

The Public

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 | HENRY GEORGE, Jr., New York | JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois |
| WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Massachusetts | ROBERT BAKER, New York | R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota |
| L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island | BOLTON HALL, New York | LEWIS H. BERENS, England |
| HENRY F. RING, Texas | FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware | J. W. S. CALLIE, England |
| WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia | HERBERT QUICK, Iowa | JOSEPH FELS, England |
| HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio | MRS. LOMA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa | JOHN PAUL, Scotland |
| FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio | S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota | MAX HIRSCH, Australia |
| MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio | WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri | GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand |
| BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio | C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon | |

Vol. XII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1909.

No. 585

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 267 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1906 at the Post Office at
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

EDITORIAL

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

The Cleveland Traction Fight.....	577
The Chicago School Lands Bill.....	579
The Core of the Social Question.....	579
The Emma Goldman Affair in New Jersey.....	580
Reorganization of The Arena.....	580
The Paine Centennial.....	581
Trivial Objections to Direct Legislation.....	581

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

The Political Situation in Great Britain (Lewis H. Berens)	583
--	-----

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

From a Member of the House of Commons (Josiah C. Wedgwood)	585
--	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Cleveland Traction Situation.....	585
Municipal Election in Portland.....	586
The Tariff in Congress.....	587
The British Budget	588
Australian Politics	589
News Notes	589
Press Opinions	590

RELATED THINGS:

New York, From a Skyscraper (James Oppenheim).....	592
One of the Unemployed (Edith J. Arnold).....	592
American Wages and Foreign.....	593
The State and the Landlords.....	594
The Initiative and the Referendum (Addie L. Howes).....	595
The Struggle of the Rich (W. J. Lampton).....	597

BOOKS:

A Study in Labor Unionism (Angeline Loesch).....	597
Books Received	598
Pamphlets	598
Periodicals	598

The Cleveland Traction Fight.

Mayor Johnson's opening speech in the referendum on the new 3-cent franchise had the right ring, and the best note in it was his declaration that he is through with liberal treatment for defeated foes.

+

Mayor Johnson has not made many mistakes in his long traction fight, but the worst of those he has made has been his magnanimity toward the predatory interests in their extremity. They were "frozen stiff" and helpless when he defeated their star candidate at the mayoralty election two years ago; but under cover of "good citizenship," and at the cosy hearthstone of the Chamber of Commerce, they were warmed into life again, and Mayor Johnson permitted it. He is not to be blamed for this, for not only was he in position to be magnanimous, but his magnanimity would have been for the common good if the conquered enemies he dealt with had been men of honor. In fact, however, they had not even the gamblers' honor, which Big Business has adopted into its code of ethics.

+

They set about baffling the execution of the contract they had made, as soon as they had made it; and when by the barest "squeak"—600 majority in a total vote of 80,000—they succeeded in nullifying it at a referendum and throwing the whole situation into chaos, they repudiated their

"gentlemen's agreement" for the restoration of property interests which had come to them upon the faith of it. The whole story of that dishonored settlement—the plundering of street car receipts, the conspiracies with labor men of the "Skinny" Madden type, the resulting "faked up" strike, the blowing up of street cars with dynamite, the financing of the campaign against the ordinance, the deception of voters by false publications representing that "no" votes were necessary to accomplish what in law required "yes" votes, the throwing of the traction system into a receivership with prospects of restoring it for twenty-five years to the old gang—this whole story is one of Wall street strategy and Union Club perfidy. And now that Mayor Johnson has brought about a situation in which the Big Business conspirators of Cleveland are once more at the mercy of the people of Cleveland, it is in the highest degree encouraging to have him declare that the magnanimity which has been so grossly abused in the past shall not be abused again, because there will be none to abuse.

+

We say that the people of Cleveland have the traction ring again at their mercy, and this is true. Next January nearly all the franchises of the old ring will have expired, and three years later none will be left alive. This is absolute, for the Supreme Court of the United States has so decided. As for the low fare franchises, which the old traction ring now controls subject to the receivership, they are terminable at will. Realizing, consequently, the financial danger before them, for bonds as well as stock, the traction ring, with all its Big Business backers, came to the front at first with demands, and then with whining pleas for another settlement. Mayor Johnson and the Council were willing to settle on fair terms to the city and the street car riders, so fixed that there would be no necessity for any new "gentlemen's agreements;" but this didn't suit the ring and its satellites. With the aid of the Chamber of Commerce, they hoodwinked Judge Tayler into lending his influence to an ordinance that would have farmed out the street car riders for twenty-five years to come to the old traction ring. But Mayor Johnson and the Council were not to be bamboozled again. After allowing the dilly dally to go on for two months or more in the hope of a fair deal for the city, they held up the Tayler ordinance for detailed consideration in committee, and adopted the long pending Schmidt ordinance, a grant to the highest bidder, for submission to referendum.

The objections to the Tayler ordinance are in general, three. For one thing, Judge Tayler had been led into recommending a higher maximum fare than the traction ring itself had offered to take. Of course the ring was agreeable, but Mayor Johnson and the Council were not. In the second place, Judge Tayler had provided for arbitration on revaluation of the traction system, the franchise to go to referendum without waiting for the arbitration award and Judge Tayler to appoint the controlling arbitrator. Mayor Johnson and the Council, though willing to have Judge Tayler for arbitrator, were not willing to leave the selection, "sight-unseen" to anybody; nor were they willing to have the people adopt a franchise to the traction ring with blanks in it for subsequently inserting values of the existing property as part of the basis for dividends. For the third thing, Mayor Johnson and the Council insisted that the franchise should provide that if the courts nullified its essential provisions for the protection of the city and the street car riders, the whole franchise should fall; but the Tayler ordinance made no such provision, and the traction ring would not assent to one. Consequently, under this ordinance, were the courts to nullify the protective provisions, the traction ring would get the best of the situation again, and very much the best of it—another one-sided franchise. These are evidently among the reasons why Mayor Johnson characterizes the Tayler franchise as one of the worst, from the standpoint of the car riders, that has been presented to the City Council of Cleveland during the entire railway controversy.

+

Of the Schmidt franchise, now involved in the referendum campaign, it is enough at present to say, what anyone may learn who wishes to, that it is a franchise, on a flat 3-cent fare, for the taking over of all the existing lines as fast as their dying franchises expire. Under it, these lines will be transferred to the city, as soon as it demands it and has legislative authority, for \$1.10 on the dollar of actual cost, the maximum dividends meanwhile to be not more than 6 per cent. Since the investors in the old low fare companies, who now hold stock in the company controlled by the old traction ring, might, in the event of the adopting of this franchise, be left with greatly depreciated stock, they would doubtless be protected by the new company in connection with the acquisition of the present 3-cent lines; for Mayor Johnson has frequently announced during the past two or three months, that under no circumstances will he consent to any settlement or other arrange-

ment which does not secure to all the low fare investors their full capital and its guaranteed dividends.

+

A vital question is now before the people of Cleveland. The issue is clearly drawn. It is between the traction ring on one side, and on the other the public interests for which Mayor Johnson has fought steadily for nine years. It is a vital question, and it involves a fight to the finish. As in the past, so now, Mayor Johnson has all the odds massed against him that Big Business in partnership with corrupt politics and befooled respectability can command. But the City Council has proved its fidelity, and the people of the city are responding with the old enthusiasm. There is no reason to doubt that they will stand behind these men who are standing for them.

+ +

The Chicago School Lands Bill.

The true character of the Commercial Club's bill for reorganizing the public schools of Chicago (p. 555) was crisply exposed by Senator Cruikshank when this bill came before the Senate with a recommendation from the committee on education that it do not pass. We quote from the stenographic report of what occurred in the Illinois Senate on the 28th of May:

Senator Landee—Mr. President, the Committee on Education reports back a bill.

Secretary Paddock.—The Committee on Education reports back House bill No. 588 with a recommendation that it do not pass, but lie on the table.

Senator Jones—Mr. President, I move that the Senate do not concur in the report of the committee.

Senator Cruikshank—Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table. Now, Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I ask leave to state what this bill is, that the gentlemen may know what it is about. [Cries of "Leave," "Leave."] I will make the explanation very brief. This is a bill which gives to the School Board of the city of Chicago the right to lease their properties there for ninety-nine years without re-valuation. If that is a fair proposition, if you gentlemen think that that is a fair proposition, if you would do that with your own property, then I will be satisfied to have you vote this bill in.

Senator Dunlap—Was the Senator a member of the committee that reported the bill out?

Senator Cruikshank—I was, and I was opposed to the passage of the bill—I proposed to the lobby that they put an amendment in there, making it twenty-five years, but they declined to do it. They wanted the ninety-nine years, or none,—

Senator Dunlap—If this goes on second reading, will you not have an opportunity to offer such an amendment?

Senator Cruikshank—And furthermore, I do not believe that the position of the committee ought to be questioned. If these were unimproved lands, there

might be some justice in it, but the land is all improved with permanent structures, and I say that to tie this property up, which is for the benefit of the children of the city of Chicago, and for the benefit of your children, because your boys are coming to the city of Chicago every day and every hour—I say to tie it up for three generations, because the average life of man is thirty-five years—to tie this property up for three generations in the interest of the rich men is an outrage, and I hope the motion will be laid on the table.

Senator Hamilton—If this bill doesn't become a law, is there any law now that provides that a school board may lease property for so long a time?

Senator Cruikshank—That question is now in the courts, and for that reason this bill is here. It is pending in the courts, and is now being litigated, and the fellows who have these leases are afraid of what the court may decide and so they come down here and try to fix it up with a bill.

The lobby referred to by Senator Cruikshank was composed of Theodore W. Robinson, of the steel trust and a Busse appointee of the Chicago school board; of Otto C. Schneider, of the tobacco trust and a Busse appointee of the Chicago school board of which he is president; of a large number of other Big Business representatives; and of the secretary, the attorney, and the assistant attorney of the Board of Education, who were in the lobby under orders from the inner ring of the school board and at school board expense without school board sanction. The "fellows who have these leases" and of whom Senator Cruikshank said that they were "afraid of what the court may decide and so come down here and try to fix it up with a bill," are the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Evening News, and various other business interests which are preying upon the school fund. The Senator Jones who made the lost motion that "the Senate do not concur" in the report of the committee adversely to the bill, a man of abilities and character, is a Senatorial representative of Governor Deneen, who sometimes allows factional obligations to transcend those that are essentially more important.

+ +

The Core of the Social Question.

As defined by Philip Snowden, one of the Labor members of the British House of Commons and a pronounced socialist, socialism may be much more widely accepted than is commonly believed to be possible. In an article on the British budget, which appears in the London Socialist Review for June, Mr. Snowden says: "The main object of socialism is to obtain social wealth for social use; nationalization of the means of production and distribution is not socialism, but the condition of socialism." It will be observed that in this defini-

tion the object of socialism is distinguished from the method which such socialists as Mr. Snowden believe to be necessary for realizing the object, and that the object, however realized, "is to obtain social wealth for social use."

+

Be Mr. Snowden's statement accepted as orthodox or not, it is certainly a correct interpretation of the social problem, whether you call it socialism or something else. For the core of the social problem is such a distribution of values as that the values of individual contributions to wealth shall go to individuals in due proportion while social values go to the community. Every consideration which divides men who seek this result is a consideration of method in contradistinction to object. Questions of exactly what are social as distinguished from individual values, or of how they may be exactly distinguished, or of how the distinction may be practically asserted—all these belong in the category of tactics. The essential consideration is that the aim shall be to render unto the individual the things that are the individual's and unto the community the things that are the community's.

+

To men who devotedly seek this object, it should make little difference whether they are called socialists or not, either in approval or in derision. There is nothing more in a name than in a uniform, except to the unthinking. But there is much, and evil at that, in the pride of cult and of opinion and of organization, which keep apart men who seek the object Mr. Snowden describes. This is one of the things that enable the common enemy to divide and conquer. In fact the dividing is done for them; conquering is all they have to do. So long as any particular kind of wealth is conceded by all shades of progressive thought on the social question to be social wealth, the socialization of that wealth, when the issue is up, should be the object of united effort.

+

It is, therefore, highly gratifying to find the Parliamentary leaders of the Independent Labor party, among whom Mr. Snowden is distinguished, so cordially supporting the land value measures of the British budget; and most earnestly is it to be hoped that their example will be followed by all who believe in socializing social wealth. Whenever and wherever this question comes into practical politics, whether on the issue of land value taxation or of

public ownership of public utilities, or of anything else that reasonably looks toward the socialization of what is social, and in respect of which cooperation of forces offers a fighting chance for realization to that extent, may this union of forces be encouraged. Nothing is to be gained and much is to be lost by segregation over points of difference as to doctrinal exactitude or completeness, when the question at issue in practical politics involves the essential principle.

+ +

The Emma Goldman Affair in New Jersey.

Allen Freeman made good his determination that Emma Goldman should speak in East Orange (p. 532), police or no police. He had engaged a hall for her, but the police forbade the meeting, Russian fashion, without the slightest idea of what she intended to say, and with no evidence whatever that she has in any of her speeches violated any law. Regardless of the prohibition, she undertook to speak; but, intimidated by the police, the hall owner refused to honor his contract. Mr. Freeman then opened his barn for the meeting, and threatened the police with damage suits if they interfered. They did not interfere. And now behold what the Associated Press reports as to this "red handed" woman's "bloody" speech:

The police would not let her talk in English's hall, so she went over to Alden Freeman's barn and told about Sudermann and Hauptmann, and Ibsen, and Brandes, and how their plays had disseminated radical thought. It was a talk that for the most part could have been delivered in a church.

Is it for speeches like this that the police are encouraged by de-Americanized Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution to overturn the most vital principles for which their ancestors fought?

+ +

Reorganization of The Arena.

It is to be deeply regretted that Albert Brandt's brave fight, along with B. O. Flower, to restore the Arena to its old place of wide circulation and strong influence, has resulted in his bankruptcy. But out of this disaster there is promise that the seed these two men have sown together for the Arena will bear fruit in the reorganization, which contemplates continued editorial control by Mr. Flower. The secret is an open one that Mr. Brandt's devotion of energy and money would have won success for the magazine, but for its independence. The business boycott is much more effective than the labor boycott, and the business boycott was thrown across the path of this enter-

prise. A periodical whose policy is genuinely inimical to special interests, one which is loyal to the masses of the people, as the *Arena's* has been, knocks with every issue at the door of the bankruptcy court. It is not very different from an abolition magazine in a slave community, except that the publisher runs less risk of lynching. But the *Arena* has lived through many years of struggle; since it was wrecked by the deposition of Mr. Flower; and as it has become in every way a better magazine under his resumed editorship than in its most prosperous days, the present reorganization may prove to be the beginning of a new and vital career both for Mr. Flower and for the *Arena*.



The Paine Centennial.

The year that brought Abraham Lincoln into the world took out of it a man to whom, more perhaps than to any other, the world is indebted for the possibilities of character and patriotism that were realized in Abraham Lincoln, and this man was Thomas Paine. For Lincoln was a veritable successor of Thomas Jefferson in other respects than as President, and Jeffersonianism had its most thorough exponent in Paine. This may be denied by the ignorant and narrow among the Lincoln hero worshippers; but no one would deny it or be otherwise than proud of Lincoln's indebtedness to Paine, had it not been for the slanders with which religious and political bigotry have associated the name of that great religious and patriotic pamphleteer. When William Cobbett took Paine's body to England from the grave on his farm at New Rochelle, the bitterness which his pamphlets against idolatry in religion and aristocracy in government had excited, was quite appropriately versified by Byron in four lines that were once to be found in Byron's works:

In bringing back the bones of Paine,
Will Cobbett, you've done well.
He visits you on earth again;
You'll visit him in hell.



It is one of the testimonials to Paine's goodness and greatness that he in his life time, and his name for a century afterwards, should have been enshrined by the type of Christian who, as Swinburne puts it, "spits on Christ," and the kind of patriot who hates democracy. Knowing neither Christianity nor patriotism in their essentials, these calumniators of Paine could no more understand him than the chief priests of old could understand the lowly Nazarene. To do good was Thomas Paine's religion, and

all mankind were his countrymen. He believed in one God, and hoped for life beyond the grave. He was a great writer, if great writing is that which stirs the heart to love and the mind to think. In one pamphlet he lifted the Revolutionary impulse in the colonies, from the level of anger at British taxation to the heights of aspiration for American independence. In another, when the days had come which tried men's souls, he re-inspired the American heart with the noblest passions of that long struggle. Washington thanked and honored him. Jefferson numbered him among his friends. Congress thanked him for his services, and gave him the farm from which Cobbett afterwards took his body. He served the people of France when they fought for liberty, for the French also were his countrymen. He would have saved them the political mistake and the moral ignominy of taking the life of the man whose dethronement he had democratically approved. In all his career, he was a true friend, a wise friend, a courageous and plain spoken friend of the plain people, even as Lincoln learned to be; and for that he has been covered with contumely by the ignorant and the bigoted, by the powerful and the idolatrous. To him as to many another like him, Lowell's lines apply; for of him, too, even—

. . . the men he agonized for
Cast the contumelious stone.



TRIVIAL OBJECTIONS TO DIRECT LEGISLATION.

The president of the New Hampshire Bar Association, in speaking before that body at its annual meeting for 1909, made some remarkable criticisms of the Initiative and Referendum. They ought not to pass without public challenge. These were his words, as reported by the Manchester Union of May 11:

Socialism in its various forms is making its attacks upon our institutions of government and society. For instance, the Initiative and Referendum are being urged to the end that the making of laws shall be taken from the representatives of the people, supposedly chosen because of some superior fitness, and given over to the direct action of the majority of the voters. This of course means the overturn of representative government, the probable end of republican institutions. The majority, when actuated by passion or prejudice, may repeal good laws, enact bad ones, or prevent the execution of wise but unpopular ones. If there is virtue in the system created by our national and State constitutions, that system ought not to be subjected to these violent changes simply because some representatives have been recreant to

their trust. Rather should the people be led to show greater care in the selection of their representatives, that the old landmarks may be preserved and the Republic be permitted to work out the high destiny planned by its founders.

These statements are quite at variance with the generally understood meaning of direct legislation. Yet they are so much in harmony with the usual methods of attack that they may well serve as the basis for an exposition of its character and tendency.

✦

We are first assured that "socialism in its various forms is making its attacks upon our institutions of government and society," and the Initiative and Referendum are specified as among these various forms of socialism.

While I presume that many socialists uphold the principles of the Initiative and Referendum, this reform is not essentially socialistic; and many people who are not socialists support direct legislation. At the last election in Oregon, where it is in effect, there were cast for the socialist candidates for Congress, 8,204 votes; at the same election, on nineteen referred measures, the average vote cast was 86,534. It was enacted by popular vote in 1902; the result standing 62,024 for, to 5,668 against. Evidently the socialists are a small fraction of those who enacted it, and a smaller portion of those who use it. Perhaps the president of the New Hampshire Bar Association used the word "socialism" as many other people do, referring to anything different from the established order.

✦

"That the making of the laws shall be taken from the representatives of the people, supposedly chosen because of some superior fitness, and given over to the direct action of the majority of the voters," is stated as the object of direct legislation.

But the Initiative and Referendum do not contemplate taking away one bit of the power of representatives to make laws, so long as those representatives act in accordance with the desires of the majority of the voters. These are the rulers, according to our "old landmarks;" and if the representatives do not do as a majority of the voters wish, ought not their power to be in justice taken from them?

In the beginning, representatives were probably chosen because of some superior fitness; but are they chosen for that reason now? Are they not chosen for the most part either because it is their "turn," or else because they have been faithful

workers for a party? Already we have forsaken the original idea of superior fitness. We already choose our law-makers for other reasons.

A representative form was necessary when our government was founded, owing to difficulties of communication; but now, with the daily and weekly press in a highly developed state, there is no reason why important measures should not be referred to the people, and be decided by a majority of those who have opinions, rather than by a body of men who only "supposedly" represent the people, but often do not.

Again, many things come up in a legislative session, on which the representatives, however honest, cannot possibly know the wishes of their constituents, because the matters were not under consideration at the time of the election. How can they act representatively on such matters, if they have no way of learning the wishes of their constituents?

✦

Direct legislation "means the overturn of representative government, the probable end of republican institutions"!

How can any one come to that conclusion? The Initiative is the whip, the Referendum the curb, of legislators; and as the horse feels neither whip nor curb so long as he obeys his master's will, so the legislator, as long as he acts as a majority of the people wish, would feel neither the lash of the Initiative nor the check of the Referendum. And in the "will of the majority" is the very essence of republican institutions.

If it were said that "the overturn of government by privilege, the end of corporation domination," are involved, one could be in entire accord with the sentiment, for this is what direct legislation would do.

✦

"The majority when actuated by passion or prejudice may repeal good laws, enact bad ones, or prevent the execution of wise but unpopular ones." They might. But does anyone honestly believe that the *majority* would do these things? He who does believe it has lost faith in popular government and might as well say so. When the majority goes wrong, and cannot right itself, it is time for a monarch to order all things for us so that we cannot go wrong.

But what are the results of direct legislation where it has been tried? They show that fears for the safety of the Republic in this respect are groundless.

The results in Switzerland show that republican institutions have been strengthened. The chief

complaints in that country have been from radicals who think the people too conservative.

In our own Oregon the measures passed under direct legislation have not been especially radical. The only measures adopted in Oregon that could be called radical are these: Popular nomination of Senators with instructions to the legislature to vote for the popular choice (and we can hardly blame them for wishing some new way of choosing Senators when we study the history of their elections previous to the adoption of the amendment); and proportional representation, which is an experiment and may be repealed if not satisfactory.

"Violent changes" do not seem to have taken place anywhere under direct legislation.

+

Of course "the people should be led to show greater care in the selection of their representatives." No one interested in good government denies that. But there is nothing in direct legislation which contravenes it. Rather the opposite. Almost always, when two or more candidates are in the field, one is brighter or of better character than the others; but perhaps the one in whom the majority have the most confidence personally, or the one they feel is better qualified in many respects, does not represent the same policy or policies they desire to have enacted into law. Under direct legislation they would be free to vote for the best man, feeling sure that if he, or some other representative, did not secure the desired legislation, they could have the measure submitted by means of the Initiative, directly to the people for their consideration.

It seems to me that many who oppose direct legislation do so because they do not understand it. Any one who clearly understands its principles and their relation to the fundamental principles of our Republic ought not to object to it on the ground of danger to republican institutions. Our government was certainly founded on the "consent of the governed," and the nearer our laws approach the desire of a majority of the governed, the surer shall we be that "the old landmarks will be preserved and the Republic be permitted to work out the high destiny planned by its founders."

GEORGE H. DUNCAN.

+ + +

Say nothing more to thyself than what the first appearances report. Suppose that it has been reported to thee that a certain person speaks ill of thee. This has been reported, but that thou hast been injured, that has not been reported.—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London, June 2nd, 1909.

"The Finance Bill consists of 74 clauses, and of these no fewer than 28 relate to land taxation. This fact is most significant."—The Times, May 29.

The above extract from The Times should suffice to show that at last the great political struggle foreshadowed and championed by the late Sir Henry Campbell has begun in Great Britain. The great budget of 1909 clearly draws the line of demarcation which in the political struggles of the future will separate the sheep from the goats, the true Progressives from the Reactionaries, no matter by what high-sounding name they may call themselves.

The secret enemies of our movement, those who under all manner of pretenses would have the great Liberal Party deal with any and every question save the Land Question, must necessarily soon be driven out of the Liberal ranks, or remaining there will sink into impotence. Old-fashioned Whig politicians, like Lord Welby (see "The Contemporary Review" for June) may loudly argue that "the super-tax on incomes is undoubtedly the most important proposal in the Budget," but the facts cry out more loudly still that, not the super-tax, but the land taxation proposals are the most important proposals, and are the main cause of the vituperative bitterness with which the budget has been greeted by all upholders of privilege and monopoly, masquerading as "property."

+

Mr. Lloyd George, who is a past-master of the art of coining phrases which stick and tell, closed his long budget speech with the words: "This is a war budget! It is a budget for waging implacable war against poverty!" And, whatever its shortcomings, there can be little doubt that its innovations have been made possible by the growing discontent with the persistence and deepening of poverty amidst a superabundance of wealth, which haunts the mind of every thoughtful man.

For almost the first time in the history of the British Parliament it has been laid down there, practically unchallenged, that property in land differs both in its genesis, its properties, and its moral justification from property in products, or even from property in those monuments of past misgovernment, national debts. For the first time the value of land, which for over three centuries has formed the main source of the unearned wealth of the great aristocracy of the country, has been declared to be in a special sense a fit and proper source whence public revenues can equitably be derived. Yes, it is the commencement of a long and implacable war against privilege and poverty, and Lloyd George has had the honor of leading the first attack.

+

As you have already realized, the attitude of the British land reformers is a somewhat reserved one. It may perhaps best be compared with the attitude of the man who at a concert appealed to the audi-

ence not to shoot at the singer, for he was doing his best. Our movement is a growing one, every day adds to our ranks thoughtful men capable of grasping our principles in all their fullness and of defending our practical proposals. Still we dare not overrate our strength; and we feel that the discussion that is now raging throughout the length and breadth of the country can only strengthen us, and necessarily tend to force the proposals for the taxation of land values on to sound and defensible lines.

Whatever their shortcomings from our standpoint,—and there was no reason to attempt to distinguish between developed and undeveloped land, nor between land-values and land-values,—the Government proposals are admirably framed to secure a universal and uniform valuation of the whole of the land of Great Britain; and this necessary first step the Government are evidently determined to secure. The rest will follow in due course. That no one need doubt for a moment.

The Tory press does not leave their readers in doubt on this point. Thus, "The Outlook," a Tory weekly, devoted to the proposal to tax our people through customs duties, under the hollow pretense of "making the foreigner pay," reminded them last week that "there was a time when the income tax stood at two-pence"—it is now over one shilling. Whilst the most ably conducted "Morning Post," the organ of solid and respectable conservatism, commenting on the proposal to tax future unearned increment, says: "Granted that there may be no increment of site value to tax, the valuation will, the socialists think [and today it is fashionable to designate all who are not conservatives as socialists], identify that which has been stolen from the community, and which may be recovered hereafter by means of further taxes." In the face of such warnings it is somewhat saddening to remember that though a twenty shilling in the £ tax, or less, would once and for all stop any further stealing from the community, it would not restore to them anything that has been taken from them in the past.

However, "Let the dead past bury its dead"; to-day the people are demanding neither punishment nor restitution, but they are commencing to demand that a distinction should at once be made between social values, values created and added to by the presence, needs and activities of the whole people, and individual values, values created and added to by the labor of individuals—and that the latter should as far as possible be exempt from taxation, and the former appropriated for social use, for public purposes.

+

Is there on this side of the water the necessary knowledge and the necessary public-spirit to carry through such a policy, now the Liberal policy, to its logical conclusion. Yes, I am inclined to believe that there is, or will be, for we are creating and increasing it day by day.

Have we the right sort of men in politics and on the Liberal side to lead such a movement, and not to be bought, bribed, cajoled or frightened? Yes, I think we have.

When Home Secretary, Asquith did not hesitate to risk his whole future career as a radical politician by manifesting his determination to maintain the

established "law and order" even at the cost of the shedding of blood. "Remember Featherstone," is a cry that might easily have put an end to the career of the man to whom it was applied. But on the whole we are a law-abiding race, we Britishers, and even those who suffer from the prevailing "law and order" do not withhold their meed of sympathy and admiration from those who boldly uphold it, more especially when they are taking sides with those who are demanding its due and constitutional alteration in accordance with changed conceptions of morality, of what is "right" and what is "wrong", of what is social and what is anti-social.

As I have written before (vol. xi, p. 344) Asquith is not a man easy to read. But personally I believe in him. He is continuously vilified, even libelled, in Tory circles, and they know the men they have to fear. To my mind Asquith "willed the budget", if I may use the expression, and Lloyd George, now his right-hand, carried it out, and devoted to it the brilliant energy that characterizes all his activities.

Of Lloyd George's pluck, courage and determination there can also be no question. He practically took his life in his hands when at the height of the war-fever he went to Birmingham to express his opinion of the war and of the man mainly responsible for the war, the idol of the Birmingham mob, who would have killed Lloyd George if only they could have laid hands on him.

The youngest of the prominent Liberal politicians, now President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Winston Churchill, is also brilliant and courageous, and, I think, far-seeing. When in earnest he reveals a realization of the true social problem and a grip of political principles which give both character and force to his speeches. His reply to the leader of the opposition, Mr. A. J. Balfour, during the great budget debate gave forcible expression to sound democratic principles. After boldly emphasizing the view that "land cannot be regarded as an ordinary commodity," he concluded his remarks as follows:

We believe that if Great Britain is to remain great and famous in the world we cannot allow the present social and industrial disorders, with their profound physical and moral reaction, to continue unabated and unchecked. We propose to you a financial system; we also unfold a policy of social reorganization which will demand sacrifice from all classes, but which will give security to all classes. By its means we shall be able notably to control some of the most wasteful processes at work in our social life; and without it let the Committee be sure that our country will remain exposed to some fatal dangers against which fleets and armies are of no avail.

It is such speeches that are giving Winston Churchill a hold on the thoughtful democracy of the country which, if life and health be preserved to him, may take him to the foremost place in the political world in the near future.

In truth, our people are outgrowing the un instructed talk, animated by vague communistic leanings, enforced by appeals to ignorance and prejudice, which had such a hold of them some twenty years ago, and which characterizes both the utterances and the work of that most disappointing man, now the head of the Local Government Office, Mr. John Burns. They want something better, more satisfying and more convincing; and only those who can satisfy this

growing want will have any chance in the Liberal party to-day in course of formation.

And if we look at the younger men rallying around the party we can see plenty already capable or rapidly learning to respond to this call. Mr. Alexander Ure, the Lord Advocate for Scotland, Mr. Hemmerde, and our staunch and ever active friend Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood are already doing fine work, laying firm the foundations for future progress, and teaching ever-growing audiences to look for something better and more elevating than mere political party talk, uninspired by any real conviction. That the land question is necessarily the bottom question, the root question, in which the key to the labor problem, the social problem, can alone be found; and that the taxation of land values offers the master key to its effective solution, is the theme of all their utterances.

And their views are being echoed and upheld with ever increasing knowledge and zeal by the more prominent members of the Labor party, whose advent into the political arena was so bitterly resented by old-fashioned Liberals, but which has done so much to breathe a more earnest and more strenuous spirit into both Imperial and local politics.

+

Yes, the logic of facts, supplemented by some real hard and consistent work during the past twenty years, has brought our question into the very forefront of the political struggle in the "Mother of Parliaments," and with its advent we can see the gleam of the dawn of a better day for the disinherited and impoverished industrial masses of the world. The struggle for social justice, equal opportunity, and true economic freedom has begun in real earnest; and though it will doubtless be a long and a bitter one, those of us who have helped to sow the seed need not now doubt the ultimate harvest.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FROM A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Westminster, June 4.

This is just a line of thanks to you for your sympathy with us over here at our success in the budget. Hughes is right (p. 486). To us "of the Religion" it is all one whether our cause goes forward in England, America, Australia or Germany, for we are bound together by something more than the ties of nationality.

Do not fancy, however, for one moment that we are singing—or going to sing—the "Nunc dimittis." We have only got a pulling infant as yet. It must be not only protected from the forces of reaction ranged against it on all sides in the House of Commons and House of Lords; it has also got to grow.

Our Budget is pretty radical all round, but the natural way in which all propertied opposition is gravitating towards and concentrating on the land clauses should act as a lesson for all time to all radicals and socialists, that the road, and the only effective road, to smash the present industrial system lies in these doctrines of Henry George.

JOSIAH C. WEDGWOOD.

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, June 15, 1909.

The Cleveland Traction Situation.

The traction question in Cleveland (pp. 563, 564) will come before the people of that city in July or August, when they will be afforded an opportunity to vote on the Schmidt ordinances which are intended to divest the old monopoly interests of traction control.

+

It was at the Council meeting on the 7th that the preliminary steps were completed, after the Cleveland Railway directors had voted not to accept the ordinance adopted by the Council on the 4th (p. 564). Although Judge Tayler had washed his hands of the whole matter (p. 563), he subsequently prepared a settlement ordinance acceptable to Mr. Andrews and his group and to the men in the Council who have all along supported that side of the controversy, and it was introduced as soon as the Council came to order. It was immediately referred to the street railway committee, to the Council as a committee of the whole, and to the City Solicitor; and the Council proceeded to consideration of the Schmidt grant of a twenty-five year franchise (p. 564) on Payne avenue from Superior avenue to East Fifty-fifth street. After debate on this franchise, which is subject to referendum, the Council adopted it by a vote of 24 to 7. When that had been done, Chairman Koch of the street railway committee called a meeting of the Council in committee of the whole for the 8th to take up the pending ordinances granting Schmidt extensions to the Payne avenue grant all over the city. The effect of the adoption by the people of these franchises will be to transfer the whole traction system of Cleveland (except a few franchises expiring in three years), within the next seven months, to the Payne avenue grantee, Mr. Schmidt, on a straight 3-cent fare basis, with municipal ownership rights as soon as the law of the State permits and the people of the city desire. Just before the Council adjourned on the 7th, Mayor Johnson said, as reported in The Plain Dealer:

As long as the street railway question is not settled by a referendum vote on any of the pending propositions, I purpose to urge a popular vote for

the proposal that is most advantageous for the car riders. I expect at once to get out the tents and hold public meetings, at which every citizen will be given an opportunity to discuss every side of the traction question. This discussion, in advance of a referendum, will assist the people to vote intelligently and with all the facts before them. If in the meantime the Cleveland Railway Company comes forward with a better proposal, then I will publicly advocate its acceptance and the abandonment of all other suggested settlements.

+

Early on the 8th, four referendum petitions were put in circulation—one by the Citizens' Referendum League, one by the street railway men's union, one by the Chamber of Commerce, and one by the Mayor and Council. The last of the four has been sufficiently signed to insure a referendum.

+

The referendum campaign was opened on the 11th by Mayor Johnson in one of his big tents. The report of this meeting in *The Plain Dealer*, which opposes the ordinance under referendum, indicates that Mayor Johnson is getting the support of the people as fully as he got that of the Council, which voted for the ordinance 24 to 7, and for the same reasons, namely that he is convincing them. The *Plain Dealer's* report of this first meeting in the referendum campaign says that—

Mayor Johnson opened his referendum campaign on the Schmidt 3-cent fare traction ordinance before a large and friendly audience at Superior avenue and East Fifty-first street last night. Vigorous in speech and full of fight, the Mayor faced a volley of questions, all of which he answered to the apparent satisfaction of the crowd.

The wide discussion of the traction question, covering the period since the Mayor first appeared as a candidate nine years ago, up to the developments of the last few days, was frequently applauded.

Councilman E. B. Haserodt was chairman of the meeting. City Solicitor Baker and City Clerk Witt joined with the Mayor in pleading for popular approval of the Schmidt ordinance as a means, they said, of settling the railway tangle and settling it right.

With all the emphasis at his command, Mayor Johnson announced he was through with treating liberally with defeated foes. "I believe the great majority of the people are through with liberality to the Cleveland Railway Company, and now stand for justice and justice alone," said the Mayor. As a prelude to his discussion of the Tayler ordinance Mayor Johnson declared his admiration for Judge Tayler as a man. He then proceeded to pick the Tayler ordinance to pieces, characterizing it as one of the worst grants from the standpoint of the car riders that has been presented to the City Council during the entire railway controversy. "We must never turn over this property to unfriendly hands without all possible safeguards to the city," said the Mayor. "And the Tayler ordinance, not his plan, but his ordinance, omits many of the most vital

things necessary to properly protect the people of this city. Judge Tayler's heart is all right. He is for the people, but he has been deceived. The approaching referendum will not be on Payne avenue alone. It will be on the Payne avenue line and extensions to thirteen other routes that will permit free transfers connecting with all the 3-cent lines on the West Side. The Cleveland Railway Company will be left with but four lines—Euclid avenue, Cedar avenue, Broadway and West Fourteenth street, on which franchises do not expire for from three to four years. But once this Schmidt grant is upheld the railway company will be begging for a settlement. The four remaining lines will not earn enough to pay interest on the bonds. A settlement will come the moment the Schmidt ordinance is ratified at the polls."

"How about a year ago?" came a question. "Did not you promise the railway question would be settled at that time?"

"What he says is true," responded the Mayor. "Now let us see what happened. Mr. F. H. Goff and the city agreed to a settlement. A compromise was made in the interest of a settlement. And here I want to say that the compromise was a mistake, one of the mistakes of the Municipal Traction Company. Well, we agreed to a settlement and in perfect good faith went before the people. The proposition was defeated by about 600 in a total vote of 80,000. But what had transpired in the interim? We allowed some \$3,000,000 for good will. What did we get? We got a strike organized by John J. Stanley and the bitterest enemies of the people's railway. Clubs were organized to assist in cheating the company out of fares, some \$3,000 a month. The enemies of the people did everything human ingenuity could devise to defeat an agreement they had sworn as men to support. It is a wonder under the circumstances the Municipal Traction Company ever ran a car. We accepted an unpopular grant. We accepted the verdict of the people. And now the Cleveland Railway Company will have to accept a verdict of the people. Here is a prophecy. There never will be a settlement as good as the one we accepted a year ago and they repudiated."

+ +

Municipal Election in Portland.

At the municipal election in Portland, Oregon, on the 8th, the Republicans made a clean sweep. Their candidate for Mayor, Joseph Simon, was elected by a clear majority of nearly 200 over the Democratic, the Socialist, the Prohibition and the Independent candidates.

+

There was also initiative and Referendum voting on as many as 35 questions, the result showing purposeful discrimination throughout, even though valuable proposals were defeated. Among the 13 measures that carried were the following of general interest:

Requiring holders of franchises to file quarterly reports: 10,068 for, and 4,449 against. Affirmative majority 5,619. Woman's Auxiliary to police department: 7,939 for, and 6,964 against. Affirmative majority, 975. Placing burden of proof on all discharged civil

service employees: 8,356 for, and 6,077 against. Affirmative majority 2,279.

Among the 22 that were defeated, were the following of general interest:

Vehicle tax ordinance: 7,345 for, and 7,919 against. Negative majority, 574.

Prohibiting use of patented article or process in street improvement: 2,828 for, and 12,036 against. Negative majority, 9,208.

Payment for water mains by benefited property: 3,848 for, and 10,738 against. Negative majority, 6,890.

Des Moines plan of city charter: 4,936 for, and 10,676 against. Negative majority, 5,740.

The aggregate vote on these questions was quite constant at approximately 15,000, while the aggregate vote for mayor was approximately 18,000.

+

Regarding the defeat of the Des Moines charter proposal, an editorial correspondent advises us that—

all the interests, or strong property "vested rights" and franchise holders, were opposed to it. The Oregonian was bitterly opposed, and maligned it. The politicians who fatten on ward councilmen, and their adherents were opposed to it. The "Uncertains," the "Don't Understands," and the conservatively-minded were opposed to it. I therefore think that on the whole the favorable vote, though small, is a pretty hopeful sign of what can be done with more time for educational work. The masses of the people themselves were easily frightened with the cry, "What! Will you give despotic power over this city and millions of property to six men?" It takes time to get the masses to understand the safety in a responsible few. On the whole, it is a remarkable showing, I think, for the Initiative, because most questions were decided sanely. Both extremes say so. The result scarcely justifies the conclusion of the Oregonian's editorial syllogism: The people have sanely decided on 35 complicated questions; ergo, the Initiative should be revoked!

+ +

The Tariff in Congress.

By a yea and nay vote of 40 to 30 on the 9th, the Senate adopted the finance committee's amendment to the House tariff bill (p. 563), and thereby restored the Dingley wool tariff. The adverse Republican vote was 9—Beveridge, Bristow, Brown, Burkett, Clapp, Cummins, Dolliver, La Follette and Nelson. In one of the controversies over this question, Senator Warren of Wyoming sarcastically asked Senator La Follette what had been the net result of his enlightening Congress on "the interests they were serving," to which Senator La Follette replied: "The result has been pretty good," for "when I came here I stood alone, and now there are a dozen who stand with me." He added: "And the results will be better, let me tell the Senator from Wyoming. The lines will be broken not only in the Middle and extreme West, but in the East as well. I think I know what I

am talking about." In the course of his speech following this controversy, Senator La Follette declared that President Taft could not have carried the last election if the voters had not interpreted the Chicago platform to mean that the Republican party was pledged to tariff revision downward. Amendments proposed by Senator La Follette, looking to a reduction of the tariff on woolen goods, were voted down on the 11th by 44 to 32. When the vote disposing of the woolen schedules had been taken, Senator Aldrich provoked a stinging reply from Senator La Follette by inquiring how Republican protectionists could explain their votes against the protection principle to their constituents, saying: "It is easy to carry this revision downward to an extreme that will destroy the confidence of the people of the United States that we intend to maintain the protective policy at all," and concluding that his own position would need no defense. Said Senator La Follette in reply:

Assuming that the Senator from Rhode Island is right, it is an impeachment of his leadership of the Republican side of this body. The want of confidence which has come to some Republican members of this body of that leadership would find justification in his course here today if it never had before. He knows well the position in which the Republican side has been placed in attempting to find their way along the path of duty in the consideration of this great measure. What aid, what assistance has been given it by the chairman of this great committee? Reserving his information upon this bill until he has compelled everybody to vote upon it paragraph by paragraph, does he expect to instill Republican confidence in Republican leadership of this body? Suppose we have blundered, and he as leader of the Republican side has aided in bringing us into a position of embarrassment before the Republican constituencies of our various States. The Senator from Rhode Island, with all his craftiness has placed nothing before the Senate that will embarrass us who voted for this amendment. I say to that Senator that I come from a State where by long training the people demand reasons for what their representatives do. The Senator says his vote will not need any defense. That is true. He has built up a system in the State of Rhode Island under which 11 per cent of the voting population can control the election of a United States Senator. He comes from a State where it is possible for a man to maintain political supremacy and put through franchises for 999 years to public service corporations. He can vote as he will. He does not have to explain. It is just as well that the Senator from Rhode Island should attempt to put this bill through without explanation. He cannot by any legislative trick, arguing amendments after they have been voted upon, confuse the minds of Senators here who have been exercising some independence, by inciting terror or timidity.

In an all-Sunday session on the 13th, the Senate finance committee decided to recommend reduction of the duty on coal but to strike out the provision for reciprocal trade in coal with Canada.

Interest is reported to be centering now on the income tax proposals upon which Senators Cummins and Bailey have come to an agreement.

+ +

The British Budget.

In committee of the whole in the House of Commons the budget (p. 561) was adopted on the 10th by a vote of 366 to 209. The Irish members voted against it on account of the increased tax proposed on whiskey, thereby cutting down the Liberal majority about half but leaving nevertheless as large a majority margin as 157. By the same vote the finance bill was passed to second reading.

+

From the official copy of the Finance Bill, now before us, we are able to state exactly what is the land values taxation plan of the Ministry. It varies from previous newspaper reports. Three kinds of land value are defined, namely, "increment value," "site value of undeveloped land," and "mineral rights," and in respect of these the following provisions are made:

"Increment Value" is "the amount (if any) by which the site value of the land . . . exceeds the original site value of the land," upon its (1) transfer, (2) lease, or (3) passing at death of owner, and (4), in "respect only of land held by a body corporate or unincorporate," also upon its periodical revaluations, in 1914 and every 15 years thereafter. In arriving at the "increment value," there is to be deducted so much value as the Commissioners attribute to (a) structures, (b) personal good will, or (c) other personal consideration, and (d), in the case of agricultural land, so much as "is due solely to its capacity for agricultural purposes." Upon the "increment value" thus ascertained, being the excess over original site value, an "increment value duty" of £1 in £5 (20 per cent) is to be imposed by a stamp tax.

"Site Value of Undeveloped Land," is the original site value of land which (1) "has not been developed by being built upon, or (2) by being used bona fide for any business, trade, or industry other than agriculture," or which (3), "having been so developed becomes vacant or unoccupied, or ceases to be used for the purposes for which it has been developed," for one year. In arriving at the "site value of undeveloped land," there is to be deducted the value (a) of mineral deposits, (b) of land the site value of which does not exceed £50 an acre, (c) of so much of the site value as is "value of the land for agricultural purposes," (d) of spaces "open to the public as of right" or of "benefit to the public as contributing to the amenity of the locality," or for games, and (e) of land "not exceeding an acre in extent valued together with a dwelling-house for the purpose of inhabited house duty." Upon the "site value of undeveloped land," thus ascertained, an "undeveloped land duty" of "one-half penny for every twenty shillings of that site value" (about 2 mills to the dollar) is to "be charged, levied and paid for every financial year."

"Mineral Rights" are the "capital value of minerals," which "shall be taken to be the value adopted as

the original capital value of those minerals, or, where the capital value of those minerals has been ascertained under any subsequent periodical valuation thereof for the time being in force, the value as so ascertained." In arriving at the capital value of "mineral rights" there is to be deducted (a) sums spent "on boring or other operations carried out by the owner or his predecessor in title for the purpose of bringing the minerals into working;" or (b) where the minerals have been partly worked, "such part of those sums as is . . . proportionate to the amount of minerals ungoten." Upon the "capital value of minerals," thus ascertained, a "mineral rights duty" of a half penny for every twenty shillings of that capital value" (about 2 mills to the dollar) is to be "charged, levied and paid for every financial year."

Methods of Valuation. For purposes of valuation (except of "mineral rights") "the total value of land means the amount which the fee simple of the land, if sold at the time in the open market by a willing seller in its then condition, might be expected to realize;" and "the site value of land means the amount which the fee simple of the land, if sold at the time in the open market by a willing seller, might be expected to realize, if the land were divested of any buildings and of any other structures (including fixed or attached machinery) on, in, or under the surface, which are appurtenant to or used in connection with any such buildings, and of all growing timber, fruit trees, fruit bushes, and other things growing thereon." In making this estimate the land is to "be deemed to be sold free from incumbrances, but subject to" any restrictive easements or covenants antedating April 30, 1909, which are necessary in the public interest "or in view of the character and surroundings of the neighborhood;" and there is to be deducted (a) the value of permanent improvements and (b) the cost of divesting it of the improvements necessary "for the purpose of realizing the full site value." For purposes of "mineral rights" valuation, "the total value of minerals means the amount which the fee simple of the minerals if sold in the open market by a willing seller in their then condition, might be expected to realize; and the capital value of minerals means the total value," after allowing deductions, noted as *a* and *b* in the paragraph above defining "mineral rights." In respect of all valuations—(1) "increment value," (2) "site value of undeveloped land," and (3) "mineral rights"—the Commissioners are immediately to require returns "from all owners of land," except of agricultural land in Ireland, "declaring the total value and the site value respectively of their land as estimated in each case by the owners, that value being declared separately as respects each piece of the land which is under separate occupation, and, if the owner thinks fit, as respects any part of any land which is under separate occupation, and being estimated as on the 30th day of April, 1909." For mineral land a separate return must be made. If in any case the owner fails to make a return, the Commissioners make it for him without appeal. If he refuses to amend his return satisfactorily to the Commissioners upon their demand, they amend it for him subject to appeal to a referee appointed by the government, who may if he thinks fit, submit questions of law to the High Court for an opinion. For the purpose of obtaining periodical valuations the Commissioners are required "in the year 1914, and in every subsequent fifth year" to

"cause returns to be obtained" in the same manner as before, "from all owners of undeveloped land and minerals, declaring the site value of the land or the capital value of the minerals as on the 30th day of April in that year." All tenants and landlords' agents are required to disclose the names and addresses of the persons receiving rents from or through them.

* * *

Australian Politics.

The Labor party ministry, which has had six months of nominal power in the Commonwealth (vol. xi, pp. 805, 918), has been driven from office by a hostile coalition. This ministry was without real power, for it had only 27 out of the total membership of 74; but Mr. Deakin, the Protectionist ex-Prime Minister (whom it had defeated on an unimportant point and who had consequently resigned), gave it his support, pending a reconstruction of his political fences. Having accomplished this by means of a coalition with the Free Trade leader, Mr. Cook, he has turned the labor ministry out. The situation is editorially summarized by the Labour Leader of London in its issue of June 4th. Alluding to the Labor party of the Commonwealth, it says:

They were conscious that they were only in office on sufferance, either so long as their policy was sufficiently moderate to suit Mr. Deakin, or until the other two parties could settle their differences and unite on the common ground of their antagonism to the Labor party. The retiring ministry has been in no sense a distinctively Labor government. Mr. Fisher, the premier, has simply followed on the lines of his predecessor, Mr. Deakin. No difference between the two has become apparent, except perhaps that Mr. Fisher has advocated a Federal land tax, which Mr. Deakin considered premature until the States had shown they were not prepared to act. The Government has devoted itself mainly to furthering the two main items in the Deakin programme, namely, the "new Protection" and the foundation of an Australian navy. This latter desire is the real explanation of Mr. Fisher's unwillingness to follow the example of New Zealand in presenting a Dreadnought to the Imperial navy. The "new Protection" is a proposal for the establishment of excise duties on home manufactures, with the object of ensuring that some part of the benefits of Protection shall go to the work people. There has been nothing in the policy or the actions of this Labor ministry to excite the admiration of Labor parties in other parts of the world, except that these workmen ministers have shown at least equal capacity for statesmanship and government. The absence of a distinctive Labor policy is of course accounted for by the conditions under which they held office. They were not in a position to command a majority; they were permitted to act only with the consent of a more moderate party.

* * *

"Dat Darwinian theory," said Uncle Eben, "wouldn't worry me none if I could be good an' sure dat some of us weren't doublin' on de trail."—Washington Star.

NEWS NOTES

—Edward Everett Hale died at Roxbury, Mass., on the 10th. at the age of 87.

—Governor Deneen has signed the Illinois legislative bill (p. 538) forbidding cruel experiments on living animals in the public schools and requiring the teaching of kindness.

—Part of a native constabulary company at Davao, Mindanao, Philippine Islands, (pp. 351, 542), was reported from Manila on the 13th as having mutinied on June 6, and attacked the American officers and others, many being killed or wounded on each side.

—The 69th National Conference of Charities and Corrections opened at Buffalo on the 9th. On the 14th Jane Addams was unanimously elected president for the ensuing year. It is the first time in the history of the organization that a woman has been elected to this office.

—The report of the board of engineers of the War Department relative to a 14-foot ship canal from the Lakes to the Gulf (p. 565) reached Congress on the 10th. It is in effect that the work would require 18 years, and cost \$159,000,000. The cost from St. Louis to the Gulf would alone cost \$128,000,000.

—The arbitration commission in the Georgia Railroad case (p. 539) met at Washington on the 9th. It consists of Hilary A. Herbert of Alabama for the railway, Thomas W. Hardwick of Georgia for its white employes, and a third to be selected by these two, but whose selection has not yet been reported.

—The home rule charter for Milwaukee (p. 565) appears after all to have been defeated in the Legislature of Wisconsin. For this result the Milwaukee Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association are held responsible, their opposition having been due to the referendum provisions and their fear of the Socialist vote.

—A grant for subways was adopted by the city council of Cleveland on the 7th. It gives to the Cleveland Underground Rapid Transit Co. the right to operate both high and low level underground railways connecting all the important transportation centers of the city, and is to be submitted to referendum at the general municipal election in November.

—Single tax speakers who think of taking vacations this summer on or near the shores of Narragansett Bay, which are much patronized for summer outings, are notified by George D. Liddell (62 Meeting street, Providence) that they will be welcomed by the Rhode Island Tax Reform Association for speeches at open air meetings in Providence and vicinity.

—After a hard fight to head off a progressive charter under the Colorado law, and to that end to defeat James W. Bucklin, the head of the progressive ticket for members of the charter convention at Grand Junction, Colo. (p. 373), a so-called "independent," but reactionary movement, withdrew from the contest and on the 8th the Bucklin ticket was elected without opposition.

—A charter bill for the complete reconstruction of municipal government in Boston has been signed

by the Governor and is now a law. It provides for alternative plans for adoption at a referendum, one of them a modification of the Des Moines plan. The modification consists mainly in omitting the initiative and referendum features and limiting the recall to the Mayor after he has been in office two years out of a four-year term.

—One of the best known of the old-time Henry George men of Chicago, John Black, died at his home in South Chicago on the 13th, after suffering five months from neuritis, at the age of 64. Mr. Black was a prosperous hardware dealer who had come to Chicago from Scotland and ranked high for fair dealing and public spirit. His marine trade made him a notable and respected man among captains and vessel men all over the Great Lakes.

—The monthly statement of the United States Treasury Department (p. 471) for May, 1909, shows the following thus far for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash balance.....	119,901,308.96
Total	\$269,901,308.96
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1908	389,557,933.16
Decrease	\$119,656,624.20

—The hatters' strike (p. 84) has been temporarily compromised, with an agreement for arbitration. The union label is not to be a subject of arbitration, however, the union workers having consented to suspend the use of the label on the product of the factories for 90 days, thus removing any obstacle which the manufacturers might claim was established by their association agreement. At the end of 90 days, the withdrawal of the manufacturers from the association will go into effect, and it is believed that the union workmen will then insist on the reinstatement of the label, which may or may not cause trouble.

—The first class to take a full course in the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy (158 Adams street), of which Graham Taylor, Julia C. Lathrop and Sophronisba P. Breckinridge are the directors, and Edith Abbott is in charge of the Research Department, was graduated on the 4th. It consisted of eleven members, seven of whom were women, and four men. They came from Michigan, Wisconsin, California, Ohio, Texas and Illinois. All of them had either graduated from college, university and professional school, or had qualified themselves to take this training by experience in practical philanthropic work.

—Governor Deneen has signed the inheritance tax bill passed by the Illinois legislature (p. 537) which increases the rate on collaterals on all inheritances over \$20,000 from 1 per cent to 4 per cent. The exemptions in the old law of \$2,000 to collaterals and \$20,000 to direct heirs is retained. Where the beneficial interest passes to the father, mother, husband, wife, child, brother, sister, wife or widow of the son or husband of the daughter or adopted child, the tax will be \$3 on every \$100 of market value when the amount exceeds \$100,000 and \$1 on each \$100 when it is between \$100,000 and \$20,000. Where the beneficial interest passes to any uncle, aunt, niece or nephew or their lineal descendants the tax is made \$4 on each \$100 market value of over \$20,000 and \$2 on every

\$100 of market value under \$20,000. In all other cases the rate is as follows: Estates of \$10,000 and less, \$3 per \$100 valuation; from \$10,000 to \$20,000, \$4 per \$100 valuation; from \$20,000 to \$50,000, \$5 per \$100 valuation; from \$50,000 to \$100,000, \$6 per \$100 valuation. All over 100,000, \$100 per \$100 valuation. There is a section providing for the compromise of tax on contingent remainders, which will affect such estates as that of Marshall Field.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (p. 471) for May, 1909, shows the following thus far for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909:

Receipts—	
Tariff	\$272,829,789.75
Internal revenue	222,889,462.74
Miscellaneous	50,641,048.04
Total	
\$546,360,300.53	
Expenses—	
Civil and miscellaneous.....	\$145,515,094.98
War	120,338,514.16
Navy	106,789,869.24
Indians	14,798,008.94
Pensions	149,955,423.20
Public Works	85,173,519.96
Interest	21,647,971.98
Total	
\$644,218,402.46	
Deficit	
\$ 97,858,101.93	

—The special committee on taxation in Rhode Island provided for by the legislature as a substitute for the proposed law remodelling taxation (p. 202), has issued a circular letter to State, city and town officials, banks, city and town councils, boards of assessors, members of the bar, members of the legislature, public service and other corporations, manufacturers, trade and real estate organizations, insurance companies and others interested in questions of taxation, which requests their opinion upon the operation of the present tax laws of the State, both as to subjects and amounts of taxation, and their advice as to what changes are desirable both as to the character and application of laws to the taxation of property, and as to what new methods of taxation, if any, are advisable.

PRESS OPINIONS

The Heart of the Tariff Problem.

New York Journal of Commerce (financial), June 8. —This tariff problem is really one of principle and of reasoning rather than of details of statistics and the adjustment of taxation between countries so as to equalize their advantages and disadvantages. As a matter of reasoning, it seems plain that the returns in production, whether to labor or capital, will depend upon the natural resources and advantages of the country and the energy and capacity of the people, and not upon restricting intercourse with other countries and hindering an exchange of products. It is certain that the hunt for differences in cost of production and the attempt to regulate trade and promote industries by taxing imports in proportion to these differences are futile and foolish as a national policy.

* *

The Protected Sugar Trust.

La Follettes (ind. Rep.), June 5.—The sugar trust still monopolizes the sugar refining business. It does

so by means of the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color," in the Payne-Aldrich bill. Those words prevent the importation of all unrefined sugars which are so light in color as to be fit for use. Those words might just as well read "no sugar shall be imported except such as must go to the sugar trust's refineries to be whitened." Of course, any kind of sugar can be imported, but the tariff is so arranged that the importer loses money unless he deals with the trust. That is the way it works outside the tariff wall. Inside the wall, you, the consumer, must deal with the trust, because it is supreme in sugar.

+ +

Land Values Taxation in England.

The New Orleans Item (ind.), June 3.—David Lloyd-George, the bold Chancellor of the British Exchequer, seems to be going far toward the single tax goal pointed to by Henry George as the cure for poverty. . . . This proves that the fundamental truth underlying the late economist's ideas is being recognized, not necessarily that the single tax will be adopted in England or anywhere else in the rigid form advocated by its apostle, but rather that it will be made a part of the assessment system which the people all over the world are beginning to insist upon as a substitute for the unequal methods now in vogue.

+ +

Limiting the Labor Output.

The Chicago Daily Socialist (Soc.), June 15.—Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University, has risen in righteous indignation to denounce the restriction of production by trade unions. . . . President Wilson probably never heard of a "racer" or "pacemaker." He has never seen old men, men weak from sickness or hunger, compelled to keep pace with a highly trained athletic workman, who had, in turn, been bribed to exert himself to the utmost. He has not seen these things take place where such feverish haste meant imminent danger of deadly crippling accidents. If he had, he might possibly consider the union regulation limiting output as a simple law against murder. President Wilson never worked in the United States steel mills or in the Chicago packing houses, where monstrous and complicated mechanism compels the human cog who fits into this mechanical monster to move with it or be crushed—crushed either literally in the iron and steel machines or thrown out of work to be crushed by the equally pitiless and deadly social machine. He has not seen these "mechanical bosses" speeded just a trifle faster each month and year until only the youngest and strongest can stand the pace. This means that when the youth of the race is ground into profits the manhood and old age are thrown out to die—with no Carnegie pension fund to fall back upon, such as stands ready to care for President Wilson should he live past the age of active service.

+ +

The Blind Who Will Not See.

The (London) Westminster Gazette (Lib.) May 15 (weekly ed.).—As for land, the House has this week listened to a rehearsal of possible hard cases. . . . According to this line of argument, it passes the wit of man to make any distinction between the unearn-

ed increment in land and the increases in any other kind of property; and if there were such a distinction, it would pass the wit of the Government and its revenue department to devise any machinery for taking it from the landlord or for preventing the landlord from taking it out of other people. . . . Mr. Harold Cox, who is the cleverest exponent of the view that the landed increment is indistinguishable from other increments, told the House of Commons on Wednesday that a doctor who increased his practice from "residence in a rapidly growing Colonial town" was on the same footing as the landlord who owns the land and draws a rapidly increasing revenue from this growth. This is really too much for common-sense. We think of the doctor toiling around that expanding neighborhood, and putting in an extra hour's work for every extra guinea he puts into his pocket, while the landlord may reside elsewhere and take his ease on the wealth which flows in automatically. The doctor, moreover, is always subject to the incursion of another doctor, who will have a shot at any piece of this earned increment which may be going, whereas the landlord may enjoy his repose in the blessed assurance that no one else can enter into his domain of the unearned. Mr. Cox supplies us with an excellently vivid and concrete illustration of the very distinction which he denies. Obviously there is a distinction between the doctor who earns his increase and the landlord who does not, and obviously it is a vital fact that the landlord enjoys a monopoly and the doctor does not. And if, when it is necessary to raise more taxation, we have to choose between taxing the landlord and taxing the doctor, common-sense and common fairness say again, tax the landlord rather than the doctor, for in the one case you are taxing property which, however legitimate, is in a very real sense created by the community, and in the other you are taxing skill and industry and making it harder for a man to render services to the community. . . . If we take the undeveloped land tax and the unearned increment duty together there is no particular reason why a landlord should not be left to make his own valuation; for if he undervalues for the undeveloped tax, he or his successor will run the risk of being heavily hit by the unearned increment tax when the land changes hands or passes in succession. The balancing of these liabilities is likely to lead to a sufficiently fair valuation for all practical purposes without much pressure from the authorities. The mechanism of these taxes will therefore, in all probability, be a good deal easier than some critics (with whom the wish is father to the thought) have led us to suppose, and in these days their justice is scarcely ever challenged. In our own Colonies, in Germany, and other European countries, it is taken for granted that there is a distinction between land and other property and that the value which accrues to it from the growth or exertions of the community is a proper object of taxation.

+ + +

"Why don't you exert your influence in this graft matter?" asked the public-spirited citizen when he met the newspaper proprietor. "It's a much-needed reform." "I know it's a good thing," was the reply. "But the trouble is that one of the other papers took it up first."—Puck.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

NEW YORK, FROM A SKYSCRAPER.

Up in the heights of the evening skies I see my
City of cities float
In sunset's golden and crimson dyes: I look, and a
great joy clutches my throat!
Plateau of roofs by canyons crossed: windows by
thousands fire-unfurled—
O gazing, how the heart is lost in the Deepest
City of the World!

O sprawling City! Worlds in a world! Housing
each strange type that is human—
Yonder a Little Italy curled—here the haunt of the
Scarlet Woman—
The night's white Bacchanals of Broadway—the
Ghetto pushcarts ringed with faces—
Wall Street's roar and the Plaza's play—a weltering
focus of all Earth's races!

Walking your Night's many-nationed byways—brush-
ing Sicilians and Jews and Greeks—
Meeting gaunt Bread Lines on your highways—
watching night-clerks in your flaming
peaks—
Marking your Theaters' outpour of splendor—paus-
ing on doorsteps with resting Mothers—
I have marveled at Christs with their messages ten-
der, their daring dream of a World of Broth-
ers!

Brothers? What means Irish to Greek? What the
Ghetto to Morningside?
How shall we weld the strong and the weak while
millions struggle with light denied?
Yet, but to follow these Souls where they roam—
ripping off housetops, the city's mask—
At Night I should find each one in a Home, at Morn-
I should find each one at a Task!

Labor and Love, four-million divided—surely the
millions at last are a-move—
Surely the Brotherhood-slant is decided—the Social
Labor, the Social Love!
Surely four millions of Souls close-gathered in this
one spot could stagger the world—
O City, Earth's Future is Mothered and Fathered
where your great streets feel the Man-tides
hurled!

For the Souls in one car where they hang on the
straps could send this City a-wing through
the starred—
Each man is a tiny Faucet that taps the infinite res-
ervoir of God!—
What if they turned the Faucet full stream? What
if our millions to-night were aware?
What if to-morrow they built to their Dream the City
of Brothers in laughter and prayer?
—James Oppenheim, in the American Magazine.

ONE OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

Edith J. Arnold in the Christian Commonwealth, of
London, for March 31, 1909.

"I beg pardon," said the Corn Merchant, look-
ing considerably startled.

"I want work!" said the Angel, gently. "I saw
your advertisement, or, rather, a reflection of it, in
the 'Celestial Mirror.'"

"Ah, yes," said the Corn Merchant, recovering
somewhat from his surprise. "I am honored, I am
sure. I shall be only too pleased. Just now we
are very busy—cable reports of failure of harvest
in several parts; and we are buying up accord-
ingly."

"In order that the poor man may not suffer,"
said the Angel, sympathetically. "I see."

"Well—er—not quite that," said the Corn Mer-
chant. He was slightly disconcerted, but he made
an effort to adapt himself to his listener. "If I
remember rightly, that was not exactly Joseph's
plan."

The Angel looked at him in sorrowful surprise.
"Is not that forgotten yet?"

The Merchant was beginning to get annoyed.
"I am sorry," he said, "but business is business,
and I must live. My competitors—"

"Excuse me," interrupted the Angel. "What
are competitors?"

"My competitors are those who buy and sell
against me," said the Merchant, still more stiffly.
"I am very sorry, but I am afraid that with so
little understanding of modern business methods"
(for the Angel was looking very puzzled) "you
could scarcely be of much use to me." And he
bowed the Angel out, very courteously.

The Angel saw another advertisement. This
time an agent was wanted to sell umbrellas. The
Angel had not much experience of the article, but
a short acquaintance with terrestrial conditions
had impressed upon him its utility, and he re-
solved to apply.

The Umbrella Dealer looked hard at him.

"Are you sure you want work?"

"Quite sure."

"Well, in my line, you see, it seems incon-
gruous," said the Dealer, doubtfully. "Not but
what I should be proud to employ you—very
proud, I'm sure, but—but—"

"I don't quite understand."

"Well, well, it's merely personal," said the
Dealer, pleasantly. "One doesn't expect, you see,
to see a person of your appearance advocating the
use of umbrellas, and the public doesn't always
take to the unexpected. But I might waive it,"
he added, thoughtfully.

While the Angel was still trying to disentangle
the possible references of the last sentence, he went
on again, briskly.

"There's another difficulty, too. I really am
afraid—you see, I can't afford a large salary;

prices are being cut on all sides, and my profits are just next to nothing."

The Angel looked sympathetic. "I am sorry," he said.

"So that I couldn't possibly give much—not to begin with."

"Certainly not," said the Angel. "I should not expect it, being inexperienced."

"Quite so," said the Umbrella Dealer, with a distinct increase of cheerfulness. "Suppose we say 5s. a week now—and your expenses. I dare say you could keep those pretty low." And he looked at the Angel speculatively.

The Angel acquiesced readily. He was not very well versed in money matters.

"And, first of all, I want you to get rid of this lot here," said the Dealer, briskly. "Between ourselves, they're rotten, all of them. Been on my hands for months. The man who sold them to me did me for once—and it's not often I'm done. But you're not attending."

"You said they were rotten," said the Angel, gently. "Won't it be rather difficult to sell them, when I tell the people? But, of course, you'll be willing to take very little for them?"

"Tell the people?" cried the Dealer. "My dear fellow, h'm—I beg your pardon—but, er—you—won't tell them, of course. Let them find out for themselves. It's their own risk."

"I'm afraid I couldn't sell them," said the Angel.

"Well, perhaps it wouldn't do," said the Dealer, pleasantly, for he was not a bad sort of a fellow. "But I'll tell you what, if you're really hard up for a job, just go around to the Bank. They're in want of someone. No doubt you'd just suit them—reliable and all that sort of thing."

So the Angel went around to the Bank, and applied there.

The Bank Manager looked him over very carefully. "Yes," he said, "you might do. I could take you on—at any rate, temporarily. But I should like to see your testimonials."

"I haven't any written testimonials," said the Angel. "Where I come from they are not considered necessary."

"Ah," said the Manager, drily, "just so. I am sorry. I am afraid the testimonials are essential. You will understand the responsibility of my position."

"Perhaps you could give me some advice," said the Angel.

"Well, it seems to me," said the Bank Manager, "that the Church would be more in your line."

"Perhaps so," said the Angel. "I did not think of the Church. Thank you. I will apply at once."

The Bishop received him with great warmth.

"Work?" he said, cordially. "We shall be only

too thankful. We will give you a hearty welcome. As soon as we have settled the formality of the creeds——"

"The creeds?" said the Angel. "What is a creed?"

The Bishop enlightened him.

"When were they made and who made them?" asked the Angel.

The Bishop explained again.

"Ah," said the Angel, thoughtfully, "they were made by yourselves and for yourselves. They are not for me. You will understand that, even though I cannot explain fully."

The Bishop shook his head sadly but firmly. "Our creeds," he said, "are the very backbone of the Church. Without them we are nothing. We cannot dispense with them."

"I am sorry," said the Angel, gently, and went out.

He is still one of the "unemployed."



AMERICAN WAGES AND FOREIGN.

A Comparison From "The Man on the Ladder," in the Chicago Police and Fire Dispatch of April 3, 1909.

The [pay of railway mail clerks in the United States, in comparison with the] pay of railway mail clerks in Great Britain, Germany and France, . . . stands as follows:

	Per Year.
In the United States	\$1,165
In Great Britain	780
In Germany	515
In France	610

There, now you see the shocking disparity in the very worst and all of its enormity—the way it is usually presented by "farmers" in Congress who are cultivating express company crops. But let us look into those figures a little further.

Information carefully collected and collated, both by official and private agents, among the former being the Department of Commerce and Labor of our own government, has conclusively shown that living in England and in the countries of Continental Europe is from 30 to 40 per cent cheaper than in this country.

Let us take 30 per cent—the lowest reported estimate of the difference in the cost of living—subsistence, clothing, housing, schooling, amusements, etc.—and see how the figures look in comparison as to pay of railway mail clerks:

	Per Year.
In the United States	\$1,165.00
In Great Britain	1,114.30
In Germany	734.30
In France	871.43

The enormity of the difference, you will observe, is not so shockingly enormous as it appears in heeled figures first shown. But even the last

set of figures does not afford a just comparison. Here is why:

The English railway clerk is allowed \$160 a year as "travel pay." The German rail man is provided free a house that is worth an annual rental of \$135 in Germany. Here, it would rent for from \$240 to \$360. In addition to his "salary" the French railway mail clerk is allowed \$180 "travel pay" and is also provided free with a house of a rental value of \$80 per year—a house that would rent here at from \$160 to \$300 per year. Making these little additions to the actual service pay of those "cheap foreigners," let's see how they compare with our "high salaried" railway mail clerks. We will figure the "travel pay" allowances at its purchasing power in buying a living, and for the rent allowances we will add the lowest equivalent given above for corresponding housing in this country.

On that basis the stack-up is as follows:

	Per Year.
In the United States	\$1,165.00
In Great Britain	1,344.30
In Germany	974.30
In France	1,288.57

Those "cheap foreigners," who are efficiently operating a cheap parcels post, you see, come out of the wash in pretty fair shape after all, when compared with our "high salaried" postal service men.

But even the last table does not present the whole truth as to the lie so often yapped about by the tools of the private interests in this country that are opposing the betterment and cheapening of our parcels post service.

The railway mail clerks of England, Germany and France not only get full pay while laid up from temporary injury, the same as do our rail postal men, but their governments pay those "cheap foreigners" a pension when they get old or are permanently injured—pay it for the remaining years those "cheap" mail handlers live!

There has been much capital made by beneficiaries of and cappers for privately operated public services in this country of the comparative wage paid here and abroad. In recent years, the same cackle has frequently been heard in both houses of our Congress during discussions of parcels carriage and of other factors and phases of our postal service. It is for that reason I have taken time and space in an effort to hit it as hard as I can.

* * *

THE STATE AND THE LANDLORDS.

Editorial in the London Pioneer of May 14.

That the land of a country which no man has made, its soil, its hidden minerals, even standing ground upon its surface, should be the peculiar and exclusive property of a small clique of privileged persons is in itself a monstrous injustice

to every other citizen and to the nation as a whole. Like other monstrous abuses, the institution of landlordism is one of slow growth. The original lords of manors had no exclusive ownership of the soil, but they were granted maintenance from the soil and from the labor of the peasantry in return for bearing the burdens of national defense by land and by sea, of the administration of justice and of local government. But the time came when they secured the monopoly of political power. For generation after generation they used political power to throw upon other backs their responsibilities and to increase the incomes paid to them to which they no longer had any moral claim. Since then the landlords have been compelled to share their monopoly of political power with other classes and even with the mass of the people; but till today they have been left in undisturbed possession of the ill-gotten gains which they appropriated during their season of power.

At last, by the Budget now under discussion, a beginning of redress is being attempted. All past extortions are left untouched. But a slight check is imposed on the increase of still further extortions in the future. The landlord who holds up his land against the public in order to increase to the utmost the toll he can draw from industry, and who has hitherto been allowed to escape all taxation on such land, will henceforward, it is proposed, part with one four hundred and eightieth part of its value to the state. When land, through the enterprise of the community, apart from any action of the owner, is found in future to have increased in value, one-fifth part of the increase shall go to the community which has created it, and only four-fifths to the privileged land owner who did not create it. When, on expiry of leases, property which he has not built falls into the hands of the freeholder of an estate, henceforward one-tenth of its value shall, it is proposed, be passed on by the freeholder to the state which has secured him the possession of his unearned income.

All these proposals are but small installments of social justice, and it is not surprising therefore that the privileged caste that has so long ruled the land, that has established injustice and decreed it by the laws, should now raise an indignant clamor in Parliament, on the platform, and in the columns of a certain portion of the Press. These gentlemen have so long been accustomed to seeing the affairs of the nation regulated in their interest, that they have come to consider that arrangement a part of the Divine Order of the Universe. That the nation should henceforward begin to intercept part of the wealth that otherwise might flow into their pockets, and use the fund for social reform and for Old Age Pensions is a proposal that drives them to fury. They will destroy the Budget if they can.

But today the preponderance of political power

rests with the workers, if they only knew how to use it. It is with the workers that the final decision will rest whether landlordism shall triumph over the Budget, or whether the new basis, more just and more democratic, for the finance of the country, shall be widened and extended from year to year. Money is needed to defend this country not only against foreign powers, but also against poverty, disease, ignorance, and destitution; not only to defend it, but to make it worth defending. The principle of the Budget is that the money needed shall come in the first place from the values which the community itself creates, from luxuries and from the superfluities of the very rich. It is called a triumph for Socialism. It is, at any rate, a triumph for common justice and common sense.

* * *

THE INITIATIVE AND THE REFERENDUM.

A High School Graduation Essay.

To restore the rule of the people and thus insure clean politics, to trim our governmental lamp so that it will shine more brightly, to maintain a republican form of government in fact as well as in name, are the objects of the Initiative and Referendum.

The Initiative provides for new legislation. Any new law may be proposed by a petition signed by a fixed percentage of the voters in any political division. The Referendum provides for the submission of all or certain legislation to the people for approval before the measures become law.

In this country the people should be the only rulers, and this principle in legislation will restore to them the rights which our present representative form of government does not protect. This is going back to first principles. There can be no better or more representative form of government than the New England town meeting which Professor Bryce described as "not only the source but the school of democracy"; and of which Thomas Jefferson said, "It has proved to be the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and its preservation." Popular self-government in this country originated with the compact drawn up and signed in the cabin of the Mayflower, and the same principles were recognized in the Articles of Confederation established by the Thirteen Colonies, and later in the Constitution of the United States.

The terms Initiative and Referendum are derived from the Latin "initium," to introduce, and "referre," to carry or send back. We have the idea in our own New England town government. Legislation may be initiated by any ten citizens who petition for an article to be put into the war-

rant. The town meeting is itself the referendum, at which all citizens may by voice and vote approve or reject the measures proposed. Nothing can be more democratic than this method of self-government, where the voice of every citizen may be heard, and the vote of every citizen must be recorded. It is truly "government of the people, for the people and by the people," and should ensure equality and perfect liberty.

Municipalities cling to the town meeting as long as possible. Brookline, with her vast wealth still maintains it, and desires to perpetuate it. Boston remained a town until 1822, when the population reached forty thousand; and it was well governed. The change in form of government was opposed by John Adams and Josiah Quincy, who cautioned their fellow citizens against giving up the method of self-government which had so well preserved their liberties and rights. The result of the change proves their wisdom.

It is not practical, however, to assemble all the voters of a city, a county, a State or a nation. Therefore representative government has been substituted; and if the people could be truly represented, nothing better could be desired. This condition, however, does not obtain. Persons elected to represent the people do not carry out the will of the people. Sometimes they can not because they do not know it. What is everybody's business is attended to by nobody. The corporations, especially the public franchise corporations, make it a business to influence legislation. Through their representatives they enter the primaries and try to secure the nomination of men who will do their will. If one man is more willing to do this than his opponent, they do their best to secure the election of that man. If the man elected is not their choice, he is seen and won over, if possible, to the side of the corporation. The corporation is neither Republican nor Democratic in politics. If a Republican will answer its purposes best, its influence is cast for him; otherwise a Democrat is favored. As Jay Gould is reported to have said, "I am a Democrat in a Democratic county, a Republican in a Republican county, but an Erie Railroad man all the time."

It is not always or often a matter of straight bribery. Plausible arguments are used; business associations, social influence, railway passes, situations for friends, flattery and sometimes threats;—all these are ready weapons. If a bribe is offered it is usually sugar-coated—a tip on the stock market, some shares of stock free, a large retainer for the lawyer, a contribution to the church, a box of fine cigars or a case of old wine; the inducement varies with the character of the legislator. There are able lawyers and public men who as lobbyists do better than they can in office or at legitimate law. These men can be depended on to look out for the interests of their

clients, and have a direct influence on legislation that is not exerted by those who elect them. The people of Massachusetts elect 380 representatives; and many of them do not know, or care to know, the will of those by whom they are elected. It is no wonder that we are badly represented when millions are appropriated by corporations seeking franchises. This does not mean that all the representatives are corrupt men. On this matter a prominent politician once remarked, "The body of representatives is divided into three parts, good men, knaves and fools. A great many of them are good men, but the knaves and fools together make the majority."

We find the terms Initiative and Referendum in use in Switzerland, where the system was adopted by the canton of Zurich in 1867, and later by all the political divisions except those where a direct vote of the people is taken, as in our town meeting. The principle was recognized by our Teutonic ancestors, who alike settled in England and Switzerland, and in both places upheld the equal rights of all in the public assembly.

But we need not go as far as Switzerland for examples. We find it in use in Oregon, South Dakota, Nevada, Utah, and some of the cities of California.

In Oregon the amendment was adopted by a vote of eleven to one. This State was the first to obtain direct legislation, and has made the most use of it. In 1904 two measures were submitted to the people, both of which were adopted. In 1906 the people voted on eleven questions. Four were defeated and seven were adopted. Among those adopted were three measures to enlarge the scope of direct legislation. In 1908 nineteen proposals were submitted, seven were defeated and twelve adopted. An examination of the various bills will show that the people used proper discrimination and voted wisely.

In the State of Iowa, on petition of twenty-five property owners, the mayor must submit the question of granting franchises for gas works, electric light and power plants to the people for approval. No such plant can be erected, no telegraph, telephone or street railway franchise can be given without a popular vote.

In South Dakota the very existence of the municipal referendum has prevented much bad legislation.

In Massachusetts the governor vetoed a bill for the construction of a new subway to be paid for by a street railway corporation in consideration of a forty years' lease without payment of rent, unless the bill should be referred to the voters. The bill in question never became a law.

In Chicago, street railway questions have been submitted to the people, who always supported municipal ownership, although this same idea was opposed by the majority of the aldermen and coun-

cilmen elected by these same people to represent them.

Maine and Missouri have both adopted an amendment to the Constitution providing for the Initiative and Referendum at the last election, in each case by a considerable majority.

Oklahoma has it, and Nebraska is likely to follow soon. To bring about this change for Federal matters may require an amendment to the Constitution. But, what of that? When our Constitution was adopted it represented the most progressive thought of the time, but as our country grows changes become necessary. Why, then, is it not proper to alter it according to our will? Why should not the city people have a vote in their government, as well as the country people in their town meeting?

The object of the Referendum is not to submit every petty question to the people, but to allow the people by a certain percentage in signatures to demand a direct vote. When a man desires to build he employs an architect whom he directs to make the plans. When they are finished he approves or disapproves of them, and they are revised unless satisfactory. The employer may represent the people, the architect, the representatives, and the plans the bills proposed.

This measure would restore to the people the right to govern themselves, and would destroy the monopoly of lawmakers. It is going back to the principles upon which this government was founded, and restores to the people the right to rule in fact as well as in theory. Representatives would then represent the people, or their work would be undone. Bribery or undue influence will be useless as the people may veto any legislative act. Mr. Brown may be influenced, but the ten thousand voters who elected him can not; and his vote will be useless unless supported by his constituency. Men will not be in public life on account of the spoils, for there will be none, and better men will be attracted to public service. Party spirit will lose its power, as votes will be cast for measures, not for men. There will be no cause for discontent, as any demand for new legislation can be met, and bad laws may be repealed if the people so will. No man need be dissatisfied when the remedy is so easily within his reach.

Without the Initiative and Referendum, popular self-government in the best sense of the term cannot exist. The Initiative and the Referendum mean equality, and equality is the true source of happiness. It was only while they governed themselves that Rome and Greece were at the height of their power.

The Initiative and Referendum will restore to the people the right to rule of which they have been deprived. A prominent advocate of this measure says: "This restoration can be brought about by the Initiative and Referendum. Shall it be done? We appeal to public opinion as the

court of last resort. The Initiative and Referendum will make this court articulate. It is now only a speechless fetish whose silent and incoherent mandates are interpreted by an interested political priesthood. Let us restore to public opinion the powers of speech of which it has been deprived. Let us allow public opinion to speak for itself, to interpret its own commands. This will not abolish representative republicanism among us, it will perfect it. This will not be a government by a mob, it will be a government by an orderly democracy. This will not be a foreign innovation; it will be in the strictest sense an American evolution."

Southboro, Mass.

ADDIE L. HOWES.

* * *

THE STRUGGLE OF THE RICH.

"I could have dropped out some time ago, but I stayed in for the satisfaction I derived."—E. H. Harriman.

That's what's the matter with men of wealth—
It isn't at all that they need
The money for which they will peril their souls;
It is simply ambition's greed.

They want to be part of the magnate push,
And to mix in a row to see
Which one of the captains shall gain control
Of the stuff that spells Victory.

It is only to win in a corporate war
That they stay in the game and play,
While a helpless and suffering world looks on,
With the blood of the bill to pay.

Theirs isn't the struggle that millions put up
To secure their daily bread,
And give of their lives that others may live:
It is power they're after instead.

For that they will hazard the best that they have,
Their health and their peace of mind;
Their consciences go with the rest as well,
For the pleasure they think they find.

It is power they're after—not power of right,
That may count for a glory crown;
It is merely the power to keep themselves up
By keeping the other man down.

If they struggled for wealth for the good they
could do
With abundance of golden might,
Their motives no man would dare to condemn
And the world would applaud their fight.

Nobody denies they are giants of strength,
And each has a right to his
As long as he hews to the line of the law,
But, God, what a shame it is!

—W. J. Lampton, in the New York World.

* * *

Old Gent: Here, you boy, what are you doing out here fishing? Don't you know you ought to be at school?

Small Boy: There now! I knew I'd forgotten something.—Philadelphia Inquirer.

BOOKS

A STUDY IN LABOR UNIONISM.

Trade Unionism and Labor Problems. Edited with an Introduction by John R. Commons. Published by Ginn & Co., Boston. 1905.

Under the editorship of Professor Commons are here collected twenty-eight essays by various authors, each dealing with a different kind of trades union or a separate aspect of the labor problem. The book "is intended to do for the study of labor unions and labor problems, what Ripley's 'Trusts, Pools and Corporations' has done for the study of capital and its organization"; that is, to provide a text-book of "concrete, definite and convenient" data for the student of economics.

All this sounds very useful—and dry. It is both. But the likes of this book it is high time for all of us to read, artisan, financier or clerk.

The workingman will see more clearly through it the trend of his great campaign, its points of weakness and strength. Our immigrants and the problems they set and solve are not so hazy after reading Professor Commons' articles on "Labor Conditions in Slaughtering and Meat Packing," "The Sweating System in the Clothing Trade," and "Slavs in Coal Mining." The disadvantages if not disasters of incorporation for trades unions are convincing in the symposium on that subject.

It would seem difficult for any business man or politician to read "The Miners' Union: Its Business Management," without a wholesome respect for the broad-minded ability and great power shown in the upbuilding of that vast organization.

Yet the volume must really be meant not for any of these, laboringman, businessman or student, but to rouse a third and neediest class of non-readers—all the tame-lived, clerkly mortals around whom the great industrial world seethes and to whom it is only a dim mass, undifferentiated, its vital impact upon them all unheeded. Fed only on their daily paper, which is carefully edited for politicians and advertisers, unused to the solid food which the unionists get in all their journals, the non-artisan, non-capitalist, the Alameda needs awakening, and this book will help. For in all its array of facts, histories and conditions, its six hundred pages tell one great truth, that the industrial world is a huge tangle, all its knots being pulled at and mostly being tightened.

ANGELINE LOESCH.

* * *

The soil of a nation is primarily the property of the whole nation—the common inheritance of all.—Robert Giffen.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—Readings on American Federal Government. Edited by Paul S. Reinsch. Published by Ginn & Co., Boston. 1909. Price, \$2.75 net.

—An Introduction to City Planning. Democracy's Challenge to the American City. By Benjamin Clarke Marsh. Published by Benjamin Clarke Marsh, Room 1320, 165 Broadway, New York, 1909.

—Wholesale Prices, 1890-1908. Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, Number 81—March, 1909. Department of Commerce and Labor. Published at the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1909.

PAMPHLETS

Land Values in Cities.

"Olcott's Land Value Maps of Chicago" (276 Washington Boulevard, Chicago. Price \$1 per year), is a unique periodical which, while intended for the guidance of buyers and sellers of real estate, is incidentally of much use in exhibiting the enormous public values that go into private pockets. The publication is issued once a year. It consists mostly of maps displaying figures "intended to give an approximate estimate in dollars of the current front foot values of inside lots in the blocks indicated." Corner lots are not indicated, but the reader is advised of a ready method of approximating corner lot values, with inside values as a basis for calculation. The fact that this annual is a successful commercial enterprise is highly significant of its trustworthiness. It is, moreover, conclusive as to the practicability (which is

something, however, that nobody has honestly doubted), of valuing land apart from improvements. Chicagoans will be interested in knowing that the present value of the Tribune site, as approximated by Olcott's for commercial purposes, is about double the value of the capitalized ground rent to which an accommodating school board has reduced it on a lease having nearly eighty years yet to run.

PERIODICALS

B. O. Flower makes a condensation of Klein's play, "The Third Degree," in the Arena (Trenton and Boston) for February, from which readers who have not yet seen the play may realize its importance both as a sidelight on the anarchism of the American police and a work of dramatic art. The same magazine for March-June is an especially interesting number, containing a scholarly article by J. W. Bennett on our dual government, an appreciation of Lowell as a poet of democracy, a rich department of editorial comment, and several other contributions in the democratic spirit, with John Ward Stimson, Rufus W. Weeks, J. T. Sunderland, Raimohan Dutt, Henry Frank and Ellis O. Jones among the contributors.

† †

The Single Tax Review (New York) for March-April has for its frontispiece an excellent portrait of ex-Governor Lucius F. C. Garvin of Rhode Island, and contains comprehensive single tax news of the world, besides a number of good contributions. Among the contributions are the first installments of two serials, one by J. W. Bengough, "The Queer Theory of George Henry," and the other, "My Island," by James R. Brown. Edmund Corkill re-

A CRITICISM

IF THE PUBLIC were not criticized as well as applauded we should fear it was missing its mark. Sometimes the criticisms strike home and we try to profit by them. Sometimes they are mere expressions of a bias; and when it comes to bias, we prefer our own. Sometimes they spring out of misapprehension. ¶ Here is one of the latter; we withhold the critic's name, but vouch for the genuineness of the letter and the good faith of the critic. Alluding to "The Public," this letter says:

"I approve of much of its doctrine, but it does not appeal to me in its method of presentation. In fact, even when agreeing with its opinions, I find myself antagonized by its extreme statements. Knowing there is some good in the handling of modern business, I can't quite tolerate the general condemnation of 'Big Business.' This is because of my own intolerance, I suppose—my bias in industrial viewpoint."

Not intolerance, but over-literalness. "Big Business" is not a technical term which defines; it is a colloquialism which suggests. ¶ The characteristic of "Big Business" is the getting and the using of legalized privileges of extortion. Some businesses may be large without extortionate privileges, but they are not "Big," not inflated, not haughty or pompous or defiant or coercive or proud or boastful or destructive. No business that serves, is "Big Business." No business is "Big Business" to the extent that it serves. But the businesses that bribe or browbeat legislators, that own judges, that coerce at elections or in legislative halls, that combine for predatory privileges instead of social service, the businesses which trample upon common rights and reach out through the mechanism of government for resistless powers of exploitation—these are the businesses, together with any others to the extent that they co-operate in this destructive social warfare, which for short we call "Big Business." ¶ And we sometimes feel, in view of the hideous facts, that in using so mild a term we err on the side of amiability.

views Andrew Carnegie's "plea for pelf." C. J. Higgins explains what the single tax is, and W. H. T. Wakefield what it would do, and among the editorial contributors are William Ryan, H. H. Hardinge, Frederick Cyrus Leubuscher, Josiah Edson, Edward Quincy Norton and Henry G. Seaver.

* * *

The advocates of a great principle should know no thought of compromise. They should proclaim it in its fullness, and point to its complete attain-

ment as their goal. But the zeal of the propagandist needs to be supplemented by the skill of the politician. While the one need not fear to arouse opposition, the other should seek to minimize resistance. The political art, like the military art, consists in massing the greatest force against the point of least resistance; and, to bring a principle most quickly and effectively into practical politics, the measure which presents it should be so moderate as (while involving the principle) to secure the largest support and excite the least resistance.

Real Estate For Sale and Exchange
EDWARD POLAK
4030 Third Ave. New York City

NEGRO PROBLEM
Following the Color Line. An account of Negro Citizenship in the American Democracy. A complete survey of the Negro Race in America, by Ray Stannard Baker. 24 illus. from photographs. \$2.00 net, postpaid.
Special Bargain Lists Free. H. H. TIMBY, Conneaut, Ohio

The Single Tax: What It Is, and What It Will Accomplish.

A straight-forward, succinct statement of the Single Tax as an economic method, by Judson Grenell, of Detroit. Mr. Grenell, who is a newspaper man of long experience, knows just what people want to know, and he knows also just how to tell it to them. Price: Five cents a copy, postpaid; fifty cents a dozen, postpaid.

THE PUBLIC Book Dept, Ellsworth Building, CHICAGO

**A New Bound Volume
of The Public**
VOLUME XI
Complete with the issue of Dec. 26, 1908.
including Index.
Excellently Bound
uniform with the earlier volumes in half roan, with gold vein paper sides, is ready for delivery.
Price, \$2.00
By express prepaid in the United States, Canada, Cuba or Mexico, \$2.50
THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago

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 consideration 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
Quarterly25
Single copies05
Trials 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 or 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, 8 1/4 inches; width of column, 3 inches.

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

For whether the first step be long or short is of little consequence. When a start is once made in a right direction, progress is a mere matter of keeping on.

—Henry George, in "Protection or Free Trade."

* * *

Dr. Howe, president of Case School, Cleveland, never fails to express his vexation when he has a student call the zero of mathematics nothing. One

of the students, Morgenthauer by name, would almost invariably read an equation like this, $x + y = 0$, as follows: "X plus y equals nothing." One day Dr. Howe lost his long-enduring patience. "See here, Morgenthauer, let me show you the difference between zero and nothing."

With this, Dr. Howe wrote a big 0 on the blackboard. "This," he said, "is zero." Then erasing the 0, he added: "And this is nothing."—Lippincott's.

THE Different Kind of a soap: that in a nut-shell is Fels-Naptha.

Fels-Naptha's success was settled when women saw in it a different kind of a soap. Saw that by following the different directions for using it, a different wash-day was brought about: one of ease and comfort; one of lukewarm or cold water.

Free Trade Congress.

Report of the International Free Trade Congress, held in London, in August, 1908. Speeches and Papers by Free Traders from all over the World—by the men named below, for example, and by many more: .

Dr. Theodor Barth, of Germany.

Mr. Yves Guyot, of France.

Mr. Max Hirsch, of Australia.

Mr. Herbert Asquith, the Premier.

Mr. Winston Churchill, Lord Welby, Mr.

Russell Rea, Professor C. F. Bastable,

Mr. John A. Hobson and Mr. J. A.

Murray Macdonald, of Great Britain.

Mr. Harvey N. Shepard, Mr. Edwin

D. Mead, Mr. John de Witt Warner, Mr.

John Bigelow, Professor W. G. Sumner,

Mr. Franklin Pierce, President David

Starr Jordan, Mr. Louis R. Ehrich and

Mr. Louis F. Post, of the United States.

Published by the Cobden Club of London.

For sale by The Public's Book Dept.,

Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago. Cloth, 651

pages, price, postpaid, \$1.00.