amendment rejecting the Lloyd-George Budget, by a vote of 350 to 75.

Pursuant to his notice (p. 1139) Lord Lansdowne moved on the 22d, in the House of Lords, that in the judgment of that body it "is not justified in giving its consent to this bill until it has been submitted to the judgment of the country." The chamber of the House of Lords was so crowded at the time with Tory peers that they overflowed into the benches reserved for those who support the Commons in this conflict. In support of his motion Lord Lansdowne claimed for the House of Lords coordinate power with the House of Commons on questions of finance. He cited precedents to the effect that although they cannot amend a finance bill, they have full power to discuss and reject. He added, alluding to the land valuation clauses, that the bill has tacked on to it legislation "which the House of Lords has already rejected, and which has been placed in the bill with a view to ousting the Lords from their legitimate opportunity of dealing with these measures, a course, he declared, that "no self-respecting second chamber would tolerate." He closed with the argument that the Lords "have a clear duty, not to decree the final extinction of the bill, but to insist

that before it becomes a law the people shall be allowed an expression of opinion." On this point he renewed his challenge. "The Lords," he said, "have carefully considered the consequences of the rejection of the bill and are ready to face them:" Lord Lansdowne was replied to on the 22d by Lord Chancellor Loreburn (a radical Liberal raised to his present position by Campbell Bannerman), who declared that "no Liberal government can ever accept office again unless provision is made against a repetition of the treatment accorded to Liberal bills in the last four years," a declaration which was understood to mean that the Lords must consent to a limitation of their veto power or the King must agree to create a sufficient number of new Peers to swamp the present permanent Tory majority in the House of Lords. On the point that the bill proposes permanent land legislation under cover of an annual financial budget, the Lord Chancellor said: "There is nothing in the bill foreign to finance with which the House of Commons has the exclusive right to deal. The attempt of the Lords to interfere is the beginning of a system which would lead to Constitutional revolution. What is embodied in the bill is not new either in the United States or Germany, and has been approved not only by the present, but by the late House of Commons."

On the 23d Lord Pentland, a member of the Cabinet, warned the Lords that the House of Commons could not be expected to find expedients for averting the temporary financial chaos resulting from their rejection of the Budget. He further declared that the Government had done forever with the old state of things, and that the Constitution of the House of Lords must be modified. He also reminded the House that a long Constitutional struggle might handicap the country in case of war, and asked the Lords to consider whether the penalty might not be disproportionate to the offense. Earl Russell predicted that the adoption of the Lansdowne resolution would start a revolution that would sooner or later bring a readjustment that would leave the House of Lords powerless. On the other side, Lord Avebury strongly criticised the Budget, declaring that it would frighten capital out of the country, cripple enterprise, and create a feeling of insecurity. The sensational speech of the debate was Lord Rosebery's, delivered on the 24th. While reasserting his opposition to the Budget (pp. 896, 943), he argued against its rejection by the Lords, urging that if allowed to pass "its intolerable impositions and loss of capital and employment" after six months would give the Lords an overwhelming victory. He characterized the present as "the greatest political moment in the lifetime of any man born since 1832." Lord Milner (of Boer war notoriety) supported the Lansdowne

resolution, as did Lord Salisbury. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, a Unionist (Chamberlainite) warned the Lords on the 25th in the most impressive manner. "If you win a victory," he said, "it will be only a temporary one; if you lose, you have prejudiced the position, power, prestige and usefulness of the House of Lords, which I believe every one of you honors and desires to serve as heartily as I do myself." He admitted that while the Lords had never in so many words surrendered their right of interference, usage had established that the House of Commons was supreme in matters of finance. As to a referendum, he said it was impossible as a matter of practice, and that he also believed the motion proposed by Lord Lansdowne was unwise. He asserted that there never was a time in the history of the country when a strong and conservative second chamber was more necessary, and he considered it impolitic to mix the question of the defense of that chamber with the taxation of food. Lord Balfour warned the Lords that they were walking into a trap set by their opponents, and that the step advocated by Lord Lansdowne was false alike to the interests of the country and the House of Lords. The Archbishop of Canterbury had given notice that the spiritual Peers would not participate in the controversy, since it was a partisan one; but on the 25th the Bishop of Hereford said that while he respected the Archbishop of Canterbury's desire that the Bishops abstain from voting on the measure, he claimed the right to the exercise of independent judgment. If the Bishops had any function to perform it was to speak for the multitudinous poor, he said; therefore he supported the Budget, which was a social welfare budget, based on sound finance. He was convinced, he went on, that the country's answer to an appeal to the ballot would be in clear English, that never again shall the fundamental liberties of the people be endangered by a privileged class.

A powerful speech was made on the 29th by Lord Morley. The Lansdowne motion, said he, though it contains but a couple of lines, involves no fewer than five points, each in turn constituting a more radical departure from Constitutional usage and practical convenience. In the first place it refers to the House of Lords the taxing power. Next it assumes the power of enforcing a penal dissolution by refusing supplies. Then there must be a new Parliament whenever the sitting Parliament has the misfortune to displease their lordships of the second chamber. Finally, said Lord Morley, the Lords are planning to throw out of gear the whole financial machinery for the year. Another notable speech was that of the Archbishop of York, on the 30th. He came to the support of the Bishop of Hereford, saying that if he voted it would be against Lord Lansdowne's amendment.

It was near midnight of the 30th when the Lansdowne motion came to a vote, with the result noted above. The House of Commons is to meet on the 1st. Special dispatches of the 27th to the New York World gave this description of the situation:

The most cheerful man in England to-day is Chancellor Lloyd George. Unless all his calculations go astray and every political portent proves fallacious, the House of Lords has delivered itself into his hands. Knowing the popularity of the Budget, he has been counting all along on the Lords being tempted to reject it. They are now hopelessly committed to that suicidal course, and Lloyd-George has gone for his week-end golf with a light heart. . . . Lord Lansdowne's amendment is a big gamble. He staked the House of Lords on the chance of defeating the Liberal Government in an appeal to the country. Nowhere is the folly of this policy more keenly felt now than by Lansdowne's own followers. If Lansdowne could discover any practicable line of retreat he would grasp it, but the Government maintains an absolutely uncompromising attitude and declines all communication with him about the Budget except across the table in the House of Lords. The King is furious at the situation, especially as ultimately he will be placed in the position of signing the death warrant of the hereditary chamber by agreeing to create any number of Peers that Asquith may demand in order to secure not only the passage of the Budget, but the reform and composition of the upper house. At present it is able to obstruct the will of the representative chamber. All England is vibrating with excitement over the situation, involving as it does a revolution almost as great as any in its history.

+ +

#### The Land for the People.

One of the spectacular phases of the British political situation was the assembling on the 23d in Parliament Square of from 5,000 to 6,000 people for a pro-Budget demonstration. No speeches were made, but the crowd undertook "to let the Lords hear the people sing a land song." The song, set to the air of "Marching Through Georgia," was as follows in the first stanza and the chorus:

Sound the blast for freedom, boys, and send it far and wide!

March along to victory, for God is on our side.

While the voice of Nature thunders o'er the rising tide:

God made the land for the people!

The land, the land, 'twas God who gave the land;

The land, the land, the ground on which we stand!

Why should we be beggars with the ballot in our hand?

God gave the land to the people!

+ +

#### The Irish Land Bill.

In the House of Commons on the 23d a com-

promise with the House of Lords on the Birrell land bill for Ireland (pp. 1094, 1139) was adopted over the opposition of the Irish members, who hotly denounced the Lords for demanding and Mr. Birrell for assenting to the alterations.



#### Just Taxation in Cleveland.

The movement for just taxation in Cleveland, resulting from the election to the board of tax appraisers there of three Henry George Democrats and one Democrat who sympathizes with their purpose, in a total of five members (p. 1089), is taking on practical form. The board has been organized with Arthur C. May as president and John A. Zangerle as secretary, and has employed W. A. Somers, the land value expert, to assist in establishing valuations such as those produced with Mr. Somers' aid under Lawson Purdy, president of the Tax Department of New York City (vol. ix, p. 769; vol. x, pp. 251, 505, 529; vol. xi, p. 569; vol. xii, pp. 674, 987). Under the Somers system a few lots 25x100 feet are laid off on maps for each square and valued individually. With this basis a mathematical calculation gives the value of all the neighboring lots, allowing also for differences in area. Experience has demonstrated the approximate accuracy of the method. Valuations of the lots to serve as bases for calculation are now being made, and the board is unanimous as to the usefulness of the plan it is carrying out. On the 29th it decided that in capitalizing ground rents it would regard 5 per cent as the earning power of the land—a 20-year-purchase basis.



#### Status of the Gompers Case.

Proceedings were begun on the 27th to bring the Gompers-Morrison-Mitchell case (pp. 1116, 1117) before the Supreme Court of the United States for final adjudication. This was done by applying to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to bring before that court the record of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia. The hearing on this application took place on the 29th, Alton B. Parker representing the defendants. The plaintiffs announced that they would not oppose issuing the writ, and the court took the application under advisement. If granted, the argument will come on in due course; if denied, remedy in the courts will have been exhausted. In its decision the Supreme Court will not pass upon any of the details of the case, no matter how much in error the lower court may have been. It will pass upon no question but the legal power of the court below. If it finds that the court below had the legal power to pass judgment at all, it will refuse to interfere. If in doubt or divided on this point, it will probably grant the writ of certiorari, in which case a considerable time may elapse before it makes a final decision; but if it is clear that the lower

court had the legal power to decide, it will probably refuse to issue the writ, and in that case these labor leaders will be at once imprisoned.



In the event of the imprisonment of Gompers, Morrison and Mitchell, the labor organizations of the country are expected to protest by dropping work on the day on which the imprisonment begins. This plan was proposed, according to the Chicago Record-Herald of the 25th, by Mrs. Raymond Robins upon her return from the convention of the Federation of Labor at Toronto (p. 1137), to which she was a delegate. In explanation, the Record-Herald report says that—

on her return yesterday from the recent convention of the American Federation of Labor at Toronto Mrs. Robins began her campaign for a "day of protest," which, in effect, will be a general strike for one day. At a meeting of the executive board of the Chicago Women's Trade Union League Mrs. Robins laid her plans before her colleagues and found a ready response. Later prominent officials of labor organizations indorsed the idea and will work to bring about its accomplishment. It is an educational campaign that Mrs. Robins is advocating—something, she said, that will bring it home forcibly to the workers that the courts are taking from them their inherent rights. "On the Fourth of July," said Mrs. Robins, "the workers of the country cease work and celebrate our independence as a nation. My idea is that a day should be set aside on which all the workers, except those engaged in works of necessity or mercy, should cease work and hold mass meetings of protest against the usurpation of power by the courts. Prominent speakers at these meetings should read the Constitution of the United States in various languages, especially defining the rights of citizens to free speech and free press. It is a campaign of education that I propose and not a general strike. A strike means a revolt against the oppression of immediate employers. In this case workers might be on the friendliest terms with their immediate employers and still should raise their voices in protest against the flching of their rights by the courts, for that is what it means. It would be useless to set this day of protest on a holiday or a Sunday. It must be on a workday, so that in ceasing work the idea will be brought home to every worker. I wish to see the thing started in time so that all the unions throughout the country may have time to think it over. It would not necessarily have to be on the very day that Mr. Gompers and his associates go to jail, although that day would be preferable. It would have the same effect on any other day, provided it was general in all parts of the country. I know that many of the men prominent in organized labor circles throughout the country are in sympathy with the idea. It would prove a demonstration that would arouse the people from their lethargy and show them how their liberties are being gradually taken from them by the courts. I intend taking it up at once with our national executive board and having it agitated in every city where we have a local branch. I believe it can be successfully

carried out if we begin in time and have the subject properly agitated."

+ +

### The Nicaraguan Situation.

American relations with Nicaragua (p. 1139) have developed warlike probabilities—in the newspaper headlines. At the time of our last report, the 18th, two American war vessels had been ordered to Nicaraguan waters—the Vicksburg to Corinto, Nicaragua, and the Des Moines to Port Limon, Costa Rica. On the 21st, after a conference with President Taft, Secretary Knox gave out the following statement:

In the event certain representations of fact which have been made to the Department concerning the Groce and Cannon case are verified through inquiries this Department has instituted, this government will at once prepare a demand upon the Nicaraguan government for reparation for the death of these two men.

Arrival of the Des Moines at Port Limon was reported on the 23d. Official dispatches have been sent from the State Department to Nicaragua. They were reported in news dispatches from Washington, published on the 24th, to contain demands for an explanation and \$100,000 damages for the execution of the two Americans said to be in the insurrectionary service, who were executed by the Nicaraguan government upon conviction by court martial for planting dynamite bombs in a government harbor. On the 28th the gunboat Princeton sailed from Seattle to join the Vicksburg at Corinto. Beyond this no trustworthy information is obtainable.

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—Solon Chase of Maine, a man of national fame in Greenback politics thirty years ago, died at Chase's Mills, Me., on the 23d, at the age of 87.

—A Prohibition amendment to the Constitution of Alabama was voted upon throughout the State on the 29th, and defeated by about 25,000 majority.

—Yves Guyot has become the editor, as successor to M. G. de Molinari, of the Journal des Economistes, the official organ of the Society of Political Economy of Paris.

—Congressman David A. De Armond of Missouri lost his life on the 23d in an unsuccessful effort to save his grandchild from death in the burning of his home at Butler, which was totally destroyed.

—Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, the famous London suffragette of the "militant" faction, lectured at Chicago on the 26th, in Orchestra Hall, under the auspices of the Men's League for Woman Suffrage.

—Dr. J. C. Barnes, of Arcola, Ill., a devoted individualist who cared much for industrial mutualism and nothing for wealth of his own, and saw in the abolition of taxation and recourse to economic rent for public revenues, the longest step toward a

veritable commonwealth, died on 23d at the age of 74.

—The Des Moines plan of city government (pp. 322, 331) was adopted by the voters of Burlington, Iowa, on the 29th. Every voting precinct returned a majority for the plan, and the total for the city showed an affirmative vote of 2 to 1.

—The lecturer at the meeting of the Chicago Single Tax Club at room 508, Schiller Building, on the 3d at 8 o'clock, will be Prof. R. F. Hoxie of the Department of Political Economy of the University of Chicago, his subject being "Captains of Labor."

—The Transandine tunnel (p. 782) cutting through the Andes on the boundary line between Chile and Bolivia, reached the piercing point on the 27th. The tunnel is five miles long, and the highest in the world. The Chilean terminus of the Transandine railway is Arica, and the Bolivian La Paz.

—A mandatory writ was entered by the Circuit Court of Cook County on the 22d requiring the Board of Review and the County Commissioners to make immediate provision for compliance with the law (p. 85) requiring publication of real estate valuations with the value of improvements and of the site separately stated.

—There was a memorial meeting in Park Street Church, Boston, on the 13th, for the late Henry B. Blackwell, at which the speakers were Edwin D. Mead, ex-Gov. John D. Long, Julia Ward Howe, the Rev. Charles G. Ames, Prof. Sumicrast, Moses H. Gulesian, Francis J. Garrison, James H. Stark, Meyer Bloomfield, and Isabel C. Barrows.

—The annual meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League (vol. xi, p. 851; vol. xii, pp. 476, 490, 970), met in adjourned session on the 30th at the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club in Boston. The President, Mr. Moorfield Storey, was to make his annual report, and the Hon. Wm. E. Borah, United States Senator from Idaho, had been invited to make an address.

—Leo Tolstoy (p. 1145), in a message to the peoples of the world, read on the 21st at an anti-military meeting held at Bienne, Switzerland, appeals to the good sense of the world's peoples to refuse in future to serve as soldiers, either voluntarily or under pressure, even if refusal entails punishment. Killing done by soldiers, he asserts, is no less murder than killing done by other men.

—At the by-election in Chicago to fill the vacancy in Congress (pp. 1082, 1106) caused by the election of Lorimer to the Senate, Lorimer's candidate, William J. Moxley, was elected. The vote was as follows: Wm. J. Moxley (regular Republican), 14,628; Carl L. Barnes ("insurgent" Republican), 8,342; Frank S. Ryan (Roger Sullivan Democrat), 6,455; Anthony Karella (Socialist), 600; William Street (Prohibitionist), 236.

—At the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Single Tax League, November 26, resolutions of regret were adopted on the deaths during the year of William Lloyd Garrison, Louis Prang, Dr. Charles K. Cutter and Edward Doherty; and the following officers were elected: President, James R. Carret; secretary, Samuel Sigilman; treasurer, Prof. Comfort A. Adams; executive committee, Robert B. Ca-

pon, William L. Garrison, Jr., Prof. Lewis J. Johnson, Michael C. O'Neill, John G. Pike and Henry Sterling.

—No more men have been rescued from the St. Paul mine at Cherry, Ill. (p. 1140). The finding of living men on the 20th gave hope that others might yet be saved, but renewed fires kept driving the rescuers back. Thirty-eight bodies were found on the 22d, which the coroner declared were of men who had died within 48 hours; indeed, one had died so recently that the body was taken to the hospital in the hope that there was still life in it. When it became finally apparent on the 24th that all efforts to extinguish the conflagration in the mine were useless, and it seemed absolutely certain that no men could have continued to maintain life anywhere in its depths, the mine was sealed by order of the State mine inspectors, to remain sealed until the fire shall have been stifled, perhaps a matter of weeks. Through deaths of those rescued on the 20th, the number of survivors has been reduced to nineteen.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### Land Clauses of the British Budget.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (dem. Dem.), Nov. 23.—The proposition of the Budget differs as widely from the tax we have on real estate as the poles, and it is based on a theory which has never before in the history of civilization been asserted in the raising of public revenue. The Budget is indeed revolutionary. It reverses all precedents. It upsets all the traditions of society. It asserts a principle so different from any which has ever before been recognized in practical statesmanship that it may well excite in the aristocracy of Great Britain the profoundest alarm. For in this Budget the claim is unreservedly advanced that land differs from all other property in its essential character and the value attaching to it differs in its very nature from all other values. All other property is created or produced by labor and it belongs to the producer. Land is not produced by labor and the value attaching to it is not a labor product. It is the result of social growth; it accompanies social advance; it measures the benefits of co-operation; it accurately and automatically reflects the advantages of community life. It is hence a community value. It is created by the community and not by the individual. It therefore belongs to the community and the community is taking only its own when it takes this value for the common use. In declaring this principle Lloyd George has gone farther than any finance minister ever dreamed of going before; and it is the principle and not the amount of the tax which has thrown the British aristocracy into a delirium of rage.

✦ ✦

### The Land Question.

Passaic (N. J.) Daily News (Rep.), Nov. 13.—Now and then we catch a glimpse of the fact that, sooner or later, the land question is going to become an issue of paramount importance in this country as it now is in Great Britain. In the present week we have

had in Passaic two rather forcible suggestions that such is the case. Last Monday, Mayor-elect Spencer, in an interview published in the Daily News, stated that the great need of the times was for equality in taxation, and that the thing to do was to assess the land at true value, going so far as to say that he held the single tax view on this question. In his address before the Neighborhood Club of the Congregational Church on Thursday evening, Mr. George L. Record, the brilliant leader of the New Idea Republicans, stated it as his deliberate opinion that the present system of land ownership was the real source of all economic "robbery." He insists that the land question presses for solution in present-day practical politics. In Great Britain the people have been convulsed by the now famous Budget which Mr. David Lloyd-George, the chancellor of the Exchequer, has put through the Commons by a tremendous majority vote. . . . Of course the land question is not nearly as acute here as it is in England, where the land is monopolized by the nobility and has not been re-valued for the purpose of taxation since the seventeenth century; but now and then we are reminded in this country that the land question is the real problem at the bottom of all our arguments about taxation.

✦

(St. Paul) Pioneer Press (Rep.), Oct. 19.—The movement to Canada is attributable, in the main, to a "fad," which, through skillful advertising by the Canadian immigration bureau and by private land speculators, has gained possession of the Western mind. . . . Hundreds of millions of cultivable acres are lying idle. . . . Illustrating these official figures, Farm, Stock and Home prints a striking map. It shows that . . . the country included in a parallelogram whose eastern boundary is a straight line through the State of Wisconsin from the north side of Lake Superior to the northern line of Illinois, whose western boundary is the west line of Idaho, and whose northern and southern boundaries are the Canadian border and the southern line of South Dakota duly prolonged, contains as much land as all that is actually cultivated in the entire Union. This leaves unused an area equal to the combined areas of all the country east of the Mississippi, all Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, Nebraska, Iowa and all the States south of these, which might as well have been left "virgin forest" so far as present-day production is concerned. Yet all these millions and millions of acres of good land, in the best of climates under the sun, are abandoned by 70,000 persons a year, who go to seek homes nearer the domain of the Frost King! The legislation, if any, which is to cure this sort of emigration, must be directed to making unprofitable the holding of land in excess of the owner's need, or which is not cultivated. Tax it high enough, and the owners will be compelled to sell at figures which will induce all but the most incorrigible "skimmers" to select an American rather than a Canadian farm.

✦ ✦

### Woman Suffrage.

Collier's.—"Even if," said Henry George, "in a ruder state of society, the intelligence of one sex suffices for the management of common interests,

the vastly more intricate, more delicate and more important questions which the progress of civilization makes of public moment require the intelligence of women as of men, and that we never can obtain until we interest them in public affairs. . . . Very much of the inattention, the flippancy, the want of conscience, which we see manifested in regard to public matters of the greatest moment arises from the fact that we debar women from taking their proper part in these matters." The arguments of those who fundamentally oppose woman's suffrage are every year coming to be looked upon as more absurd. We laugh at the idea that Fred Busse is a better municipal housekeeper than Jane Addams, or Charley Murphy than Florence Kelley.

+ +

#### Reforming a Monarchical Custom.

Albuquerque (New Mexico) Tribune Citizen (ind.), Nov. 23.—The custom of granting "holiday pardons" has been stopped in Colorado by Governor Shafroth. He has announced that there will be no Thanksgiving Day pardon this year and that the custom of granting pardons on holidays will not be followed in Colorado while he is Governor. This custom has been followed, to some extent, in New Mexico, some of the governors having made it a rule to pardon some convict on each holiday. The custom is senseless. If a convict deserves a pardon he should not be required to wait in confinement until a holiday comes. He should be pardoned at once. If he does not deserve a pardon he ought not to get it on a holiday or any other day.

+ +

#### Cleveland as an Object Lesson.

La Follette's (ind. Rep.).—Nov. 20.—The Cleveland struggle shows in miniature how the machinery of government, ostensibly intended for the people's use, is geared up against the people; it shows how unworkable it is in the hands of the many, but how easy it is in the hands of the few. The city, like Congress, is bound like Gulliver with a thousand thongs, when it seeks to achieve deliverance from privilege. The city could not enter the electric lighting business as it willed. It could not settle the street railway question as it wished. It could not own the railways nor turn them over to someone who would run them on terms deemed fair to the community. The courts lent themselves to over fifty injunction suits leveled at the city. Even the charter of the city was taken away by a hostile partisan court. The rights of half a million people were subordinated to the alleged rights of a handful of men who had acquired franchises worth tens of millions of dollars by corruption and fraud, and who repaid the generosity of the city which had enriched them, by using all of the wealth with which they had been endowed to club the community into submission to its will.

+ +

#### Subway and "Unearned Increment."

Charles Ferguson in Chicago Examiner (Hearst), Nov. 25.—Under the laws of the State as they now stand the whole cost of a comprehensive rapid transit system, extending far into the suburbs, can be

charged upon the real estate directly benefited. That is to say, that, so far as the municipal treasury is concerned, the new subway and elevated roads need cost nothing at all. The whole expense of construction can be taken out of the "unearned increment" in the value of land. It is necessary that the whole of the new value conferred upon land should be taken by the city. Where this method of financing rapid transit enterprises is not used, the city as a whole simply assumes a huge burden of debt for the sake of putting unearned money into the pockets of real estate speculators. In such a case the people pay for the improvement, not once, but twice. They pay once in taxes and they pay again in rising rents. The matter is, in fact, susceptible of a much stronger statement. For in the long run the whole value of municipal improvements tends to be absorbed by the land owners, leaving the mass of the people as poor—in the midst of the highest mechanical developments of civilization—as they would be if the modern tools and engineering of comfort did not exist.

+ +

#### The Clock Is Winding—Watch It.

Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune Citizen (ind.), Nov. 16.—Extremes are nearing a clash every day now, with the present "conservatives" on the one hand, keeping mails and streets full with their subsidized press, ridiculing with all sorts of epithets those who dare to anticipate the truth, and on the other hand, with those so-called saviors of the laboring man who, by methods of coercion, combination and monopoly, hasten the sad day that is bound to come unless the remedy is applied before it is too late. The clock is winding up. Don't forget that. And if the spring is turned to the breaking point, the extremes of fiendishness and brutality exhibited at Cairo will some day spread throughout the land. Calamity howling or no calamity howling—facts are facts, and must be told.

+ +

#### A True Word for Debs.

Kansas City (Mo.) Star (ind.), Nov. 15.—Vital sincerity and unshakable faith are the qualities that have made Eugene V. Debs the accepted prophet of many thousands of men and women in the United States. They are the qualities which, in spite of honest suspicion and in spite of a lesser quantity of insincere persecution, have at this time gained for Mr. Debs the respectful attention of the majority of the people. It is perhaps an especial tribute to the character of the man that he has gained this public esteem, although most of the people do not see the social problem through his glasses. Intelligent, impartial men and women know that whether the creed of Mr. Debs is wrong or right he intensely believes it to be right. They know enough of evangels of new faiths in the past to pardon and even sympathize with a violence of conviction which antagonists misrepresent as a violence of acts. Thinking men and women see that in the intellectual and moral and spiritual unrest of this time it would be dull-witted, if nothing worse, to disregard the fact that this material thing of socialism which Eugene V. Debs stands for is rooted in idealism—the rights of humanity and the brotherhood of men.

**Socialist Politics.**

The Chicago International Socialist Review (Soc.), November.—Socialism, the proletarian revolt against the ruling class, was never so much alive as today. . . . Meanwhile the Socialist party as an organization has failed to make a corresponding growth. Its vote in 1908 was but slightly larger than in 1904. It has during the last five years enrolled probably over 150,000 members, including those who held membership cards in 1904, but the present total membership as shown by the monthly dues is about 45,000, and the number who took the trouble to attend meetings and vote on a recent referendum was only about 8,500. . . . Most of the proletarian members of the Socialist party thus far have been members of craft unions for the very good reason that such membership was for them a necessary condition for holding their jobs. This membership naturally made them reluctant to antagonize craft unions, and this reluctance is reflected in the platforms and resolutions of the Socialist party. Apart from trade unionists, our membership thus far has been mainly recruited from the small producers and professional men, who are not in daily touch with the great industrial processes as proletarians are, and can exercise control over these processes only through the political state. Thus it is not in the least surprising that the Socialist party in the past has placed undue emphasis on voting and law-making. Nor on the other hand is it surprising that with these tactics we have scarcely touched the great mass of the proletariat. But forces stronger than ourselves are pushing us on. The great capitalists have built up a system of organized industry beside which the political state is a pigmy. In the course of this process they have been systematically crushing out the old conservative trade unions. On their ruins is already rising a new type of union, revolutionary as Marx himself, ruthless as capitalism, strong in the thought, learned not from Marx but from grim experience, that the workers have nothing to lose but their chains, and all the world to gain. It is in these unions not the aristocracy of labor but its democracy, that the Socialist party of the future must find its strength. Long enough we have cringed before the aristocracy of labor begging for votes that we did not get. Long enough we have experimented with "immediate demands" that might swell our apparent strength by winning the votes of people opposed to revolution. The time has come for the proletarians of the party and those who believe the party should be proletarian in its tactics to bring about a revolution inside the party. Let us not withdraw but take possession. Let us put wage-workers on the national executive committee. Let us cut the "immediate demands" out of our platform and leave reformers to wrangle over reforms. Let us make it our chief task to spread the propaganda of revolution and of the new industrial unionism, and when we elect members of our own class to office, let us instruct them that their most important work is to hamper the ruling class in the war it will be waging on the revolutionary unions. With tactics like these, apathy will disappear, and the Socialist party will for the first time become a vital force in the struggle between capitalists and wage-workers.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

**PATIENCE.***For The Public.*

If this, my service, shall in beauty fall,  
 And, for some comfort to unfold your heart  
 My utmost strength but sorry loss avail  
 To gloom the empty days thus set apart,  
 Still shall I serve, as conscience gives me grace  
 The cherished hope of you, the sacred trust  
 That holds me proudly in my humble place  
 Among the brave ambitions of the dust.

For of this heart, that touches for your sake  
 With tenderness the difficulties rough,  
 Is all my faith, that finally must make  
 Of willing sacrifice, more than enough,  
 The peace fulfilled, so wearily pursued,  
 Bloom at my feet—as reddest roses would  
 With love's old songs all happily renewed  
 If my slow uncompliment you understood.

GEO. E. BOWEN.

\* \* \*

## THE REARING OF PHEASANTS AS A SOCIAL SERVICE!

Leonard Willoughby, of Wallaton, Notts, England, in  
the London Bystander of October 6, 1909.

Rearing of pheasants is a very costly matter, and one which I anticipate will be seriously curtailed in the near future if this so-called "Working Man's Budget" is passed. County gentlemen will be very hardly hit if this iniquitous bill becomes law, and they will consequently have to effect economies in every direction. One of the very first will be in reducing their shootings, or in giving up rearing birds altogether. Pheasants which are hand-reared cost about 4s. each to feed, from start to finish. Thus it is easy to understand what sums of money find their way into farmers' and tradesmen's pockets for the purchase of food alone, for hundreds of thousands of pheasants all over the kingdom have to be fed for months every year. The money which is expended one way or another over shooting is quite enormous, for it must be remembered that, in addition to the purchase of eggs and food, there are wages, clothes, and fuel for keepers; there are also endless expenses in connection with rearing. When the shooting commences, there are beaters at 2s. 6d. and 3s. per day, with meat, bread, cheese, and beer. And there is the expense of hospitality to guests. Take it all in all, the old saying that each pheasant shot np costs, one way and another, a guinea, is not far wrong.

Now, who benefits from all this? The poor

owner certainly does not, for it is all pay, pay, pay with him, and if he does sell his surplus birds, he will only get back 2s. to 2s. 6d. a bird. But the public gets the benefit, for they can purchase these costly reared birds for the price of chickens. One day those people, the farmers, tradesmen, working-classes, and laborers, will wake up to what they have lost, when they find the country house shut up, and shooting, as it used to be, a thing of the past. They can only then thank themselves, for it is by the votes of these very people that a government was returned to power bent on mischief. To ruin the gentleman and landowner, to upset everything which has done so much to keep good relations between the upper and working-classes, has been their intention. And this is their idea of benefiting the poor, by ruining owners of estates, by killing sport, and by introducing socialism of the worst type.

\* \* \*

### THE SECURITY OF PROPERTY.

From a Speech by Winston Churchill, of the British Ministry, Delivered at Abernethy, October 16, 1909. Reported in Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of October 18.

The security of property depends upon its wide diffusion among great numbers and all classes of population, and it becomes more secure year by year because it is gradually being more widely distributed. The vital processes of civilization require, and the combined interests of millions guarantee the security of property—I speak of the immediate security of property; but, ladies and gentlemen, the security of property over long periods of time requires another condition. It must be supported by the moral convictions of the people; and if those moral convictions of the nation are to be retained, there must be a constant and successful effort to reconcile the processes by which property is acquired, with ideas of justice, of usefulness, and of general benefit.

A society in which property was insecure would speedily degenerate into barbarism; a society in which property was absolutely secure, irrespective of all conceptions of justice in regard to the manner of its acquisition, would degenerate not to barbarism, but death. And that is, I think, the message, the main message, which is to be found in the heart-stirring speeches which my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Lloyd George] is delivering in the country, and which are arousing people to face all sorts of awkward facts which hitherto they have been glad to leave neglected and unattended on one side.

No one claims that a Government should from time to time, according to its conceptions of justice, attempt fundamentally to recast the basis

on which property is erected. The process must be a gradual one, must be a social and a moral process, working steadily in the heart and in the body of the community. But we do contend, when new burdens have to be apportioned, when new revenues have to be procured, when the necessary upkeep of the state requires further taxes to be imposed—we do contend that in distributing the new burdens a government should have regard first of all to ability to pay; and secondly—and this is a newer point—that they should have regard to some extent, and so far as is practicable, to the means and the process by which different forms of wealth have been acquired, and that they should make a sensible difference between wealth which is the fruit of productive enterprise and industry or of individual skill, and wealth which represents capture by individuals of socially created values.

\* \* \*

### SUFFRAGETTE VIOLENCE.

From a Criticism by Edwin D. Mead in the Boston Transcript of October 20, 1909.

It is a great mistake, but I find it is not an uncommon one, to think that the recent violent proceedings in London and Birmingham and Newcastle, the attempted assaults on the Prime Minister, and the rest, really represent the main body of English woman suffragists, or have their approval. Nothing of the kind. These things are condemned by the sensible progressive people of England as emphatically as they would be condemned here. In suffragist circles especially it is keenly realized how damaging all these follies and excesses—yes, and crimes—are to the cause.

I do not speak of the conservative wing; it was with the radicals, scores of them, that we talked everywhere. Read the articles in the London Nation and the News during the last month; these show the feeling of the stanch English radicals towards the recent recourse of Mrs. Pankhurst's women to brickbat arguments. The Nation is the ablest radical weekly journal in London. The News is the ablest Liberal daily. Both have been strong defenders of the radical suffragists, even the "militant" suffragists; but neither of them will stand for this new sort of thing.

No sober person can stand for it, and the strong leaders of the woman suffrage movement in England see clearly that that movement least of any in the world can itself adopt what has latterly become the pet principle of its opponents, that the ultimate political tool and sanction is force. On that battlefield women will ever be doomed to defeat; on the intellectual and moral field their victory is sure and will come rapidly, as victories go in great movements.

Naturally condemnation of such able and devoted leaders as Mrs. Pankhurst is not pleasant and

is not easy. Mrs. Pankhurst and her associates are deserving of the highest honor for their zeal and their great achievements for the cause in the last half dozen years. I wish that half of their critics had a record of devotion half as good. They have inspired thousands of women as they have never been inspired before; they have raised a regular army for the cause, raised large amounts of money, and organized the most vigorous propaganda the cause ever had in England. The cause will never again drop back into the indifference from which it has been raised so largely by their consecration and energy. I am of those who believe that, up to the time of the late personal assaults, the Government not only tactically blundered in imprisoning the "militant" women in the manner and on the basis on which it did it, but that it would not have dealt in a similar way with an equal body of men doing similar things. These women have our legitimate sympathy and support. Their strong positive services will be remembered and will be influential long after their mistakes are forgotten. But their mistakes are grievous—it would be foolish and pusillanimous for their friends not to be outspoken about it—running at last into a fanaticism and lawlessness which many feel make their activity for the moment a greater hindrance than help to the cause.

The change in sentiment in thoughtful London circles in the last year is marked, and is very painful. Instead of the confidence and enthusiasm which we found in all progressive places two years ago, in the Liberal newspapers, the Liberal clubs, and in advanced social circles generally, we found this autumn confusion, scepticism and dismay. Political friends and the average man have alike been alienated by a sustained course of proceedings conspicuously unwomanly and unfair. No opinion was expressed to us oftener than that woman suffrage would not begin to receive the vote in Parliament today that it would have received two years ago; and the disaffection which the recent violences have engendered in the man in the street and the woman in the home is deeper than that in the House of Commons.

I cannot illustrate the feeling among the best English friends of woman suffrage better perhaps than by reference to some strong London leaders well known here in Boston.

No one who heard Rev. Silvester Horne at the meetings of the Congregational Council here a few years ago needs to be told of his high position in the London pulpit; there is not, to my thinking, a better preacher in London, and there is certainly no abler or more courageous champion of good causes. He is one of the most earnest advocates of woman suffrage; and he deplores these recent excesses.

The same is true of Mrs. Byles, whose strong addresses here at the time of the International Peace

Congress are so well remembered, and who has been for years one of the leading woman suffragists in England. At the very time we were in London she was writing to the newspapers her strong protests against these proceedings, and many were joining her in public expression of their sense of the deep injury which the course was doing the cause.

Herbert Burrows was another of the able English speakers here in 1904, a zealous suffragist and a trenchant writer for the cause, who draws the line at the new departures.

I think we have never had an English suffragist in Boston who appealed to us more strongly than Mrs. Philip Snowden, who was here last winter, wife of the well-known Labor representative in Parliament. Her personal charm, her eloquence, her zeal, her justice and her common sense combined to make a deep impression upon every audience which she addressed here, and it was so in New York and everywhere else. She is a warm friend and admirer of Mrs. Pankhurst, highly appreciating her achievements; but she holds the new policy mournful and disastrous, and she told us that a great organized protest against it by leading English women was under discussion.

I might multiply such judgments, most earnestly expressed by leading English suffragists; but I mention here simply persons well known to our Boston suffrage circles. I wish to defend the English suffragists stoutly from the notion, which I find rather widespread, that this new policy of violence represents them as a body, or has their sanction. Every level-headed person among them with whom we talked felt it to be as vulgar, fanatical and wrong as any of us here would deem such proceedings—and just as prejudicial to the good name and real progress of the movement.

It stands to reason. All talk about such violence having a justification in England which it would not have here, by reason of the different conditions of English political life, is nonsense. England in respect to all the essential conditions of political agitation is just as free as we are; and the suffrage cause, in my judgment, is much farther advanced, much more hopeful of early success, there than here, in no sense desperate. It is hardly a generation since any general suffrage for men in England came in; not a quarter of the men who now have the suffrage had it in 1866. Somebody may say that a lot of them raised a good deal of a row, tore up Hyde Park fences and what not, in agitation for it. So they did. So meetings to protest against the Boer war were brutally broken up again and again by the English jingoes eight years ago; and meetings to protest against the Budget were repeatedly broken up or turned into pandemonium by radical English workingmen and others—with whose zeal for the Budget, if not with their way of showing it,

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.

## BOOKS

### A FINE EXPOSITION OF ETHICS.

**The Ethics of Progress; or The Theory and the Practice by which Civilization Proceeds.** By Charles F. Dole, author of "The Spirit of Democracy," the Ingersoll Lecture of 1906 on "Immortality" at Harvard University, etc. Published by Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York. Price \$1.50 net.

In reviewing William Allen White's novel, "A Certain Rich Man" (p. 836), it was with great difficulty that we escaped the use of laudatory superlatives, if indeed we did escape; and now we are face to face with the same temptation, after reading every word of Mr. Dole's "Ethics of Progress." Of different classes, these books are complementary. Mr. White's gives you in fiction form a picture of American life, exemplifying in action the principles of ethics which Mr. Dole's eloquently expounds.

"What kind of ethics befits and corresponds to the needs and social relations of civilized men," is the object of Mr. Dole's inquiry, and these are the limitations he adopts: "Ethics is the science of human conduct. As a science it must meet the demands of our intelligence. It must harmonize with other sciences and help to make our thought of the universe congruous and complete." And not only must it "meet the reasonable conditions of thought," but it must "also work out into, and inspire rational and beautiful conduct." Nor is this science a mere human creation. It is no petty substitute for the moral law, which is from everlasting unto everlasting; but in Mr. Dole's ethical system "it consists, like other sciences, in tracing the underlying laws which govern moral movement and growth." In other words, if we interpret this book aright, ethical science is to natural moral law what physical science is to natural physical law, a progressively changing human apprehension of eternal natural principles which present constantly changing phenomena to human observation. "Ethical problems consist largely," as Mr. Dole explains, "in the application of universal principles, already admitted, to new and altered circumstances, or to new phases of human life as it grows more sensitive from age to age."

Looking beneath the surface of human conduct, the author distinguishes three attitudes of mind: antagonism, indifference and good will, the last being the ethical attitude.

In this view the two great rival theories of ethics, the utilitarian and the idealistic, are reconciled. The selfish or utilitarian, and the sympathetic or social forces in human nature, so far from being antagonistic, "play together, if not over the whole field of human conduct, at least

over the larger part of it, in far closer harmony than men thoughtlessly suppose." The point is that "selfishness ceases to be selfish and rises into a new term, as soon as it begins to take in family and kinship and the whole human race." Even "the most enlightened and refined theory of selfishness does not account for the highest acts of a man's life, which often in fact threaten self destruction." And these acts are very common; "they gleam out every day from the simple annals of the poor."

But good will, "the key to the theory of ethics," is no "mere sentiment dependent upon the character or the attractiveness of its object;" it is not good nature; it is not goodness. "To say that a man feels kindly or means well is to say little." But "to affirm that the man wills well is to say an altogether different thing." For will "determines the man's ruling purpose." It comprehends not only the will, but the sympathies and the intelligence, these three in conjunction being good will and producing ideal conduct. This is the reason that the principle of good will is "a safe key to open all the problems of ethics." It serves at the same time as "an inspiration to every form of noble personal conduct." He who determines his conduct by good will in this truly devotional sense will do right—what is right for him—in every emergency and as a "natural consequence."

Taking this principle as his clue and guide to the science of ethics, not forcing it but using it as a working hypothesis, Mr. Dole subjects it to the test of the facts of life and appeals to it for practical answers to practical problems. Everywhere he finds it to be "the essential driving power of the ethical life."

So rich in its suggestiveness is this book, so keen in its penetration, so comprehensive in its psychological grasp, so convincing in its concrete applications, and so simple yet lucid and eloquent in its diction, that a condensation of its scheme conveys a very inadequate idea of the force of its reasoning and the charm of the whole. A few isolated quotations may, however, dimly suggest its educational value and delightful literary quality.

Describing the irreligious man, Mr. Dole writes that it "is not he who denies some dogma or opinion, least of all who dispenses with certain conventions and ceremonies, or goes to no church, but rather the man who has no sense of belonging to a universe, no thought of a binding structure to which he owes allegiance; in other words, the good man fits into all manner of human relationships, to which he adjusts himself in order to render them more complete," whereas "a man is 'bad' or morally worthless so far as he fails to fit into and strengthen the social structure of mankind."

In relating democracy to good will and both to eternal moral law, he makes this impressive declaration: "We cannot conceive any world in any time where good will would cease to be valid, or where ill will or self will would become beautiful. Wherever any form of social life is, good will must be the universal spring out of which all rules, usages and customs proceed. The modern democracy builds upon this idea. It is slowly and surely coming into sight. The democracy is not a form of government in which one party by virtue of numbers and greater power, forces a minority to obey its laws. It is hardly safe, indeed, to use the word government, as if one party commanded and the other only obeyed. A democracy rests upon willingness. Less and less do its members need to see the show of force. Not bayonets but public opinion persuades men. So far as democracy ever has seemed to fail, as in ancient Athens, it has been because people had not yet developed humanity enough to live together as fellows. They trusted in force and not in persuasion. So far as democracy is coming into its own, it is because men are learning lessons of good will toward one another."

"There is no evil till the sight of the ideal has come," is one of the author's sententious statements; followed by the explanation that "the sense of evil is a tribute to the ideal of good." But he conceives of evil nowhere as a separate power, but always as a form of weakness or immaturity. "Consider the vices of cowardice, cruelty, ugliness and hate. Under each of these names we find weakness or poverty of mind and resource." "Pride, arrogance, egotism, moral pests as they are, all express a certain weakness, not power." "Whichever way you look at sin or moral evil, it represents some sort of social incapacity." "The moral life follows all the great common analogies. Thus, moral evil is like weakness, childishness or disease. It involves the sense of failure, of frustration, of disfavor, of consequent pain and unrest. The judgment or sense of guilt fixes the fact of this weakness or disease. It calls attention to it and publishes it. This is salutary. The sense of guilt points toward the way of strength or cure."

And repentance—where will you find a definition at once so true, so terse, and so forceful as this? "The one use of responsibility is to get one upon the track of right as soon as possible. The aim of responsibility is forward-looking, not backward. Repentance is the negative side of responsibility. It bids a man look back on what he has done. But repentance is not to stand sorrowful over the past. The use of repentance is not to prolong pain; it is to urge the man to do better; it is the beginning of fresh life and moral power."

"In every case the ethical condition is that the act shall proceed in the name of good will, and

not of wilfulness." "Absolute justice can hardly be expected in a growing world; what is more important is the spirit of justice." "Moral movement is by the laws of vital growth." "The law of growth for the individual and for society is identical with the law of good will." "God does not march men in platoons; each man's cause is his own." "There is a species of pressure upon us or within us which urges us to do the right, whatever the right may be; we readily admit that this is rather vague, as vague as the force of gravitation, but also as real." "Certain clear test questions guide the conduct at every step and guide it safely: Am I doing the best which I know?" "Every system of government which has tried to build upon the superiority of a class has proved to be in unstable equilibrium, and growingly so."

This book's theory of ethical compromise is of present practical importance, and in our judgment eminently sound. We present it in our closing quotation from a book which should rank among the best, both as to substance and as to form: "What shall a man do, when caught in the toils of a system of society which he inherited but did not make? What shall the early Christian do with his polygamous household? What shall Washington do with his slaves? . . . Problems of compromise touch us on every side. Society exists in strata, all in motion, perhaps, but at various rates of movement. Shall the individual move at his own rate, ahead of the rest, and regardless of what others are willing to say and do with him? Or shall he wait for the rest, and cease to utter himself till others are ready to march with him? Luther answered this question in one way, and Erasmus in another. . . . There are two senses in which we use compromise. One is a bad sense. A man stoops from what he knows is best, to do what is worse. He sees an ideal, and he denies it or refuses to give it expression. He conforms to a standard in vogue lower than his own, against which his conscience protests. . . . This sort of compromise stunts a man's soul. . . . On the other hand, we are bound up together in society in such ways that we often are obliged to act together, or else we cannot act at all. A man is a citizen with millions of others. . . . A man cannot cut himself off from the human race because he sees ideals invisible as yet to others. . . . The only question is whether they [the social acts he is as yet unable to prevent] are the acts of his own volition. The question follows, if the practices are wrong, whether he is doing what he can to forbid or correct them? . . . The problem of righteous compromise may be likened to the working of the resultant of forces. There is a certain direction in which you wish to move a load. Other men associated with you, however, pulling also at the same load, point in various directions for your pole star. Are you not glad if by your united efforts the load moves, whether northeast or north-

west, provided on the whole it makes a distinct nothing? Will you stand aloof and do nothing, and see the load only move to one side or the other? 'I do not wait,' said a Chicago politician, 'to hitch my wagon to a star; I hitch it to anything that goes my way.' This conduct was not necessarily immoral. It is fair compromise, that is, co-operation, if we insist upon pressing, through the activity of all, as far and as fast as we can toward our goal. That is fair compromise in which a man does not retract, nor retreat, nor falsify his manhood."

And the sum and substance of it all is simply this, "that the man at each issue or hour of temptation must act in good will."

**BOOKS RECEIVED**

—The Substance of Socialism. By John Spargo. Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York. Price, \$1 net.

—Annual Report of the Department of Government of the City of Cleveland for the Year Ending December 31, 1908.

—The Budget, the Land and the People. The New Land Value Taxes Explained and Illustrated. A complete Guide to the Great Question of the Day. With a preface by the Right Hon. D. Lloyd George,

M. P., Chancellor of the Exchequer. Issued by the Budget League. Published by Methuen & Co., 36 Essex street, W. C., London. Price sixpence net.

—Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation. By Edward Bernstein. Translated by Edith C. Harvey. Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York. 1909. Price \$1 net.

—The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets. By Jane Addams, Hull House. Author of "Democracy and Social Ethics," "Newer Ideals of Peace," etc. Published by Macmillan Company, New York.

**PERIODICALS**

Judge Lindsey's autobiography, "The Beast and the Jungle," continues in Everybody's, the December installment furnishing an interesting instance of graft in Denver which might be duplicated by the true story of any other city, together with an affecting account of the origin of the juvenile court. The same number of Everybody's opens with an account by Elizabeth Robins of the "Why?" of the suffragette movement in England.



The appreciation in the New Church League Journal for November by the Rev. Clyde W. Broomell, of Quincy Ewing's Atlantic Monthly article on the heart of the race problem, concentrates the race question even on its practical side into a single

**NOTICE**

I wish to announce that I now have an office at 28 Jackson Blvd, in Suite 701, where I will be pleased to see my friends and patients. C. L. LOGAN, Osteopath.

Tel. Harrison 6298

*Addresses by* **HERBERT S. BIGELOW**

A GROWING GOD  
CALF PATHS  
THE LIFE ETERNAL

THE SERVANT IN THE HOUSE  
THE MISSION OF A  
LIBERAL CHURCH

Price, 5 Cents each.

**The People's Church and Town Meeting Society**  
Second National Bank Bldg. CINCINNATI, OHIO

**Books for Gifts**

x x x No Charge for Postage.

**The Prophet of San Francisco.** By Louis F. Post. x x x Ten Cents.

Rough grey paper cover, handsomely stamped with dark blue; pages uncut.

**Labor and Neighbor.** By Ernest Crosby. x x Twenty-five Cents.

Stiff drab paper cover; with portrait of the author.

**Garrison the Non-Resistant.** By Ernest Crosby. x x Fifty Cents.

Blue cloth stamped with gold; beautifully printed on heavy paper; with portrait of the author.

The same book in stiff drab paper cover; without portrait. x x Twenty-five Cents.

**Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce.** By Louis F. Post. x One Dollar.

Fine blue cloth stamped with gold.

**Social Service.** By Louis F. Post. x x x One Dollar

Blue cloth with gold lettering.

**The Ethics of Democracy.** By Louis F. Post. x x One Dollar and a Quarter.

Rich blue cloth, stamped with gold; with portrait of the author.

Book Dept. of The Public, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago.

pointed inquiry, "Can one race of men advance in religious, and from religious to moral, intellectual, civil, social and industrial freedom and happiness by keeping another race down?"

+

The debate on Socialism between John Z. White and Arthur M. Lewis at the Garrick Theater, Chicago, on the 3d of October, is reported in full in *The Evolutionist* (180 Washington street, Chicago) for November. Accompanying the debate is an excellent photograph of the debaters "after the battle."

+ + +

Landlord (also sitting Member for district): "By the way, Dobbins, I've been meaning to tell you I'll send a man up and have that shed of yours mended, as soon as you like."

Dobbins: "Thankee, sir. Then it be true that general election be a-comin' on?"—Punch.

+ + +

The daredeviltry of Kipling, the glorified hysteria of Dickens, the charming cynicism of Thackeray, the

pessimism of Schopenhauer, the individualism of Nietzsche, the lyric indignation of Shelley, the blasting scorn of Byron, the thinly veiled flippancy of Bernard Shaw and the subtle nihilism of Stevenson, are capable of creating more dangerous discontent than the diatribes of the down-right revolutionists. Logic and equity alike demand that these idols be toppled from their pedestals and relegated to the limbo of the enemies of society, if the apostles of new ideas (however abhorrent these ideas may be to the average person) are to be sentenced

**NOT** the least interesting feature about the success of Fels-Naptha soap (the genuine) is the fact that very many women were first induced to use Fels-Naptha by grocers' wives.

Than whom none had greater opportunity to test the many brands of laundry soaps sold at grocery stores to women.

## Francisco Ferrer in Art

A world famous sculptor has made a clay model bust of Ferrer from a late photograph that was verified by a friend who knew him personally. This model has been reproduced by a secret process in a beautiful picture 8½ x 11½, making it an art production fit to be hung in the home of every person who strives for progress and who believes in liberal ideas.

Mounted on a dark grey paper. . . . 25c

Mounted on an extra heavy six ply card board 50c

THERE IS NOTHING MORE FITTING  
FOR A XMAS OR NEW YEAR GIFT  
THAN THIS WORK OF ART.

- - SEND FOR PHOTO TO-DAY - -

**SAMUEL A. BLOCH,**

THE BOOKMAN

1323 N. Oakley Ave., CHICAGO, ILL.

I SELL ALL BOOKS OF ALL PUBLISHERS

*By the Parsons "Who is authority on contracts."*  
"OUTLINES OF THE RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY OF SWEDENBORG" by Theophilus Parsons. Cloth, 318 pages. Post-paid for Fifty Cents. Stamps taken.  
Rev. L. G. Landenberger, 3741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

The fundamental truths in THE SOUL OF THE WORLD made plainer to me than before.—A. D. Cridge.  
By ESTELLA BACHMAN  
428 pages. Cloth, \$1.00  
Order of EQUITIST PUBLISHING HOUSE, Station A, Pasadena, Cal.

When writing to Advertisers please mention THE PUBLIC.—

to death.—Alvan F. Sanborn, writing from Paris to the New York Independent, of Francisco Ferrer.

\* \* \*

"Just think of it! One person in every 37 in England is a pauper."

"Why, John," she returned, "it isn't so. I met more than 37 people in London last summer myself, and there wasn't a pauper in the lot."—Philadelphia Public Ledger.

*Some of the Contents of*

# "Social Service"

the new book by

**LOUIS F. POST**

**The Use and Abuse of Money** is one of the subjects with which this book deals in an elementary and readable manner.

**The Law of Demand and Supply** is put upon a rational basis and clearly explained.

**An Explanation of Trade** and of the origin, function and mechanism of **Banking** and **International Trade** is a feature of the book which every teacher should read.

**From Feudalism to Capitalism** is a subject to interest all students of economics and economic history. From cover to cover this book is a readable story, which deals simply and truly with the art of earning a civilized living.

PUBLISHED BY

**A. WESSELS, New York.**

SOLD BY

**A. C. McCLURG & CO., Chicago**

ALSO BY

**THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago**

**Price, One Dollar, Postpaid**

Our readers are asked to mention THE PUBLIC when writing to Advertisers.



## Cut Glass for Christmas Gifts

Buy Direct at Factory Prices.  
Write for Catalogue.

**NEWARK CUT GLASS COMPANY**  
6 West Park St., NEWARK, N. J.

## Real Estate For Sale and Exchange

**EDWARD POLAK**  
4030 Third Ave. New York City

# The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

### Terms of Subscription

Yearly .....	\$1.00
Half yearly.....	.50
Quarterly .....	.25
Single copies .....	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders on Chicago, or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due, or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

### Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion.....	\$20.00
Half-page, each insertion.....	10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion.....	5.00
One inch, each insertion.....	1.20
Half-inch, each insertion.....	.60

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8½ inches; width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday day of publication.

The clippings at the right tell the facts about Tariff manipulation and raised watch prices—

READ THEM!

This is to announce that the prices of the high-grade Ingersoll-Trenton and the low-priced Ingersoll watches have not advanced and will not.

Although our output is over 12,000 watches daily—more than four times that of any other product—we did not join in the petition presented jointly by practically every other American watch factory asking for higher "protection" when the revision was under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of Congress.

Those factories got the higher tariff they asked for. Now they have raised their prices. We ask no tariff favors. It costs us no more to make watches than formerly, and we deem it business wisdom and fair play to the public to adhere to the prices and the policy of delivering the utmost values possible which have built up the stupendous sales our watches now enjoy.

Our prices have always been published broadcast and marked on every watch box. Others have no standard price, they sell at different prices in different stores so you cannot estimate their recent increase.

Ingersoll-Trenton

The Best 7-Jewel Watch

\$5 in solid nickel case \$7 in 10-year gold-filled case \$9 in 20-year gold-filled case

The "I-T" is patterned after and embodies every essential feature of the most expensive American movements. Its movement is of the bridge-model construction reserved by others for their highly-jeweled product. No other popular-priced watch is made in this type.

It has 7-ruby, sapphire and garnet jewels, protecting the points of principal wear, and will give 20 years of service.

It has the compensating balance wheel automatically adjusting itself to changes of temperature; the micrometric regulator, permitting most precise adjustment, and every other characteristic of the best watches.

It is an exceedingly close timer. Very few watches can equal it. In appearance it has no superior at any price. People are accustomed to paying far more without getting so good a watch.

Sold Only by Responsible Jewelers

The "I-T" watch can be handled only by jewelers competent to regulate and repair it and who will sell it at the moderate prices advertised by us. It is new now. Jewelers who have not yet put it in stock or those who demand exorbitant profits, as well as those whom we consider irresponsible as sales agents, may recommend something else.

But in your own interest simply insist upon examining the "I-T" side by side with what is offered.

Many jewelers display the "I-T" in their windows.

If not locally obtainable sent prepaid by us. Our booklet "How to Judge a Watch" is a complete explanation of watch construction which every man should understand, mailed free with names of local jewelers who sell the "I-T."

The Ingersoll watches from \$1.00 to \$2.00 are sold by 60,000 dealers throughout the country.

Note "I-T" Monogram on dial



ROBT. H. INGERSOLL & BRO.

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

SAN FRANCISCO

New York Times, Sept. 21

WATCH PRICES UP; TARIFF AIDS TRUST

Big Manufacturers All Over the Country Advance Rates by About 7 Per Cent.

IMPORT TRADE TO SUFFER

Increase in Amount of Duty Means More Business for Large Concerns but Hurts the Small Dealers.

Special to The New York Times.

WALTHAM, Mass., Sept. 20.—The price of watches all over the country has been increased about 7 per cent. The Waltham Watch Company to-day fell in line with the other manufacturers, and put into effect the higher rates.

Two days ago it was announced at Chicago that two of the largest Western watchmaking concerns had advanced rates. To-day the Eastern companies followed suit, the Waltham company acting in conjunction with other concerns of the East.

The advance affects both watches and watch cases. The high...

Chicago Tribune, Sept. 18

PRICE OF WATCHES UP WITH TARIFF

Elgin and Waltham Companies Announce Increases Following "Revision."

COMPLAINT BY JOBBERS.

See "Harmony" in Action of the Wholesalers, Who Deny They Violate Trust Law.

Because of the "revised tariff," according to jobbers and consumers, American made watches are to cost more. At least the Elgin and Waltham companies, who are commonly understood to carry on their affairs with great harmony of action, have sent out announcements to jobbers, advising them of advances in prices ranging from 5 to 10 per cent, and the jobbers think the advance has been posted simply because the Payne tariff, which watch manufacturers...

PRICE OF WATCHES ADVANCED. Waltham, Mass., Sept. 20.—In conjunction with other Eastern watch manufacturers, the Waltham Watch Company to-day advanced the price of watches and cases. The advance is understood to average about 7 per cent. This action by leading Western manufacturers follows an advance by leading Western manufacturers last week. The prevailing high price of materials is given as the reason for the increase.

HOME OFFICE, 7 Frankel Bldg., NEW YORK LONDON MONTREAL

When writing to Advertisers please mention THE PUBLIC.