

# The Public

GENERAL LIBRARY,  
UNIV. OF MICH.,  
NOV 19 1909

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

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

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

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

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

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

Vol. XII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1909.

No. 607

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

Single Copy, Five Cents      Yearly Subscription, One Dollar  
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898 at the Post Office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

The New British Way.....	1105
"Lower Class" Obstinacy.....	1105
Governmental Highwaymanship .....	1105
Physical Force Labor Leaders.....	1105
The Congressional By-Election in Chicago.....	1106
Probable Abolition of Negro Suffrage.....	1106
Tax Reform in New Jersey.....	1106
Defeat Hath Its Victories (Frederic C. Howe).....	1107
Partisan Disintegration .....	1107
The British Suffragettes .....	1108
An Ideal Chicago, and the Cost of It. VI.....	1111

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

The Political Situation in Great Britain (L. H. Berens) .....	1113
Mary Jackson Kent (Sallie R. McLean).....	1115

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

Convention of the American Federation of Labor.....	1115
Protest Against Arrest of Labor Leaders.....	1117
Street Speaking in Spokane.....	1118
President Taft's Journey Ended.....	1118
The "Dreadnought" Rage.....	1118
Chinese Mining Concessions.....	1118
China's Preparations for Constitutionalism.....	1118
News Notes .....	1119
Press Opinions .....	1121

### RELATED THINGS:

The November Night-Wind (Dwight Marven).....	1122
Lincoln Steffens Gets a Writing Machine.....	1122
Wise Advice to Landowners.....	1123
Suffragette Violence .....	1123
Dread Nought (Guy Kendall) .....	1124

### BOOKS:

The Rising South .....	1125
The South and the Negro.....	1125

## EDITORIAL

### The New British Way.

Untax labor by taxing land values.

+ +

### "Lower Class" Obstinacy.

Despite the fact that all political parties in every campaign are devoting their energies for the benefit of the "poor workingman," the poor workingman obstinately refrains from becoming a rich workingman.

+ +

### Governmental Highwaymanship.

The indignant screams of rage from men and women who are held up and searched for "smuggled goods" at the port of New York are music to the souls of men who despise a pickpocket law—and the tariff is just that. Collector Loeb is making tariff taxes odious to the wealthy and influential, and thus he is preparing the way to righteousness.

+ +

### Physical Force Labor Leaders.

Wise words, as well as sympathetic, are these of the Chicago Daily Socialist in allusion, in its issue of the 11th, to the indefensible hanging of the so-called "anarchists" in Chicago almost a quarter of a century ago:

No more powerful blow was ever struck for capitalism than when that bomb was thrown on Haymarket Square. It set the labor movement of

America back a generation, and its effects have not yet disappeared. . . . Experience shows that no power of the capitalist class has ever been able to set back the triumphant march of the social revolution. Whenever it has been stayed it has been by the foolish hand of some over-impatient would-be friend of labor. We may protest against the injustice of their trial, we may denounce the capitalism that wronged and tormented them to desperation, but we cannot deny that because they sought to discourage the use of the peaceful but powerful weapon of the ballot these men must bear some share of the blame for a reactionary labor movement in America.

Precisely that ground was taken by Henry George at the time of the Chicago executions, to the sorrow of many of his friends who did not understand him and of persons who didn't want to or care to. "One bomb," said he to those in his personal confidence, "one bomb attributed to the labor movement would set the movement back fifty years." And so, at the risk of valued friendships and the certainty of gross misrepresentation which only time could set right, he refused to join in the revolutionary outcry of which those unjust executions were the occasion, but, acquiescing in the decision of the courts, simply appealed as a citizen to the Governor for clemency. Henry George was prophetically right then, as the Chicago Daily Socialist is right now. The Haymarket bomb, no matter who threw it, preceded as it was by make-believe conspiracies and foolish talk of violence among over-impatient friends of the labor movement, did set peaceful revolution back a generation and still exerts a baffling influence. Public opinion will not tolerate this kind of agitation where the mechanism of a free and effective ballot has been attained or is attainable.

+

The Daily Socialist's comment upon the "anarchist" executions is thoughtfully sympathetic as well as wise. Alluding to the overwrought men who fell victims to an overwrought public opinion against them, the Daily Socialist concludes with a lesson that should be taken to heart:

They may be excused because they had had no experience to guide them, and they paid for their mistake with the last full measure with which men may pay for anything. But we cannot excuse those who today, with the knowledge of these facts before them, seek to deprive labor of its legitimate weapons, or lead the worker to throw away his political power, or to deliver it over to his enemies. These cannot plead ignorance.

It is safe to assume that the man who in this country and under existing circumstances proposes a policy of violence for the labor movement,

is either a fool friend or a tricky enemy—a sympathizer without judgment or a private detective without conscience.

+ +

### The Congressional By-Election in Chicago.

No hesitation on the part of democratic Democrats in voting for Barnes, the "insurrection" or independent Republican candidate in the Congressional contest now on in Chicago, should be caused by any campaigning of first rate Democrats—such as ex-Mayor Dunne, Congressman Rainey, John McGoorty or Congressman Champ Clark—for the regular Democratic candidate. Like one who sits at a poker table and must "ante" when his turn comes, men in practical politics must play the game according to the rules. They cannot side-step a party obligation and survive in party politics. But Democratic voters need not be embarrassed by the rules of the game. If they are democratic Democrats they will better express themselves by voting for the Republican independent than for the regular Democratic candidate whom Roger Sullivan has nominated in order to help out his political side-partner, Senator Lorimer. Both democratic Democrats and democratic Republicans should concentrate upon Barnes in order to defeat Lorimer and Sullivan.

+ +

### Probable Abolition of Negro Suffrage.

Senator Cullom made it clear enough in a Washington interview on the 7th—we found it in the Chicago Tribune October 8th—that Southern Negroes are to be disfranchised. He himself evidently wants it done. For, as he sees it, the "solid south" must be taken away from the politically bankrupt Democratic party and brought into the Republican fold, where it can be used as a buttress for plutocracy; and this cannot be done so long as the Republican party stands for suffrage regardless of color, even nominally. In Senator Cullom's interview the Negro who looks may plainly see the handwriting on the wall for the citizenship of his race.

+ +

### Tax Reform in New Jersey.

Not long ago we noted the fact that in F. R. Low, Passaic, N. J., was blessed with a Mayor who did not yield to the land speculators' pleas for low land taxes, but had appointed a single tax appraiser (p. 55). At the Republican primaries, however, Mr. Low was "turned down" for reelection and Gen. Bird W. Spencer substituted. Gen. Spencer was accounted a corporation man

when nominated; but now that he is elected it appears that he is not trammelled by corporate interests. Here is what he says on taxation, taken from an interview in the Passaic News of November 5:

"Aren't you coming pretty near to the Henry George doctrine, General?" the Daily News man asked. "Oh, when it comes to taxing the land, I'm a single taxer," replied the Mayor-elect. "Now, look here. We are standing in front of the People's bank, in which I happen to be interested. The land, the bare land, is taxed \$7,500 a lot. That's because we have put up on it a bank building of which we are rather proud. Right above there is a precisely similar plot with a ramshackle old building on it, a building that is a nuisance to us all, and the land is only assessed \$2,500 a lot. Don't you see the inequality? The justification that this land on which the People's bank stands brings in revenue and the land just above doesn't bring in much revenue, is all nonsense. I'll tell you what we've got to do. We've got to go all over the situation and parcel out the land fairly and assess it equally. Let us get the values up; personally I'd like to see them 'way up, say ninety per cent of the true value. When it comes to the improvements I don't care what is done so long as the assessments are fair. I should like to see the assessments on improvements as low as possible. Improvements are a benefit, not a detriment."

\* \* \*

## DEFEAT HATH ITS VICTORIES.

Tom L. Johnson would have missed something had he won, something that has come to almost every man who has lighted a fire in advance of his time.

In every age, in every clime, in every democracy—no matter what the form of popular expression has been—the same thing has happened. Aristides had to leave Athens because he was just; the Gracchi were deserted by the Romans because they disturbed the existing order. When Caesar turned his mind from the camp to the social condition of the people they did not comprehend. In our own era Cobden and Bright had to sit idly by and wait for the tide to ebb and flow again. Washington was eclipsed for a time, so was Jefferson; the people wanted peace, and with both men there could be no peace. Only fortunate accident saved Lincoln. Grant passed from the Presidency to temporary obscurity only to take a new place in the people's hearts. Clemenceau in France, in many ways the most wonderful, the most democratic, the one man who has brought pride to the French people in recent years, passed from the Ministry last year only to be appreciated as he never was before in a few weeks' time.

No one has yet analyzed the mind of man in the mass. Possibly no one ever will. But every

line of experience shows that it is like the seasons.

There is a seed time and a harvest. Their coming and going cannot be created, cannot be hastened, cannot be controlled. It seems to be necessary to rotate from agitation to calm, from achievement to rest or reaction. This is true of every sentiment that moves men in their political relations.

The purely moral issue lives at most through a single administration. Witness San Francisco, and Seth Low's administration in New York.

Even a military issue cannot hold a people who have been carried into it with overwhelming enthusiasm. In the field of social and economic politics it is even more true. The fires seem to bank themselves automatically, and no man can keep them aflame for the time being.

It is cruel, bitter cruel, to those who have gone out on the skirmish line and found themselves abandoned there. But it is probably only a manifestation of nature in the progress of the world.

I confess I am rebellious about it. I am never inclined to say, "It is all for the best." Some day the advantage may be obvious; but it isn't now. Yet if a man can, he ought to go out and look up at the stars to get a proper perspective of the things his heart is set upon. If you have done that, or if you have not, then let us think about tomorrow, and how Tom L. Johnson can spend the next two years.

He won't go to Africa for lions; so much we know. It is certain that there is big game enough in America to keep him occupied for an unlimited period; the only question is which jungle here is most promising.

FREDERIC C. H.

\* \* \*

## PARTISAN DISINTEGRATION.

Signs of that disintegration in the Republican party which the Democratic party has experienced possibly to the limit, multiply on all hands, and Senator Cummins' speech at Chicago two weeks ago was in no sense the least of them.

The outlook is hopeful.

Not that Senator Cummins said anything to hearten impatiently expectant radicalism. He did not. He stood out frankly for Protection. There was not a free trade note in all his speech. But he did hold up Protection in its nakedness, albeit he gave it his approval.

Senator Cummins really believes in the Republican platform, which demands Protection through such tariff duties "as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and

abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." So does the great "insurgent" rank and file in the Republican party of which he is a leader.

But this idea of Protection cannot survive a thorough going popular discussion. Its fallacies are so vulnerable that a political campaign between it and tariff for revenue only, would probably give the whole tariff system its death at the polls.

And though it were to win at the polls, the impossibility of realizing it in legislation, would offer such tempting opportunities to the greedy Interests whom Senator Cummins is fighting, that they themselves would open the public eye to the iniquity of Protection and bring down upon it in the very hour of its apparent victory the great public fist with a smashing knock-out blow.

+

A small thing it seems, that over which Senator Cummins in behalf of democratic Protection challenges the plutocratic Protectionists to mortal combat politically.

But political revolutions break out over small things.

In the very nature of affairs political it must be so. The party leader who would command the support of a discontented faction of his party in order to make it progressive, cannot be extreme even if he would. Votes are few at the extremities of political pathways, and political leaders must have votes just as military leaders must have soldiers.

Votes in masses are to be got not by appeals to extremists, but by appeals to the middle minds, to those that are as yet but barely distinguishable from those from which they are ready to secede, or whom may be unwilling yet to secede at all.

It is for this reason that radicals in agitation are seldom successful in politics. Leadership in thought and leadership of men are totally different functions, usually requiring different faculties. And neither kind of leader can long fool anybody by merely posing for the other kind.

It is because Senator Cummins sees no further than "fair" Protection "for all"—which is as far as the revolting masses in the Republican party yet see—that he is a better political leader for his time and opportunity than if he were at heart a free trader. The point is that he and his followers in Iowa, like La Follette and his followers in Wisconsin, and other Republicans in other States, are raising the real issue, and raising it so gently that their party will be shaken up and racked to pieces over it before its radical tendency is

generally recognized. It was not over the question of slavery but over an extension of slave territory, that the two great parties of the 50's went to pieces and a new one came into power.

+

The disintegration going on in both great parties now, over the vital political question of democratic Protection which Senator Cummins is defiantly raising in one, and over the vital political question of tariff for revenue only, which William J. Bryan is vigorously pressing in the other, has but one political meaning. Senator Cummins sensed its meaning when he said in his Chicago speech:

In a country developed as ours is developed, with our abstract ideas of liberty and free government thoroughly established and never questioned, national politics relates almost entirely to economic, industrial, commercial and financial questions. Under these conditions the natural dividing line, politically speaking, puts the progressives into one party and the conservatives into the other. The traditions of the olden time, when the issues were of a different character, necessarily obscure this division, but nevertheless the potential forces of one party will be progressive and of the other conservative. Hitherto, although there have been some irreclaimable and hopeless obstructionists who have been and are Republicans, the party as a whole has been progressive. There are some signs now that a number of our distinguished leaders think that we have gone far enough and that we should settle down, for a period at least, into the quiet and peace of inaction. I hazard the prediction that if we do, the camp we pitch will be our burial ground. There are things to be done, and if we are not willing to do them some other party will undertake the task and we will become nothing more than a memory in the life of the nation.

But party progress as to the tariff spells, not gradations toward more Protection, not gradations toward more refined Protection, but gradations away from Protection and toward Free Trade—toward free trade not as to customs tariffs alone, but to all taxation.

+ + +

## THE BRITISH SUFFRAGETTES.

There are two ways of looking at the lawless aspects of the suffragette movement in England, and they are so different that they cannot to any advantage be considered together.

We may on the one hand regard these phases of that movement as unpremeditated outbreaks, irresponsible and uncontrollable, the promoters of which can no more be reasoned with than persons in a panic, or than you can reason with smallpox epidemics, or with anything else of a pathological nature. The victims have taken the disease and

that is all there is to it. So considered, the subject is one for the advice of pathological experts.

But if, on the other hand, these outbreaks are purposeful, and the persons responsible for them are reasonable and responsible creatures, then the subject is one for rational discussion as a species of political tactics. So considered, we are not prepared to condemn them sweepingly. On the contrary we are disposed to acknowledge that lawless demonstrations by outlawed classes—disfranchised women are an outlawed class—may be both legitimate and effective as modes of protest and a means of agitation.

It all depends upon the object, and the good faith and good sense of the leaders (vol. xi, pp. 535, 849, 866; vol. xii, p. 55), together with the circumstances under which the demonstrations are made.

+

The first inquiry regarding the British suffragettes, considered as persons in possession of their faculties, is their object. Not what most of them say their object is, or think it is, but what it really is.

Suppose the demand of the suffragettes were fully granted to-day, what would be the relation of British women to the suffrage to-morrow?

The question is not a difficult one to answer. The demand is very specific. It is that women shall be admitted to the suffrage on the same terms as men. To know, then, the practical effect of that demand, we have only to ascertain the terms on which men in Great Britain are admitted to the suffrage.

Turning to Lowell's "Government of England"—the Lowell who is now president of Harvard University—we find in the first volume at page 209 the following classification of voters: (1) Men who own land worth \$10 a year, or are lessees of land under 60-year leases or longer at \$25 a year, or under leases of 20 to 60 years at \$250 a year (these values varying somewhat in Scotland and Ireland); (2) men who were freemen or male descendants of freemen of boroughs prior to 1832; (3) men who occupy as owner or tenant land worth \$50 a year; (4) men who occupy as owner or tenant any dwelling house or part of one as a separate dwelling, including caretakers who occupy in dwellings in which the employer does not reside; (5) men who occupy lodgings of the value (unfurnished) of \$50 a year.

Now, if the suffrage were extended to women on those terms, which are the terms of the suffragette demand, how many women would be enfranchised?

Those who own land worth \$10 a year capital-

ized—say, \$200 in capital value; which would practically exclude all working women.

Those renting land for 20 years or more at \$250 a year, or 60 years or more at \$25 a year; which would exclude most, if not all, working women.

Free women of boroughs and their descendants; and of these there are probably none.

Women who occupy land worth \$1,000, or \$50 a year; which would exclude most, if not all, working women.

Women who occupy, individually, as owner or tenant, a dwelling house or part of one as a separate dwelling (including women caretakers occupying in dwellings in which their employers do not reside); which would exclude nearly all unpropertied women, for they occupy, as a rule, as members of the family of a husband or father.

Women who occupy, individually, lodgings of the value (unfurnished) of \$50 a year; which would exclude all working women except the few of the better paid classes.

When it is remembered that under the suffragette demand women could not vote in virtue of the right of husband or father, but only in virtue of their own separate and distinct property rights, it is evident that the suffragette extension of suffrage would extend the suffrage not very far beyond women with property in their own name, and that the largest woman vote would be cast by rich women. It is roughly estimated that hardly more than 4 per cent of the women of England would be enfranchised if the suffragette demand were literally allowed.

+

There are two replies to the above criticism.

The first is the reply that municipal suffrage, which gives to women the same voting rights that men have, has enfranchised nearly 90 per cent of the women municipally. But British suffrage for men rests upon a far more liberal basis for municipal than for Parliamentary purposes. According to Lowell, at page 146 of his second volume, the proper qualifications for municipal suffrage include occupation, joint or several, of any house, warehouse, counting house, shop or other building, without regard to its value. Even with this greater liberality as to qualifications, municipal suffrage for women in England appears, says Lowell, to have added only about one-eighth to the municipal voting register.

The second reply to the above criticism of the suffragette demand is to the effect that the women whom this extension of the franchise might invest with voting rights, whether many or few,

would use their greater influence to confer the right upon their still unenfranchised sisters. "I doubt it," said the carpenter, and shed a bitter tear." Much more likely would the force and influence of the enfranchised women of property be exerted against further extension of the suffrage. Not for sex reasons, nor with sex discriminations. God forbid! But because "property and intelligence go together, don't you know," and intelligence thus certified to should govern. Whereupon, if the suffragette tactics now used to coerce favorable Parliamentary action by "ministers of the Crown" were logically followed, the unpropertied and therefore unenfranchised of both sexes would proceed to break up the dinner parties and smash the windows of the propertied classes in order to coerce their favorable action as voters!

+

The second inquiry regarding the British suffragettes, is the good faith or good sense of the leaders (whichever you prefer to call it), or both, in connection with the circumstances.

These outbreaks did not begin until the Liberals had come into power charged with a commission by the electorate to do certain things—things that could not but have been, and which have proved to be, highly offensive to propertied persons of both sexes—especially to those whose property rests upon privilege. But very soon after the Liberals so commissioned had come into power, the suffragette outbreaks began.

If these outbreaks were of a socio-pathological nature, as some of their defenders explain, the peculiar fact that they began just at that time is of no importance. Nobody can regulate or be responsible for the period of the beginning of social hysterics. But if the outbreaks are deliberate, responsible, rational and controllable, the time chosen for beginning them is a highly significant fact.

For nearly a score of years the privileged classes had been in power in Parliament through the Tory party. Yet the Tory party was undisturbed by these lawless suffragette tactics. Hardly, however, had the Liberal party come into power, with its commission to undermine some of the hoary privileges the Tory party stands for, than suffragette lawlessness set in.

Why it should have embarrassed the Liberal ministry, most Americans do not understand. But it evidently did, and the radical wing most of all. Considered as a responsible program, it was inexcusable to any progressive who realizes the vital importance of making reforms one by one so as

to concentrate popular influence instead of dissipating it.

Before the Ministry could do anything effective in a progressive way, it had to "get together." A score of officials, just invested with vast responsibilities, cannot agree upon progressive policies the instant they come into power, if some of them are temperamentally progressive and others conservative. The progressive elements must first convince the others. And if at that critical juncture there are lawless demonstrations which can be identified with the progressives, the delicate task of the progressive members of a ministry is multiplied immensely. It was this task (which had fallen upon Lloyd George and Winston Churchill and Mr. Ure and some of their sympathetic associates) that the lawless suffragette tactics loaded down as with a cargo of lead.

For part of the program of the progressive ministers which fell under that load was woman suffrage. Not the limited kind of the suffragette demand, which, while giving the vote to no workingman's wife, to hardly any workingman's daughter, to only a few unmarried workingwomen, would give several votes to each woman of property who held property in different voting places—not that spurious kind of woman's suffrage was it that the progressive ministers were striving to make a part of the ministerial program, but the genuine kind of one man one vote and one woman one vote.

Lloyd George was urgent for this electoral reform, and the Prime Minister was not unfavorable. Curiously enough, however, Lloyd-George, an outspoken woman suffragist on the principle of one woman one vote, has been the victim of the worst attacks from violent suffragettes, if we overlook the horsewhipping of Winston Churchill as a piece of insanity. Next to George, perhaps, the worst sufferer was the Prime Minister, whose acquiescent disposition toward George's suffrage programme could hardly have been stimulated or emphasized by his personal experience with suffragette tactics.

It is not to be forgotten either, if we consider the suffragette movement with reference to thoughtful tactics and not as an uncontrollable disease, that the speeches of Asquith and George and Churchill and the others that were so violently interrupted, were speeches in favor of the land clauses of the Budget, which are radical in their tendencies, and are urged on the one hand and opposed on the other because they are recognized as a death blow to feudal landlordism.

+

We are not disposed to regard the suffragette

movement as tainted with bad faith, notwithstanding the suspicious circumstances. There are too many other possibilities of explanation. Nor have we a word to say against it if it is pathological. But if it is a responsible movement, generated in good faith, nothing can be said in its favor. It has placed itself across a progressive Liberal program, to the embarrassment of progressive Liberals and the delight of reactionary Tories; it has done all it could to thwart the efforts of radical ministers for womanhood suffrage; and its demands would place upon woman suffrage a property qualification which, while liberal with reference to men, would be enormously restrictive as to women.

+ + +

## AN IDEAL CHICAGO, AND THE COST OF IT.

### VI. Of Detailed Plans for Meeting the Cost.

Having seen, with sufficient probability for practical purposes (p. 1086), that the growth of Chicago and the consequent increase in Chicago land values in the next fifty years, if the Ideal Chicago were realized, would be amply greater than the cost of that realization, we come now to a consideration of the practical details.

We assume, of course, that in fairness to all interests the cost ought to be paid out of the consequent increase in land values, if practical provision for this is possible. The policy being conceded—and what honest man can oppose it in principle?—details for executing the plan remain to be proposed.

+

The first inquiry in this connection is as to the differentiation of increase in land values that would result without the Ideal Chicago, from the increase which would be due to its idealization.

Without idealization, land values would doubtless go on increasing in the future as they have in the past; but, considering the city as a whole, in a diminishing ratio.

Mr. Hurd in his "Principles of City Land Values," at page 18, truly says: "The life of value in land, whether the unit taken is a city, a section of a city, or a single lot, bears a close analogy to all other life in being nominally characterized by a small beginning, gradual growth, and increased strength, up to a point of maximum power, after the attainment of which comes a longer or shorter decline to a final disappearance. Thus all value in city land undergoes a continuous evolution from a state of non-existence,

through a cycle of changes to a final dissolution, or to a new birth, when the process is repeated on the same land."

We direct attention to Mr. Hurd's "new birth" of value.

Evidently he does not mean that city land values actually disappear after reaching a maximum. That would not be true. What he doubtless means is that there is a maximum beyond which they do not go under the old impulses; and that when this maximum is reached they have a backward tendency unless new impulses give them, as it were, "a new birth." That this is true every intelligent real estate expert knows.

Under that natural law of city land values, the effect of existing impulses in Chicago might soon be spent. Were Chicago to stop growing and improving, Chicago land values would stop increasing and begin to decline.

That this will not occur, but that the reverse of this will occur, is highly probable. Chicago land values will doubtless keep on growing phenomenally in the future as in the past. But it will not be due in great measure to the impulses of past growth. It will be due mostly to new civic impulses. Chief of all these new impulses, and far and away ahead of all other influences, would be the influence of the proposed idealization for which we are seeking an expense fund.

Other influences would come in, to be sure. There would be a wonderful increase of population; there would be a far reaching extension of city area; there would be tremendous improvements and economies in industry and intercourse, in life, work and enjoyment.

Some of these value-creating influences would come in some degree without the idealization; and with idealization the increased value of Chicago land would be somewhat due to those influences. Let that be so, and yet the owner of the site of Chicago could lay no more claim to the consequent values. Why should land owners be entitled to those values? Due to general causes, why should they be diverted to individual advantage? But that is not the question we are discussing. Our object here is to concede to Chicago land owners—however preposterous the concession—all the values so produced.

In an excess of social generosity, we are proposing to leave to Chicago land owners, their heirs, successors and assigns, all the land values that may come from increase of population not caused by the contemplated idealization of the city; all that may come from public or private

improvements not due to this idealization; all that may come from city growth and civic advance of any kind except from the idealization for which we are seeking an expense fund. What we here aim to do is to estimate approximately the proportionate increase which may with reasonable fairness be attributed to that idealization, and provide for meeting the expense of idealization out of that increase after it shall have been realized.

+

The question we now put to fair minded men, asking them to answer it with public spirit and regardless of their own public interests, is this: Would it not be fair to assume that of the enormous increase of annual rental values, actual and potential, both within the present city limits and far out upon the prairies to which its limits and the intensification of its civic life would soon extend if we had our Ideal Chicago, at least 75 per cent would be due to the idealization? Would it not be fair to say that of this vast increase, not more than 25 per cent would have come at any given time but for the idealization? Would not this estimate be fair, aye over-fair and extremely generous, to the owners of the land in and about the present Chicago?

We think so.

But if a larger proportion of these social values ought in fairness to be left to landowners, and a smaller proportion be devoted to the expense of idealization, let it be so. Or if, on the other hand, a smaller proportion ought to be left to landowners and a larger one devoted to the idealization, let that be so. The essential point is that the idealization ought to be paid for out of the increase in Chicago land values which it actually causes.

The proportion to be assigned to that expense fund is a detail which the land-value experts would have no difficulty in adjusting with approximate fairness. For present purposes we shall assume tentatively that 75 per cent of the increase would not be an excessive proportion to attribute to the proposed idealization.

All further steps are matters of mere adjustment—including scheme for valuations, possibilities of financing, and legislative authorization.

+

As to valuations, the British House of Commons has already formulated a scheme, evidently feasible, directly in line with the principle above set forth.

Its finance bill for 1909, provides for a com-

mission to value the land of Great Britain as of April, 1909, for the purpose of ascertaining its present value irrespective of improvements. At stated periods in the case of corporation land, and at death or sale in the case of land owned by natural persons, revaluations are to be made. On the increase so shown, the tax is to be 20 per cent of the capital value.

Similar methods are resorted to by scores of German cities for a like purpose.

Much of the detail of the British finance bill and of the German municipalities may be omitted here. In any such scheme for valuing Chicago land with a view to paying for an Ideal Chicago out of the increase of its land values which may be attributable to the idealization—say 75 per cent annually of the increased annual ground rent value—we have the primary valuations ready to hand.

Under our taxing system all the land in Chicago and thereabout, simply as land and irrespective of improvements, is already valued for taxation upon its capital value. Let those valuations, say for the year 1909, be adopted as representing the land values of the Ideal Chicago upon the eve of idealization, they to be regarded as the property of the landowners subject only to existing taxation, and to no exaction whatever on account of the idealization. Then let the revaluations for ordinary taxing purposes reveal the increase in land values irrespective of improvements from time to time. Of the increase so revealed, let 25 per cent be considered the property of the owner of the land, to be added to the value of 1909 and subjected only to the same taxation. But let 75 per cent be considered distinctly as capitalized annual profits on the idealization of Chicago; and let this capitalization be regarded as public property the income of which is sacredly pledged to the expense of making, maintaining and extending this great civic enterprise.

+

In the above generalized suggestion, we differentiate the increased values by percentages of capitalization—25 per cent for the owners and the rest for the city. But this is only for temporary convenience of statement.

With different rates of taxation, the capitalization of the two proportions would vary. Under a tax of 1 per cent, say, the capitalized value of land of a given annual ground rent value is greater than under a higher rate of taxation; and as this is increasingly so, a tax of 100 per cent on capital value would reduce the market capitaliza-

tion to a point somewhat lower than the actual or potential ground rent—enough lower to yield at least commercial interest on the purchaser's investment.

In practice, therefore, it would be necessary to resort to some actuarial device for securing to the owner on the one hand, and to the city on the other, the proportions of value which we have suggested as fair. This, however, would evidently be mere matter of expert skill. Several devices would be possible. The problem is merely to assign (1) present capital land values, less ordinary taxation, to the landowners as their property; (2) approximately one quarter of the increase in ground rent value, less ordinary taxation, also to the landowners as their property; and (3) approximately three quarters of the increase in ground rent value to the Idealization fund as public property.

If annual values were the subject matter of the problem it would present no difficulties. But as our land markets deal with capitalized rather than annual values, we are under the necessity of ascertaining the varying rates of taxation that would approximately secure present annual values and one quarter of the increase to owners, and three quarters of the increase to the city. The computation however, would be simple.

+

Inasmuch as the income from this new source might not be available at first, how should the initial expenses be met?

Precisely as the expense of all public undertakings are met—by the sale of bonds. Yet differently in one particular, namely, that the bonds, instead of running against the mere taxing power of 1 per cent or so on capital value, should run against 75 per cent of the entire increase in rental value over the rental value indicated by the capitalized valuation of 1909.

Thus these bonds would in effect have behind them a taxing power of about five times the present rate, and on three-fourths of the increasing value of a city which all agree would increase phenomenally if the idealizing plans were carried out. And wouldn't it seem like a poor enterprise, this of an Ideal Chicago, if three-fourths of the future increase in Chicago ground rent values would not be ample security for the preliminary bonds?

+

The difficulties of legislation we freely admit. But no lawyer, we surmise, can point out any legal difficulties. The only difficulties would be

those which private interests might interpose, politically and otherwise, for selfish ends.

+

Here, then, is the suggestion for meeting the expense of an Ideal Chicago such as the Commercial Club proposes, and proceeding with the enterprise without years of delay. Summarized, it is simply this: that bonds be issued, payable (principal and interest) out of a tax equivalent to three-fourths of the increase of annual ground-rent values, the whole contemplated area of the Ideal Chicago to be included in the assessments; and that these bonds be sold as the work of idealization progresses, the proceeds to be applied exclusively to that work.

Doubtless this suggestion is open to many objections, some of them plausible and possibly some of them sound. Let them be considered when they are interposed.

But what are the possible objections?

Isn't it fair that the cost of an Ideal Chicago shall be paid out of the increase in Chicago property values which the idealization causes?

Is there any kind of Chicago property except land that would to any high degree or with any approach to permanency be increased in value by the Ideal Chicago?

Is 75 per cent of the increase in ground-rent values an excessive proportion to attribute to the influences of the proposed idealization? If so, what would be approximately a fair estimate?

Are there any legal obstacles in the way of the necessary legislation? If so, what are they?

Are there any insuperable obstacles in the way of financing the necessary bonds? If so, what are they?

Assuming that the suggestion is fair in principle, what obstacle of any kind lies in its path to which the City of Chicago can yield without stultifying the maxim upon which she prides herself—"I will"? Shall this be altered to "I want to but I can't"?

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London, Oct. 30, 1909.

We are on the eve of momentous events. "Unsettled questions have no regard for the repose of nations," as one of the greatest among your statesmen expresses it.

The most vital unsettled constitutional question in Great Britain is as to what power, if any, the House of Lords has over bills dealing with the raising or

the expenditure of the supplies annually granted to the Crown by the House of Commons. For many centuries, in fact ever since the stirring times of the Commonwealth, the House of Commons has ever been jealous of any interference with money matters, with the power of the purse, on the part of the House of Lords. Repeatedly the House of Commons has urged and vindicated its claim to be the sole arbiter, not only of questions of taxation, but also of the expenditure of every penny of the money raised. For many generations this claim, even if not formally admitted, has been acquiesced in by the House of Lords, and has been accepted by statesmen and political authorities as a principle of Parliamentary procedure necessary to the harmonious and peaceful working of the unwritten Constitution of Great Britain. Both in the House of Lords and the House of Commons, responsible statesmen of every shade of political opinion, including William Pitt, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Salisbury, W. E. Gladstone, Lord Rosebery, Lord Halsbury (the last Conservative Lord Chancellor) and the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, have from time to time admitted and urged the unreserved acceptance of this fundamental constitutional principle. Hence the assent of the House of Lords to money bills has for many generations come to be regarded as merely formal, and as inevitable as is the assent of the Crown. As Winston Churchill so forcibly said, when speaking at the National Liberal Club on October 8th—

The control of finance by the representative assembly is the keystone of all that Constitutional fabric upon which and within which all of us here have dwelt safely and peacefully throughout all our lives. . . . Take finance away from the House of Commons, take the complete control of the financial business away from the representative assembly, and our whole system of government, be it good, bad or indifferent, will crumble to pieces like a house of cards.

Of course, so long as the landed interest was almost as predominant in the House of Commons as it still is in the House of Lords, as was the case till after the last general election, the House of Lords had little inducement to venture to challenge this basic constitutional principle. So long as it was only a question as to what special taxation should be imposed upon industry and the earnings of industry, the House of Lords might well rest content to acquiesce in this claim of the House of Commons. But as soon as the question arose as to whether taxation is to be imposed upon privilege and monopoly, masquerading as "accumulated wealth," as "capital" and as "property," the House of Lords, composed as it is of the chief amongst the beneficiaries of such "property," may well desire to have recourse to any means, constitutional or unconstitutional, which may enable it to challenge the power of the House of Commons to impose such "revolutionary" and "socialistic" taxation, accompanied as this is by the necessity for a complete, uniform and universal valuation of what they regard as their special heirloom, the land of Great Britain. This proposal not only lays down the lines of the Liberal policy of the future, but foreshadows radical and drastic, equitable and beneficial, changes in both local and national taxation. It has aroused the bitter hostility of the privileged landed classes to a degree unparalleled in recent history. And it is upon this issue we are to-

day led to believe, that the House of Lords may venture to assert its claim to complete control over the power of the purse—a step which in any other country would bring the nation to the verge of civil war.

+

Will the House of Lords take this step? Will it deliberately challenge such a conflict? The general opinion to-day is that it will. But once again I find myself in an insignificant minority; for, bluster as its members may, personally I do not believe that its responsible members will stake the existence of the House of Lords as at present constituted on a quarrel which can have but one issue. Slow as it is to move, Great Britain will never consent that a body of men who owe their position to the mere accident of birth shall usurp the governing power, and become the sole arbiters of the future destinies of the country.

However this may be, the Budget has passed the report stage, its third reading will certainly be carried on Tuesday next, after which it will automatically pass to the House of Lords for their formal consent—or rejection.\* The decision will be known to your readers before these lines appear in print. Whatever it may prove to be, the present position of the Liberal or democratic party was admirably summarized by Winston Churchill, in the speech already quoted, in the following words:

When the Budget leaves the House of Commons the time of discussion as far as we are concerned will have come to an end. It will leave the House of Commons in a final form, and no amendment by the House of Lords will be entertained. . . . Our intentions are straightforward. We seek no conflict, we offer no conflict. We shall make no overtures to the House of Lords, we shall accept no compromise. We are not called upon to offer them any dignified means of escape from the situation into which they have been betrayed by the recklessness of some of their supporters. They have no right whatever to interfere with financial business, directly or indirectly, at any time. That is all we have to say, and for the rest we have a powerful organization, we have a united party, we have a resolute Prime Minister—we have a splendid cause.

+

Naturally enough, the chief burden of the prolonged struggle over the Budget in the House of Commons has fallen upon Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and he has conducted the controversy in a manner which has gained him the grudging respect of his opponents and the unstinted admiration and confidence of his followers both inside and outside the House. He has risen to the occasion in a great and masterly manner.

Firm though courteous, resolute though polite, he has given consideration to every argument advanced. He has made concession after concession, but not one that would jeopardize or lessen the demand for a complete, uniform and universal, valuation of the land of Great Britain.

Thanks to his generalship, the Finance Bill leaves the House of Commons strengthened rather than weakened by the prolonged controversy. Outside the House, despite all traditions to the contrary, Lloyd

\*All of which has happened. See *The Public* of November 12, page 1094.

George, without any loss of dignity, drops his Parliamentary or Ministerial manner, and appeals to his fellow-citizens in stinging words and pointed arguments which carry conviction and inspire enthusiasm.

His Limehouse speech was good, so good as to add oil to the fire of hostility already aroused; but his speech at Newcastle was far better, and brought home to millions, as no other speech has done, the true inwardness of the great struggle in which the country is engaged. "A plain talk about the Budget," he termed it, and so it was, too plain for the mob of little men of either party. His impeachment of landlordism was masterly, and his peroration, in which he warned the Lords of the root questions their proposed action would inevitably evoke, and of the only possible answers to the same—"answers charged with peril for the order of things the Peers represent, but fraught with rare and refreshing fruit for the parched lips of the multitude who have been treading the dusty road along which the people have marched through the dark ages which are now emerging into the light"—will necessarily take rank amongst the most eloquent, instructive and inspiring words the Budget controversy has evoked.

If the Tory party, the Constitutional party, as its friends are fond of calling it, the party of Privilege and Plunder, as its enemies term it, decides to throw the country into the throes of a revolutionary struggle, the British democracy need desire no more courageous, far-sighted, or able leader than Lloyd George.

In saying this I by no means desire to disparage any other of our prominent Liberal leaders. Asquith, too, has shown himself worthy of his opportunities and of the confidence of his fellows. Without his support Lloyd George could not have carried the Cabinet with him. Winston Churchill, too, has proved himself staunchly democratic, and to have realized the true inwardness, as well as the seriousness, of the present struggle. Above all others the Lord Advocate of Scotland, Mr. Alexander Ure, has earned abundant laurels during the past few months. His mastery of the subject has made his numerous speeches most effective, so much so as to call down upon him the bitter hatred of the opponents of the budget.

After lesser men, or less prominent men, had failed to disturb him, last week the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour deemed it advisable to indulge in a bitter, and to my mind unwarranted and unscrupulous, attack, unparalleled in recent British political controversy, on the honor and veracity of the Lord Advocate. But this only gave Mr. Ure an opportunity for a most dignified reply, emphasizing the very point which had aroused Mr. Balfour's ire.

And so the great struggle progresses. What the next few weeks will bring forth it is impossible to say. But one thing is certain: the Land Question has come to stay; and in Great Britain the Land Question to-day means, not any question of Small Holdings or Peasant Proprietorship, nor any bombastic scheme of extensive state purchase, but the question of the Taxation of Land Values.

It is with this question that the future of Liberalism in Great Britain is bound up. A rational land system is manifestly impossible in the absence of the rating and taxation of land values. And it is en-

couraging to know that in Great Britain to-day progressives of all shades of opinion would willingly endorse Mr. Lloyd George's contention, which appears in this week's "Nation": "A rational land system lies at the very root of national well-being. Liberalism will commit one of the most fatal blunders of its career if it allows this question to rest—until it is settled."

LEWIS H. BERENS.

✦ ✦ ✦

## MARY JACKSON KENT.

Glendale, Ohio, Nov. 15, 1909.

Mary Jackson Kent, one of the most enthusiastic and sincere disciples of Henry George, a constant reader of *The Public* for many years, a veteran of eighty-five who, though in the atmosphere of wealth, was a fundamental democrat of clear vision and sane judgment, passed away at Glendale last week. She became a follower of Henry George soon after the publication of "Progress and Poverty," and from that time to the end of her long life she was ready with testimony for her faith. With convincing logic and in the pure English speech so characteristic of the educated Irish, she charmed all who heard her.

No world movement escaped her attention, no democratic triumph passed her by unnoticed, no apparent disaster to democracy eluded her sympathetic comprehension. A devoted Episcopalian, she found intense satisfaction in reflecting upon the significance of the economic discussions at the last Ecumenical Conference in London; but on the other hand she was depressed by the recent exposure of Trinity Church as a New York landlord.

On the subject of practical methods, Mrs. Kent pinned her hopes to the movement for direct legislation, believing that through this alone could economic justice triumph. For she feared that the great vested interests would persist in narrowing the opportunities of the poor until, driven to bay, they might plunge headlong into revolution.

SALLIE R. McLEAN.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

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

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

---

Week ending Tuesday, November 16, 1909.

---

### Convention of the American Federation of Labor.

One of the most important conventions of the greatest labor organization on the American continent is that now in session at Toronto. It met on the 9th (p. 1093), in Massey hall, provided for it by the City Council of Toronto, and on that day listened to President Gompers's address. This address was followed by the report of the

executive council, one of its notable recommendations being an old age pension bill prepared by Congressman Wilson, a member of the convention. The bill provides for an "Old Age Home Guard," to be composed of persons eligible under the bill who apply to the Secretary of War for pension enlistment. They must be more than 65 years old, must not own property of more than \$1,500 in value, nor have an income in excess of \$240. The members of the "Old Age Home Guard" would receive pensions of \$120 a year. Another recommendation was for an appeal of the Gompers (p. 1093) case to the Supreme Court of the United States, both upon the question of the validity of the injunction and the question of authority for the contempt proceedings. Conservation of natural resources, further restriction of immigration, promotion of industrial education, and encouragement of a closer bond of affiliation between farmers and organized labor, were among the other recommendations made by the Executive Council. The Council also recommended that the convention indorse the resolutions adopted at the last Council meeting expressing horror and indignation over the assassination of Francisco Ferrer of Spain.

On the 10th little was done beyond receiving and referring resolutions and listening to an address on woman suffrage by Prof. Frances S. Potter, formerly of Minneapolis, but now the general secretary of the National American Suffrage Association. She advocated political settlements such as have been formed in several cities in the West with the object of training women for citizenship and the exercise of voting rights.

A report of the special committee on industrial education was presented on the 11th by John Mitchell, chairman of the committee. This report favors—

the establishment of schools in connection with the public school system, at which pupils between the ages of 14 and 16 may be taught the principles of the trades, not necessarily in separate buildings, but in separate schools adapted to this particular education, and by competent and trained teachers. The course of instruction in such a school should be English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, elementary mechanics and drawing. The shop instruction for particular trades, and for each trade represented, the drawing, mathematics, mechanics, physical and biological science applicable to the trade, the history of that trade, and a sound system of economics including and emphasizing the philosophy of collective bargaining. This will serve to prepare the pupil for more advanced subjects, and in addition to disclose his capacity for a specific vocation. In order to keep such schools in close touch with the trades, there should be local advisory boards, including representatives of the industries, employers and

organized labor. The committee recommends that any technical education of the workers in trade and industry being a public necessity, it should not be a private, but a public function, conducted by the public and the expense involved at public cost.

At another point the report declares that—

organized labor's position regarding the injustices of narrow and prescribed training in selected trades, by both private and public instruction, and the flooding of the labor market with half-trained mechanics for the purpose of exploitation, is perfectly tenable, and the well founded belief in the viciousness of such practices and consequent condemnation is well-nigh unassailable.

Agnes Nestor of Chicago, representing the glove workers' union, presented its resolution requesting the Department of Labor and Commerce to establish a special labor bureau for women and to put a woman at the head of it; and Mrs. Raymond Robins of Chicago, also a delegate, addressed the convention on the 10-hour law for women in Illinois.

On the 12th members of the United Mine Workers of America introduced the usual Socialist resolution declaring that the workers must own all the means of production and distribution before they can be free from economic-servitude.

A resolution introduced on the 13th by the piano and organ workers of Toronto urged the early formation of a labor party; a resolution asking that the Federal civil service act be amended to give all postal and other civil service employes the right of free speech and freedom of press, and the right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances against arbitrary rules issued by department officials was referred to the Executive Council to be taken up with the members of Congress in Washington. The president of the Federation was instructed to name a committee of three members each year for the purpose of making recommendations to the President of the United States respecting appointments to the Federal bench. On this day also action was taken by the convention to the following effect on the following subjects:

For woman suffrage.

For an 8-hour day for post office clerks.

For legislation for better protection of actors and actresses from the "extortion and corrupt business methods" of so-called theatrical employment agencies.

For a postal savings bank act.

For deep water ways projects.

For a continuation of the fight against tuberculosis.

For the granting of American citizenship to the people of Porto Rico.

For the construction of a twenty-six-foot channel

through the great lakes from Buffalo to Duluth and from Buffalo to Chicago.

On the ground that employment agencies are used as strike-breaking organizations, the Federation decided to attempt to secure national legislation for their regulation. "Labor Sunday" was a suggestion laid before the Federation in a resolution introduced by Secretary Frank Morrison. The resolution designates the first Sunday in September of each year as an occasion when the churches of America should devote some part of the day to a presentation of the labor question. It also recommends that the various central and local bodies be requested to co-operate in every legitimate way with ministers who thus observe Labor Sunday. Another resolution of general interest offered by the American Federation of Musicians, asked that the American Federation of Labor petition Congress to appoint a special committee to investigate the methods employed by the steel industry in maintaining industrial conditions, and that if it is found that the tariff instead of being used to maintain American industrial conditions, is turned into the pockets of the employers, the tariff on steel be suspended.

+

A mass meeting attended by over 4,000 persons was held on the 14th, Sunday, to declare a labor war upon the saloon. The principal speech was made by the Rev. Charles Stelzle, fraternal delegate to the Federation of Labor from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. In the course of his speech Mr. Stelzle said:

I came from a family of saloon keepers and brewers. I have no sympathy with those who characterize the saloon keeper and bartender as low browed brutes. I am not a prohibitionist. But I am unalterably opposed to the saloon. The labor movement is a bigger thing than the saloon question. The time has come when the labor movement and the saloon should be divorced. In too many cities of the country trade unionists are compelled to pass through the saloon in order to get to their meeting places, and woe betide the man who doesn't stop to take a drink. Many of the workmen of America are helplessly in the power of those hall owners. It is the duty of the municipality to provide centers which may be used for the gathering places of the people in their organizations. In many instances workmen themselves have taken the matter in hand and in some of the leading cities they have erected labor temples which are used for the social, physical, intellectual, and moral uplift of the people. To the task of labor temple building organized labor may well direct itself. The work should be entered upon with a program which includes the entire American continent. Such a movement would give organized labor a dignity not yet achieved in our American life.

Other speakers were John Mitchell, John B. Lennon, vice president and treasurer respectively of the Federation; Thomas L. Lewis, president of

the United Mine Workers, and James Simpson. Mr. Mitchell said:

The labor organization has done more to advance the cause of temperance upon this continent than any other influence. Poverty has driven many a strong man to drink and drink has driven many a strong man to poverty. A shorter work day and good wages would do more than any other agency to advance the cause of temperance. I am not at all impressed by the statements often made that if we destroyed the liquor traffic an awful calamity would result. If a brewery or a distillery is closed, upon its ruins will rise a factory. It would mean simply a readjustment of industry. Every scandal in the labor movement, few as these have been, can be traced to the influence of the saloon. I would ask you who are not wage earners to judge organized labor by the good it does and not by its faults and weaknesses.

Mr. Lennon said that the liquor business lowers the standard of efficiency of the workingman, and prophesied that the time would come when the forces of labor would be arrayed against the saloon. The United Mine Workers, Mr. Lewis said, have prohibited their members from selling intoxicants, even at picnics. Education of the masses, he argued, would go a long way toward eradicating the liquor traffic.

+

On the 15th, the convention ordered the outlining of a plan of campaign against the steel trust as "the most formidable and aggressive enemy" of organized labor. The resolution was introduced by P. J. McArdle, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America, and was adopted unanimously and with enthusiasm. The most sensational feature of this day's session, however, was the announcement toward the close that telegraphic information was to the effect that the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia had refused a stay of proceedings beyond the 19th in the Gompers-Mitchell-Morrison case (p. 1093), from which it was inferred that the sentence imposed upon these labor leaders would be executed on that day. There was an immediate movement in the convention looking to an adjournment from Toronto to Washington in order to act in a body as an escort for the leaders on their way to prison. They are under \$12,000 bail bonds—\$5,000, \$4,000 and \$3,000, respectively.

+

#### Protest Against Arrest of Labor Leaders.

Resolutions calling a general strike if Gompers, Mitchell and Morrison are imprisoned for contempt of the Van Cleave injunction against freedom of the press (p. 1093), were unanimously adopted by standing vote at the regular meeting on the 14th of the Central Labor Union of Phila-

delphia. The resolutions, presented by H. C. Parker of the Cigarmakers' Union, were received with shouts of approval. They denounced the courts as allies of organized wealth, and declared that if Gompers, Morrison and Mitchell were imprisoned under the mandate of the court of the District of Columbia, every wage worker ought, as a protest and for a show of strength, to cease work for two weeks. A committee to develop and carry out the plan in Philadelphia was appointed. With a request that the proposed protest strike be made nation wide if the occasion for it arises, a copy of the resolutions was sent to the Toronto Convention of the American Federation of Labor.

† †

#### Street Speaking in Spokane.

Under a city ordinance forbidding outdoor speaking in Spokane, Washington, speakers for the Industrial Workers of the World had been imprisoned up to the 11th to the number of 300, all of whom were then in jail—a third of them in the Federal army prison by arrangement between the city and the War Department. The conflict had at that time been in progress 9 days. It was precipitated by the declaration of a "free speech day" by the Industrial Workers, who had decided to ignore the city ordinance. The police used streams of water from fire hose to disperse the meetings and arrested scores of union men. Since that time, no day has passed without a large number of arrests for street speaking. On the 11th there were fewer arrests and the "water cure" was not used.

†

Four of the Industrial Workers' leaders are in jail in Spokane, charged with conspiracy. James Wilson, editor of the local organ of the Industrial Workers, was first arrested. E. J. Foote was sent there from Portland, Ore. to take Wilson's place and was arrested. C. L. Filigno and George Cousins are the other leaders in jail. The members of the Industrial Workers of the World who have assembled at Spokane have come from every city on the Pacific coast, and a large number are from the middle West and East. Recruits are reported to be arriving daily and the union men are reported as being determined to continue their fight until they win their point—the revocation of the ordinance which, they charge, robs them of the right of free speech. They have conducted an orderly campaign, according to Spokane dispatches of the United Press.

† †

#### President Taft's Journey Ended.

From Florence, South Carolina, President Taft (p. 1092) went to Wilmington, North Carolina, on the 9th, and thence to Richmond, arriving in Washington at the end of the day on the 10th.

He is reported to have rounded out a route of travel 12,759 miles long.

† †

#### The "Dreadnought" Rage.

Germany has jumped over France and the United States in naval strength and now stands only second to Great Britain as a sea power, according to official announcement from the navy department in Washington, on the 8th; and no halt has been called. Germany's battle ship building program this year is the largest in her history, contracts being let for 210,992 tons. This is a larger tonnage than England constructed last year when she achieved a "Dreadnought," which cost \$10,000,000. Great Britain is now laying down "superdreadnoughts," thirty per cent larger than the original ship of this class, and carrying fifty per cent greater gun power. They will cost \$15,000,000 apiece. The Orion will be the name of the first. Canada is also planning for a navy of its own. A bill in preparation by the ministry calls for the construction of three second class cruisers and four torpedo boat destroyers, also for the establishment of training schools for officers and men. Turkey, too, has a naval program which the ministry is preparing to urge upon the parliament convening this week, providing for the building of seven "dreadnoughts" in seven years, with smaller ships—together calling for something like \$100,000,000.

† †

#### Chinese Mining Concessions.

In view of published statements that the recent Chinese-Japanese agreement relating to Manchuria (p. 876), and mentioned in connection with the Crane incident (p. 1095), had created for Chinese and Japanese subjects a monopoly to carry on mining operations along the South Manchurian railway and Antung-Mukden railway, which would exclude Americans from an extensive field of industrial exploitation, the State Department issued a statement on the 15th to the effect that inquiry had been made of China and Japan and that—official assurance has been received from each to the effect that no such exclusive claim to mining rights was intended by the agreement; and that, if minerals are found by Americans and others within the designated territories, no objection will be made to their working the mines under concessions granted by China—the whole scope and purpose of the agreement being that any operation by Chinese and Japanese subjects of the mines within the territory mentioned should be joint as between themselves.

† †

#### Chinese Preparation for Constitutionalism.

As reported in The Public three weeks ago (p. 1040), the new Chinese Provincial Assemblies have met, pursuant to the ten years' program for constitutionalism given out fifteen months ago.

Frank G. Carpenter, writing from Peking to the Chicago Tribune, describes a wonderful "campaign of education" now going on throughout China. Since the promulgation of the edicts, Mr. Carpenter says, "the Chinese have been studying parliamentary law and preparing themselves for self-government. They have organized debating societies in every part of the Empire, and they are now discussing the chief features of Western civilization. Many of the governors have established schools for this purpose and are educating their subjects along constitutional lines. The viceroy of Nanking, who rules about 100,000,000 on the lower Yangste-kiang, has appointed lecturers, who are giving nightly talks on modern constitutional government, and many of the cities of his dominion have assemblies where the people come together every week to discuss what they shall do when allowed to vote. The same movement is going on here in north China. Tientsin has its constitutional debating societies. It has organized municipal councils, and the city fathers are attending night schools. The same is true of Hankow and other places farther west, as well as of Canton and the other big centers of the south. Indeed, this whole nation is in the throes of an intellectual and social revolution, and that mighty body politic which we know as the Celestial Kingdom, is rejuvenating its soul." Moreover, modern thought demands a modernized language, and a new system of phonetic writing is under way. "The new schools will practically create a new language for China," says Mr. Carpenter; and he continues: "Schools are now being organized by the thousands, and there are tens of thousands of the old Chinese professors who are fitting themselves to become modern teachers. At the time the edict was sent forth 10,000 went to Japan and spent about six months there fitting themselves for the new education. The most of these have returned, but there are at present something like 5,000 Chinese studying in Japan, and there will soon be in the neighborhood of 1,000 studying in America."

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—President Taft has named November 25 as Thanksgiving Day.

—Ransom R. Cable, former president of the Rock Island railway (father of Ben. T. Cable), died in Chicago on the 12th at the age of 75.

—The Zelaya government in Nicaragua seems at last to be making headway against the revolutionists (p. 1068), winning a little naval battle on the 12th, and recapturing Greytown.

—A direct legislation league for Nebraska was organized at Lincoln on the 5th with ex-Senator J. H. Mockett as president; A. G. Chapman, secretary; L. S. Herron, treasurer, and an executive committee consisting of Mayor Don Love, Rev. A. L. Wetherby,

L. J. Quinby, S. M. Coffey, F. R. Williams, H. T. Dobbins, and George Wood.

—Raymond A. Patterson, the "Raymond" of the Chicago Tribune, died at Washington on the 13th. He was Washington correspondent of the Tribune and his pen name was famous throughout the country as that of a trustworthy newspaper writer.

—Mary Darrow Olson, sister of Clarence S. Darrow and principal of one of the Chicago public schools, a woman of high repute as an educator and a trusted leader in the democratization of public school education in Chicago, died on the 14th at the age of 58.

—Fountain L. Thompson was appointed on the 10th by Gov. Burke as United States Senator from North Dakota to fill the unexpired term of Senator Johnson (p. 1044), who died last month. Senator Thompson declares himself an advocate of tariffs for revenue only.

—News of the death of a prominent single tax man of the early days of the Henry George movement comes from Boston. Dr. Charles K. Cutter, a well known physician of Somerville and Charlestown, Mass., died at Somerville on the 11th at the age of fifty-eight.

—Bombs thrown by unknown persons on the 14th in Buenos Ayres, Argentina (p. 731), killed the chief of police of that city, Mr. Falcon, and the police secretary; and in Ahmedabad, India (p. 972), gave Lord Minto, the Viceroy of India, and Lady Minto a narrow escape from death.

—Ruth Bryan Leavitt (daughter of William J. Bryan) is filling successful lecture engagements in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and Colorado. Her terms for Nebraska are \$25 and expenses, and outside of Nebraska, \$50 and expenses; and her subject is "A Pilgrimage through Palestine."

—For each meeting of the Chicago Single Tax Club, at their club room, 508 Schiller Building, a lecture, followed by discussion, is announced. These meetings are held every Friday at 8 o'clock. The club room is opened at 7. For the 19th, the lecture will be by G. C. Olcott on "The Income Tax."

—On application of Joseph Call, attorney for the lemon growers of southern California, Judge Morrow of the United States Circuit Court issued on the 11th a temporary injunction restraining the Southern Pacific, the San Pedro, Salt Lake & Los Angeles and the Santa Fe railways from (p. 963), raising the freight rate on lemon shipments from California.

—The death roll of old time single tax men has been lengthened by the name of Louis Blaul, of Philadelphia, who died on the 5th, after suffering several years with locomotor ataxia and total blindness. Mr. Blaul was a successful business man, noted for integrity, who freely devoted energy, means and time to the promotion of the Henry George movement.

—The meeting of the National Grange at Des Moines, Iowa, on the 15th, adopted a resolution declaring "this convention hereby demands the same political rights for all citizens, regardless of sex, in order that government of the people for the people and by the people may be established in the nation." Other resolutions favored parcels post

and postal savings banks, and opposed a ship subsidy.

—At the October convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs (p. 1045) the Women's Henry George League of New York city offered a resolution asking for the appointment of a permanent committee on taxation, "to report upon all changes in taxation, whether proposed or actual, and their probable effect upon living expenses for citizens of New York." It was referred to the board of directors.

—The second session of the Turkish (p. 829) Parliament (pp. 663, 782) was opened on the 14th by Sultan Mehmed V in person. The Grand Vizier, Hilmi Pasha, read the speech from the throne, which is reported as being a conservative document, dealing chiefly with internal affairs. Ahmed Riza Bey was re-elected President of the Parliament by a large majority. The budget shows a deficit of nearly \$23,500,000.

—At the dinner to ex-Judge Edward Osgood Brown on the 13th, the speakers, besides Judge Brown, were ex-Mayor Dunne (the chairman), Bishop Williams of Detroit and Victor Yarros. Judge Brown spoke on the British Budget, and duplicates of the land reform posters used at the Hyde Park meeting last summer (pp. 727, 824), which had been forwarded by Joseph Fels, were displayed back of the speakers' table.

—The constitutionality of the Illinois 10-hour law was sustained on the 11th by Judge Goings, in the Municipal Court, upon a criminal prosecution against the president of the Bowes Allegretti Co., which was accused of working Kitty DeWitt in a factory more than ten hours a day. The foreman testified that he employed 22 girls, 18 of whom made from \$30 to \$40 a week. He said the Christmas season now on necessitated long hours.

—The mail steamer *La Seyne* of the French service, running between Java and Singapore, was run down in a fog early in the morning of the 11th by the steamship *Onda* of the British India line, and 95 persons were drowned or devoured by the sharks which swarmed at the location of the disaster. Sixty-one persons were rescued from the bloody waters. Eight Europeans were among the lost. The other victims were native passengers and sailors.

—A terrific hurricane swept the West Indies last week. Ships were wrecked. Jamaica reports a loss of lives that can never be reckoned, and a loss of \$7,000,000 in property. Forty-eight inches of water fell at Kingston between the 5th and the 11th, 13 inches falling in one day. In Hayti earthquakes added to the horrors of the situation, turning the drenched island into a quaking bog. There also the property loss runs into the millions and the loss of life was large.

—Execution of a mandate for contempt of the Supreme Court of the United States was enforced on the 15th against Joseph F. Shipp, ex-Sheriff of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and five others. This is the case (p. 565) in which the Supreme Court had issued a stay of proceedings in behalf of a Negro convicted of murder, and a mob had thereupon lynched the prisoner. The Supreme Court held that the sheriff and the five others had facilitated the

lynching in defiance of the court's order of stay. They are in jail at Washington upon sentence for six months.

—A five days' convention of the National Farm Land Congress assembled to consider the reclamation of unoccupied lands in all parts of the country for agriculture, began its sessions at Chicago on the 16th. The men who have answered the call are Governors of States, Federal officials, irrigation engineers, railroad managers, colonizationists, agricultural experts, and representative citizens of the respective states appointed by Governors, Mayors and chambers of commerce.

—A white man and a Negro were lynched at Cairo on the 11th by a mob. The Negro they hanged from an illuminated arch across a business thoroughfare, afterward dragging his body by the rope through the street to a bonfire where they burned it. Then the mob rushed to the jail and seized the white man, confined on a charge of wife murder which he denied, and hanged him to a telegraph pole. The incitement was the revolting murder of a young woman for which the lynched Negro had been arrested. Governor Deneen sent eleven militia companies to the scene of the riot.

—The 14th was the last day on which the Detroit United Railway cars (pp. 277, 354) may operate under the franchises on any of the principal 5 cent lines. On the stroke of midnight 66 miles of city streets passed back under city control. On the 15th the first payment under Corporation Counsel Halley's rental plan of \$300 a day was due the city. In addition to being at liberty to tie up a great proportion of the city traffic, the city has it within its power to shut off a large portion of the Detroit United Interurban service, which now finds an outlet from the city over the main thoroughfares, Woodward, Michigan, Jefferson, and Gratiot avenues.

—After an immense socialist meeting in Frankfort-on-Main, Germany, on the 14th, in favor of universal suffrage, a great procession was formed which marched to the Bismarck monument and then to the Schiller monument, speeches for election reform being made at each. Because some of the crowd had shouted, "Down with Bismarck and the Prussian Junkers," at the Bismarck monument, and one of the speakers had denounced Bismarck as an oppressor, the procession was dispersed by the police when on its way from the Schiller monument to police headquarters. The reports speak of the meetings and procession as "serious demonstrations in the streets," but give no facts indicating any disorderly conduct except by the police.

—Remarkable demonstrations by a spirit medium were reported from New York on the 14th. The medium is an Italian peasant woman, Eusapia Palladino. Italian scientists, led by the neurologist, Morelli, had tested her powers in 28 seances, and were of the opinion that the phenomena she exhibits, while not spiritistic, are genuine and not fraudulent. She is in this country now under theatrical management, and was tested on the 14th by newspaper reporters principally. Her feat on this occasion consisted in causing, without any device the observers detected, the rising of a table of its own volition, apparently, and its self-suspension in the

air for 35 seconds. Also a voluntary somersault by a stool. The laws of gravitation were apparently defied.

—At Bristol, England, on the 13th, a militant suffragette, armed with a horsewhip, assaulted Winston Spencer Churchill, one of the British cabinet ministers, and it was only after a struggle that she was restrained. Churchill and his wife had just arrived by train and were leaving the railroad station when the woman suddenly darted out from the crowd and commenced to belabor him with the whip. He seized his assailant and succeeded in wrenching the whip from her hands after a sharp struggle, during which the two barely escaped falling from the platform to the tracks below. The suffragette was arrested and imprisoned. At the police station she was identified as Therese Gurnett. She was smartly gowned. Churchill's hat broke the force of the blow, but the lash curled about his face and left a red mark.

—Two hundred and fifty-six miners were entombed in the burning levels of the mines of the St. Paul Coal Company at Cherry, Ill., on the 13th, and eleven brave men were burned to death in making efforts at rescue. The fire is believed to have started from a torch used in place of electric lights temporarily out of repair. The torch projected from a niche in the wall of the second vein, and five carloads of hay caught from it. In spite of the fact that the mine was sealed for the night to suffocate the flames, a faint hope existed that some of the men might have kept themselves alive in distant recesses of the mine, and sounds like shots heard on the 14th lent strength to the hope. Efforts to reach to them on that day failed, however; and on the following day when a draft was started with a big air fan to blow out the gases, the flames broke out afresh and the mine was once more sealed up, inevitably stifling any possible survivors.

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### A "Luxurious" Citizen.

New York Press (Rep.), Nov. 11.—Tom Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, who has recently been defeated for another term, evidently does not regard himself as a philanthropist. He is getting the most "fun" he can out of life. He is working for the city because he likes it, not because he thinks it his duty to do so. The vision of a city beautiful, externally and in material and moral happiness, which may be some day, appeals powerfully to his imagination. He indulges himself in the thought of it and pleases himself by working for it, by helping to bring it about. This work to him is as pure a pleasure as is the building of a house of blocks to the child. He retired from business because it no longer satisfied his temperament, his desire for full pleasure, moral and intellectual. He fought the street railway fight for fun—for this deeper fun which means the best kind of ethical activity. "I chose public life and the fight against monopoly because I enjoy it," he said. In defeat Johnson will not forego this deeper luxury. He asserts that he will be a candidate for Mayor two years hence, and in the meantime he will

continue to lead the life he loves—to work for the common good as he understands it. He will continue to attack unjust privilege wherever he can. Whether or not he has always been wise and successful, he has always been, in this unusual sense, extremely self-indulgent. It would be well if the world had many more citizens who were given to this kind of luxury.



### Political Defeats.

La Follette's (Ind. Rep.), Nov. 13.—In the defeat of Tom L. Johnson and of Francis J. Heney we find nothing disheartening. The struggle to wrest our government in city, State and nation, from the clutches of Special Privilege, has been marked by many setbacks. It is a long struggle, a big struggle. It is not in the books that the leaders of the people's cause should win every engagement. Defeats must be met. Sometimes they seem overwhelming. But to the leader whose heart is in the cause, who fights with his eye fixed steadfastly on the ultimate goal, who has no thought of personal glory or personal gain, one defeat, or two defeats, or a series of them all along the line are but incidents. When they come he buckles on his armor more securely, looks to his weapons, reorganizes his forces and faces the next encounter undismayed. To such a man, defeat never means surrender.



### Free Speech.

New York Press (Rep.), Nov. 10.—Nothing could be more alarming, both to those who want ultimate industrial peace in this country and to those who believe that free speech is one of the fundamental necessities of a free people, than a number of recent happenings. The suppression by the police of a Ferrer protest meeting in Philadelphia, the decision of a judge in that city that a man might have ideas about government which would deprive him ipso facto of Constitutional rights, and this wholesale imprisonment of men who want to talk in Spokane, these are incidents which point to the great increase in this country of the exercise of authority without the most sensitive regard for the rights of the individual, upon which is founded the greatest welfare not only of a few of us but, in the long run, of all of us. It is a dangerous thing to rest placidly in an assumed national virtue and not to realize that the human nature which has made possible governmental oppression in Russia may make it possible here. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. There are always forces at work making for reaction from true civilization, and to these forces we must be sensitively alive at every moment.



He ate and drank the precious words,  
His spirit grew robust;  
He knew no more that he was poor,  
Nor that his frame was dust.  
He danced along the dingy days,  
And this bequest of wings  
Was but a book. What liberty  
A loosened spirit brings!

—Emily Dickinson—"A Book."

## RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

### THE NOVEMBER NIGHT-WIND.

For The Public.

Down thru the dark o' the wood, like a spirit, it ran;  
Its shrieking appalled,—  
Voicing the woe at the heart of the world, over man,  
Long error-enthralled.

DWIGHT MARVEN.

\* \* \*

### LINCOLN STEFFENS GETS A WRITING MACHINE.

Expressions of Opinion from Grateful Men, Obtained Wirelessly by W. G. Eggleston.

*Postmaster General Hitchcock:* "That is, indeed, great news. It means a material reduction of the postal deficit, for we can now dispense with two-thirds of the force in the Dead Letter Office."

*Joseph Leggett:* "It is another illustration, young man, that nothing can stop the onward march of the Single Tax."

*Louis F. Post:* "It is good news; and yet— Perhaps I can best illustrate what I mean by saying that there is a pleasurable element of uncertainty in groping under the bed, in the dark, for a collar button. Steffens's purchase removes the pleasurable uncertainty, but there still remains the uncertainty of—but why say it?"

*President Taft:* "Good! My speeches now have no rival in the realm of mystery!"

*Editor Anybody's Magazine:* "Too bad! The great charm of Steffens' writing was that the whole editorial force had to get drunk as a biled owl to read it. Now we'll have to keep sober."

*James G. Maguire:* "Well, I suppose I'll have to go back to solving chess problems for mental gymnastics."

*Theodore Roosevelt:* "He's a liar."

*Bolton Hall:* "It sounds like a parable."

*Francis J. Heney:* Now I can read one of Steffens' letters without asking the Court to continue a graft case for a week."

*James H. Barry:* "Things will be less uncertain hereafter."

*Daniel Kiefer:* "It is equal to a \$5,000 subscription to the Fels fund. Now I'll quit dreaming, after reading one of Steffens' letters, that I'm translating 'Progress and Poverty' from Turkish into Japanese."

*W. S. U'Ren:* "So? I hope it won't give me mental dyspepsia. For years I have used his hand-made letters to exercise the Fletcherizing muscles of my brain on."

*William Marion Reedy:* "The *x*, the unknown quantity, of the world's reform movement has be-

come a known quantity. To read one of Steffens' letters now will be like knowing the principal parts of hash while you eat it."

*Joseph G. Cannon:* "Got a writin' machine, eh? What he needs is a thinkin' machine."

*Eggleston himself:* "I'll bet that if Steffens will send a typewritten letter with one of the old-time kind, to the typewriter man, he'll get a \$250 rebate on the price of a \$100 machine. They would make a great 'Before and After' advertisement."

\* \* \*

### WISE ADVICE TO LANDOWNERS.

Significant Editorial on the Advance of Land Value Taxation. From the Real Estate News (September, 1909), the Leading Real Estate Paper of Chicago.

While real estate in America now furnishes far more than its proportional quota of the public revenues, it is still, in contemplation of law, taxed at the same rate as personal and intangible property; it has not yet been singled out as a class by itself, devoted to pay a fraction of its capital value into the public exchequer. The sagacious investor who, a quarter of a century ago, bought for \$500 a suburban lot which is now worth \$25,000, rests in the confidence that as an American citizen he cannot be despoiled of his vested interests. Habit has lulled him into security, though the land tax, now firmly entrenched in Germany and certain to prevail in England, is advancing on these United States with all the slow certainty of fate. No Atlantic ocean can stay its progress. The degree of distress which it entails will depend largely upon the tact and foresight with which landed proprietors meet it.

According to the gospel of the land taxers, all increase in unimproved real estate values is due to the growth and industry of the community, and not to anything done by the owner himself. The purchaser of the \$500 lot no doubt thinks himself entitled to the benefit of his bargain, but there is at least \$20,000 of its present value, they insist, which he has done nothing to create. Abstractly considered, there is plausibility in the argument that this increment of value belongs to the community which created it rather than to the individual owner who sat passively by. The feudal lords held by mere royal favor and force of arms the broad domains which they could not personally use. Were it not for the inertia of tradition and the necessary pains of readjustment, few persons would now be found to argue that land was a proper subject for private ownership except to the extent of productive use. The right to hold land merely for a rise in values, if not prejudiced by old habits of thought, would present itself to an industrial age as an economic anachronism. So

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

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

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

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

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

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

\* \* \*

## SUFFRAGETTE VIOLENCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\* \* \*

### DREAD NOUGHT.

Guy Kendall in the London Nation of October 23, 1909

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

And truly have none other.

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

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

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

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

Dread not though foes thine earthwork's weakness  
find,

Strong soul entrenched behind!

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

\* \* \*

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

---

## BOOKS

---

### THE RISING SOUTH.

**The Southerner.** A Novel. Being the autobiography of Nicholas Worth. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.

This is not a new novel, but there is no staleness about it; and while it has the artful touch of fictional autobiography, it is not improbably a veritable life story in its principal outlines.

The scenes are laid in a Southern State, neither named nor definitely indicated, but very like North Carolina if one may draw an inference from the atmosphere of the story. It begins with the Civil War, when "Nicholas Worth" was a boy old enough to know the truth about Santa Claus, yet young enough to suspect the war of being another such entertaining invention until the dead bodies of Confederate soldiers began to come home for burial.

To all the boys of that time, North as well as South, the homely touches of these opening chapters must set the doors of their old-time memories ajar. Here, at any rate, this is a very true story. The war was so far away from most of us that it long seemed unreal in many a commonplace back country community of both sections. Neighbors had gone a-soldiering, to be sure; but that seemed like a picnic, and you wished you could have gone with them—only your folks wouldn't let you. But the war had no reality to you until some of those neighbors came back in boxes, and you went awe-struck and curious to the little churchyard to see them buried.

The war plays its part, though not obtrusively, in making the interest of this Southerner's story. Incidentally there are pictures of the old South as it really was. Its overwrought provincialism is brought out boldly, yet in a spirit of well-tempered sympathy as well as judicious candor. This candor and sympathy continue hand in hand in the after years, down through the last page and into the present period. They are especially admirable and all the more so for being plainly human wherever the Negro question enters in, whether as a Southern problem or a Northern diversion.

It is in the solution of that problem on high grounds, neither sectional nor national, that the fictitious autobiographer has made his career. He has done this in the spirit, even if not at all angles according to the academic doctrines, of essential democracy. His fine epigram that "there can be no such thing as a democracy with any zone of silence about it," will be recognized as giving the keynote to his character. He is a Southern democrat with a little "d." For the Negro, for example, he cares nothing "merely because he is a Negro," but "because he is a man—or a child";

and he prefers "to think of the people in the Southern States as a people—white and black alike—living under certain conditions, which can be made very fortunate and prosperous conditions, rather than about any particular class or race of them." Applying this principle to educational questions, to the tendency to distinguish either in favor of Negroes or against them in educational effort, he declares his conviction that "into any proper scheme of education, there are no white men, no black men—only men."

One observation will especially interest many of our readers. It is not the autobiographer's, but he puts it approvingly into the mouth of his brother. Referring to a co-operative farming plan, this far-seeing brother says: "This is the first step; the men who use the land best must at last get its fruits, and our system of ownership and control must ultimately shape itself to this primary principle of justice."

The whole spirit of this novel finds compact utterance in its last paragraph: "Therefore to you who read this, if you believe (as I do) that our American ideal is invincible and immortal, and that men may in truth govern themselves and give fair play and abolish privilege and keep the doors of opportunity open—even here where fell the Shadow of the one Great Error of the Fathers—we who have toiled where doubt was heaviest now send good cheer."

\* \* \*

### THE SOUTH AND THE NEGRO.

**The Basis of Ascendancy: A Discussion of Certain Principles of Public Policy Involved in the Development of the Southern States.** By Edgar Gardner Murphy, author of "The Present South." Published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York, London, Bombay and Calcutta. Price, \$1.50 net, \$1.60 postpaid.

This book, by a Southern man of Montgomery, Ala., is another of those expressions from the South which indicate that the day of the Bourbon is passing.

Perhaps one might better explain the antipathy of white men toward Negroes in harmony with Professor Royce's idea than with the author's—as among childish phenomena due to the traditional relations of master and slave, rather than fundamental. But the substance of the book rests upon conditions as they are, and tries to make the best of them regardless of philosophical abstractions. Its spirit is democratic, with an aristocratic tinge we should say, but at any rate genuinely even if not completely democratic.

Assuming that the Negro is not a white man in a black skin, but that there are fundamental differences which government cannot alter, the author lays down the premise that the Negro "has not been adequately accorded the economic sup-

port of the profounder social forces of security, opportunity and hope," and that this fact the government may "largely alter if it will." The question is, will it do so? And the purpose of the book is to present a basis for "an affirmative answer to that question." Not to answer it in the affirmative is regarded by the author as a suicidal policy for the white race.

"The law which does not protect the weak, will not—and in the end cannot—protect the strong. That which our oblique processes and our temperamental discriminations—whether in the letter of our statutes, the administration of the police, the opinions of the bench, or the verdicts of the jury—must destroy (if the zealots of race antipathy shall have their way), is not the Negro, nor the white man only, but society itself—society as a sufficient instrument of equitable and profitable relations between man and man. When, accordingly, we cheat the weak out of his legitimate protections, we not only despoil ourselves of our consciences and our peace, but we cheat our generation and its children out of the heritage of our institutions."

Solid ground to stand upon, that; and the author is right in intimating that the admonition is needed by the North as well as the South.

Race mixture of blood the author does not fear from inter-racial justice and equality of opportunity. He fears it from repression. "A race's life," he truly says, "is an organic growth; it is not like a dead platform that we can safely build our houses over or our walls about; it is a living thing. You can force it back and can lay it prostrate, but when you have driven it even underground it will reappear. Its living roots, its secret and extending tentacles of growth, will search beneath the familiar soil, will find their way below the foundations of your wall, will come up upon the outer side—intertwined with your own growth, blended with your stock, and terrible in their confusions and their fruitage." It

is not upon repression, therefore, that this author would preserve the racial peculiarities and maintain the integrity of both races. "Build your walls, if you will," he exclaims, "but give to this race also a garden of noble spaces. Build your walls high in self-protection, but rear them as no dungeon above another life. Let its growth have its own sunshine, light from the same sun, nurture from the same air and the same rains; let all wise and pure conspiracies advance it. Its liberation will mean not its encroachment, but its self-fulfillment. Force it downward into degeneracy and abasement, and, having no garden and no sunshine of its own, its pervasive and intruding death will seek you out. Your sounder health depends less upon its repression than upon its freedom."

With an unanswerable challenge to those who fear amalgamation, the author asks: "How can the Negro be expected to cling to his race world with simplicity of feeling or tenacity of purpose if that world be chiefly synonymous with humiliation, and if the only creditable or honorable world of which he knows is the world of another people?"

As to the white South with her Negro problem, the essential issue as the author sees it is not the Negro at all. "He is comparatively of little significance except as the humble occasion and instrument of the processes through which the South is refining and establishing her conceptions of society and is determining her relations to the country at large, to the world, and to democracy. The fundamental issue is not what we will do with the Negro, but what we—with the Negro as the incident or provocation of our adjustments—will do with our institutions." The question of the Negro's incapacity, the author scouts as irrelevant, the real question being "whether the attitude of the state toward such capacity as he has, is to be that of development or repression."

The problem for the South, as definitely put, is this one of "practical and fundamental policy":

## The Little Schoolmaster.

In the cause of Fundamental Democracy The Public ministers to the University Class.

Its subscribers are those who are disillusioned as to sham measures, and who will "go the distance" if the road is clear.

Think what a power is the association of 10,000 such men and women, established by such a medium.

But we must also think of extending and organizing this already great influence; and this must be done by *all of us*.

Break in now to this work by sending the subscription of some friend who will *appreciate the truth as you do*.

530 Walnut St.,  
Cincinnati, Ohio.  
November 13, 1909.

Daniel Kiefer

"Is the Negro race at the South a large and persistent factor in our economic and political organization, to be, in every fundamental sense, a retrogressive or a co-operative population?" The author's choice may be anticipated, but his hopes as a Southerner can best be expressed in his own words: "It was through the Negro in our experience that the South once lost her mastery, her mastery not over him alone, but over those oppor-

tunities for a national leadership and for an uninterrupted eminence of service to which her capacities entitled her. It may be that through this same strange waiting, baffling factor in her life, her ascendancy, in higher forms, may again return—in forms not threatening the estate and dignity of labor, the sway of freedom, the instinct and custom of our age, but bestowed by a labor which she has freed, and by an age and a democ-

**T**HERE is one simple, easiest, right way to use Fels-Naptha soap: and that is to go by the plain directions on the red and green wrapper that covers the genuine Fels-Naptha.

The results will repay any woman who reads, and heeds.

## The Public

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Terms of Subscription

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

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

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

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders 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 .....	1.25
Half-inch, each insertion .....	.60

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

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

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

racy which, in her service to the profoundest task, she has supremely justified."

\* \* \*

County Commissioner W. F. Elrick met E. A. Binyon, secretary of the Municipal association, the other morning in the Cleveland courthouse.

"Binyon," says Elrick, "what do you think! I've just caught on to a bit of petty graft in this county. Not only in this county but right in my own household! Can you beat that? It's a fact."

Elrick bit off the end of a cigar morosely before he continued. "You see," he went on, "my wife's

been allowing the washwoman 10 cents car fare every time she comes. And I've just found out that the washwoman lives on a 3 cent car line and has been 4 cents to the good on every one of the transactions for the last couple of years. Ever hear the like of it?"—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

\* \* \*

"Wattles appears to be a good deal discouraged about something."

"Yes. He lost considerable money in a stock deal not long ago. He could hardly have taken it harder if he had been an English duke when the Budget was passed."—Chicago Record-Herald.

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

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

Three Portraits of  
**TOM L. JOHNSON**

In narrow black wood frames  
with white mats.

**ONLY THREE.**

**ONE DOLLAR each, while they last.**

Office of **THE PUBLIC, 357 Dearborn St., Chicago**

## The Tariff:

**What it is:**

**How it Works:**

**Whom it Benefits.**

**Protection:**

**Revenue:**

**Free Trade.**

By **Lee Francis Lybarger**, of the Philadelphia Bar. Author of "Land, Labor, Wealth."

Sold by The Public's Book Department for 30 cents, postpaid.

# SOCIAL SERVICE

New Book by **LOUIS F. POST**

Published by **A. WESSELS, New York**

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

Also by **THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago**

**Price, One Dollar, Postpaid**

When writing to Advertisers please mention **THE PUBLIC.**

