

The Public

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

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

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LEWIS STEFFENS, Massachusetts
L. F. 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 PELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLEDS, New Zealand
W. G. BEELSTON, California.

Vol. XIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 1910.

No. 614

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 387 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

EDITORIAL

Who Profits by the Increased Cost of Living? Do You?

Some facts in the economic and social conditions of this country have certainly impressed themselves on everybody so that not even the traditional "obstinate jurymen" stands forth to deny them. At the beginning of this year of grace 1910, the cost of living for everybody, measured by a money standard, is extremely high. Prices of foodstuffs and all other necessities of life have been for a long period steadily climbing upward. The measure of a money standard, however, is not the only one nor the best one by which the cost of living is to be considered. We have been told so often by the advocates of "free silver coinage," as well as by the protectionists, that low prices mean hard times and that high prices mean prosperity, that we might accept the present high prices as evidence of that onrush of prosperity which is still the subject of mutual congratulation among the participants in "big business," if it were not for a still more vital fact, as obstinately in evidence as the high money prices for the commodities that all the people must have. This fact is that the wages of labor (and we use the term in its widest sense) have not advanced to keep pace with the rise of the necessities of life; and measured therefore by labor values—the labor, that is, that must be expended to get them—food, clothes and shelter, to say nothing of simple "luxuries" that are real necessities for any developing life.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Who Profits by the Increased Cost of Living? Do You?	1
Labor Safety Laws.....	2
"Lead Us Not Into Temptation".....	2
A Test for the Thoughtfully Inconsistent.....	3
Land Monopoly in the Philippines.....	3
The British Revolution (Louis G. Hoeck).....	4

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The British Parliamentary Campaign (Portrait of Winston Churchill)	8
The Nicaraguan Revolution.....	10
"Conservation of Equal Rights".....	10
The "Insurgent" Movement.....	11
A New Morgan Merger.....	11
The Strike of the Forty Thousand.....	11
San Francisco Votes for Municipal Ownership.....	12
Indiana's New Accounting Law.....	12
Boston Under Her New Charter.....	13
Mayor Gaynor Installed.....	13
Close of Mayor Johnson's Administration.....	13
News Notes	14
Press Opinions	16

RELATED THINGS:

A Man Is Passing (Edmund Vance Cooke).....	18
Home Lessons in Economics.....	18
Henry George and Social Reform (Dr. P. C. N. Starcke, Translated by C. M. Koedt).....	18
He Who Would Reap, Must Sow (R. E. Chadwick) ..	20

BOOKS:

The American Revolution.....	20
Books Received	21
Pamphlets	21

are exceedingly and distressingly high. As to the wage-workers and mass of salaried men in cities, nobody denies this disproportion between any increase in the compensation for their labor and the increase in the cost of their living. And now the Secretary of Agriculture declares that the farmers are not getting the benefit of increased prices of foodstuffs even, and that the blame lies largely with the exorbitant profits of the retailer. With the first of these propositions, the farmers unanimously agree; and from the latter the provision dealers as unanimously dissent. One has only to talk with his butcher or grocer in these days to ascertain the emphasis of that dissent.

+

Under these circumstances what becomes of the fancied "prosperity," so far as the masses are concerned? If the same labor will buy less necessities, then one must work harder or live more narrowly. A good deal is said about the hitherto high standard of living in the United States for the laboring man as compared with other countries, but apart from the consideration that this is not one of the obstinate facts that everybody agrees to, the whole argument of the "boosters" and economic optimists is that this high standard must be maintained at any cost. For this are high protective tariffs, exclusion acts, *et id omne genus*, to be maintained. And, indeed, the whole economic problem after all is, as it affects the mass of the people, to keep the wages of labor in labor products high. It would seem a queer kind of prosperity, therefore, which by an era of high prices makes the great majority of the people work harder or live more meanly!

+

Who gets the benefit of the increased prices? That there is certainly an abundance of "prosperity" in certain classes, and that "the good spenders," the extravagant, the ostentatious, and the idle dissolute, are in high feather, is in evidence in many ways. If the estimate of a leading daily paper is to be taken, a half-million of dollars was spent for extra food and drink alone by these classes in Chicago on New Year's Eve. But it is not they alone who are "prosperous." The men in big business interests, intent on incorporations, consolidations, mergers and trusts—into which they pump "water" and from which they extract "cream," certain pecuniarily fortunate professional men—lawyers, doctors and dentists, and some other classes of people who are the retainers of the "big business" men in our "benevolent feudalism," have been able to increase their incomes and

charges or salaries to an extent which has caused the conservative old fashioned workers in their respective lines to gasp with amazement, and to an extent evidently far beyond any increase in the cost of living. They are "prosperous" and getting rich beyond the dreams of avarice. These "classes" constitute a small proportion of the whole people, however. But they are taking for their own and their children's—mostly in the form of charges and liens on the future labor of the masses and *their* children—a large proportion of what the whole people produce. They are generally the advocates and makers of the laws under which monopoly thrives.

+

And it is monopoly and the laws which buttress monopoly, which are at the bottom of all the trouble. "Service for service," which is the foundation of all just social and economic conditions, has been abrogated to an alarming and ruinous extent in favor of service, enforced and rendered compulsory by the effect of bad economic and financial legislation and of vicious systems of taxation, to the holders of privilege and monopoly. If the men high in official business and social life who are giving out interviews at the demand of magazines and newspapers, would but think straight and simply, we should hear more sound economics, and less of the babel of voices about "over gold production," as though that mattered if labor prices kept up with other prices; of the high valuation of farm lands, proving that the farmer was getting the benefit of the high prices of breadstuffs, as though it was not plain that the land held out of use had not increased the monopolistic value of that which remains; of the overcapitalization of railroads and manufacturing corporations, as though that was not the result of the laws which feed monopoly; and of the necessity of subsidizing in some form intensive farming, and irrigation projects, and a merchant marine, and many other things that the genius, industry and intelligence of the masses of the American people would speedily bring about without government aid, if labor of the brain and hand were freed in the United States from the baneful blight of legislation and judicial decision in favor of privilege and monopoly.

+ +

Labor Safety Laws.

We are not fanatical believers in the good effects of restrictive and regulating legislation which affects freedom of contract. But the strongest individualist, regarding the fearful toll of life and limb and health that the great Moloch of

machinery takes continually from the factory and mill workers of Illinois—men, women and children—cannot but rejoice that under the conditions which exist, there have come into operation at last in this State stringent rules of law for the guarding of machinery (vol. xii, p. 538). Going into effect on January 1 of this year, a new factory law provides that all dangerous machinery shall be guarded; that all dangerous projections on revolving machinery shall be countersunk; that means shall be supplied for the prompt stopping of any machine or shafting; and that passageways between machinery must be of ample width and well lighted. Neglect of these precautions on the part of many of the great employers of labor in Illinois hitherto has resulted in incalculable distress and misery. Our courts are crowded with litigated cases for personal injuries which might have been avoided had not human life and limb been accounted cheaper than protecting devices and safeguards. The new law was sorely needed and has been long delayed. Let us hope that it will be strictly enforced and accomplish its object. It will at least set up a higher ideal in the community of what is due from the employer to his workmen.

* * *

"Lead Us Not Into Temptation."

Montreal has recently abandoned the ward system of electing members of the City Council, and at the election on November 2 that system was abandoned by the voters of Sacramento, Cal. Though a step in the right direction, that step will not insure honest, efficient government. The "Boodle Board" of San Francisco was composed of Supervisors elected at large. A weak man elected at large is as susceptible to the temptation of a bribe as a weak man elected by a ward. As was seen in San Francisco, the possessors of privilege do not hesitate to tempt with bribes weak men elected at large. It is the duty of society to shield its public servants from temptation. "Lead us not into temptation" has a broader meaning than is commonly given to that prayer. It means that we are bound to close all avenues by which our brothers, including our public servants, may be tempted; for it is immediately followed by the petition, "but deliver us from evil." The two petitions apply as well to social as to individual life and morals. Society must shield itself and its public servants from temptation and from evil by making bribery unprofitable and therefore impossible, and by abolishing the privilege of private ownership of public utilities. The initiative, referendum and recall will make bribery unprofitable. They will

deliver the public servant from great evils; they will abolish the incentive to lead our public servants into temptation.

* * *

A Test for the Thoughtfully Inconsistent.

I would rather be a weathercock on the house of the Lord, than a peg for the tents of the wicked.

* * *

Land Monopoly in the Philippines.

The Organic Act of the Philippine Government provided that the unapportioned public lands obtained by treaty with Spain, should not be sold in tracts of over forty acres (vol. iv, p. 734; vol. v, p. 199); and that no one corporation engaged in agriculture, should hold more than 2,500 acres. Attorney General Wickersham has ruled that the church lands bought from the Recollet friars by the United States to straighten out certain delicate semi-ecclesiastical questions which had arisen, do not come within this limitation (vol. vi, p. 585); and has upheld as legal the sale of 55,000 acres of them in one parcel to a supposed agent of the sugar trust. The decision may be legally correct, and it may also be true that the original restriction was unwise. But the argument of officials in Washington about the matter as reported in the daily press, seems highly inconsistent with the avowed purpose of that original restriction, which we were told ought to convince Anti-Imperialists that the United States would never permit its citizens "to exploit" the Philippines to the exclusion or injury of native interests. The acting head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs and the Secretary of War are quoted in the Inter Ocean as saying, "The church lands were bought for an investment. They are not public lands in the sense that the lands acquired from Spain are government lands. We want capital to go into the islands, and it would be preposterous to think that men will invest their money in the islands if they are to be limited to a little 2,500 acreage." Perhaps so, but it is no wonder that this sale "has attracted the attention of a number of members of Congress." Can it be that our "benevolent despotism" over the Philippines is after all to result in the same sort of "development" and "improvement" and "Anglo-Saxon civilization," which have developed and improved the Hawaiians off their beautiful islands and the face of the earth, and established a thriving seat of American settlement there? "Manifest destiny" have proven great words to conjure with, but the natives may not like to see the destiny so manifest!

THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

The Revolution in Great Britain is now in progress in dead earnest. The excitement throughout the land is intense and extreme. Truly Lord Rosebery said of the Budget which is the cause of it: "This is not a budget, but a revolution; a social and political revolution of the first magnitude."

When the Budget was first presented to the House of Commons last April the drift of it was not clearly apprehended, and the criticisms in the papers were mild and harmless. But as the landed interests began to appreciate the unexpected significance of the proposals the storm began to gather. It grew as the bill passed on to its second and third reading during the succeeding six months. And now that storm has reached the proportions of a cyclone since the House of Lords has vetoed it. An open conflict over two questions has been precipitated—two burning questions that have been smouldering in the hearts of the people for generations—namely, the land, and the House of Lords. Shall the land belong to the people, or to the few who hold it for their own enrichment? Shall the House of Lords continue to block reforms and defeat the will of the people? These are the tremendous issues before the people. By the middle of January the country will have expressed its opinion.

Land Tenure.

To appreciate the situation it is necessary to say a few words about land tenure in England, the provisions in the Budget taxing land values, and the legislative power of the House of Lords.

The land is the storehouse from which all wealth is drawn. Possession of the land therefore means the control of those living on and from it. In the beginning land in England, as in all other countries at the outset, was held in common by the tribe or tribes dwelling there. It was common property. Gradually as the tribes or groups of people settled down in villages, the land in and around them was held in a similar way. Later the care, and thence the possession, drifted into the hands of a great family in the tribe, and then the various members of that community became dependent upon that family.

This was the condition in which William the Conqueror found England in 1066. The families who then held the land were for the most part forced to surrender their estates to the new king. And then William proceeded to produce the famous Domesday Book, which preserves the record of the position and size of the various estates in

England, and the names of the favored Saxon and Norman barons to whom he made presents of these estates. This was the beginning of the formation of the vast estates in land belonging to the nobility in England. William constituted himself the supreme lord of all the land, and the families held their estates of him as tenants and vassals in return for service.

In turn these nobles or barons granted the use of certain small lots to their retainers and to peasant proprietors or yeomen, in return for military service in case of war. This is what is known as the feudal system or feudal tenure of land, which lasted for some centuries. Gradually, however, as population increased the terms of holding the land were altered. The nobles annexed the small holdings of the yeomen to their own estates, and only permitted occupancy on payment of a specified rent or feu-duty. At the same time the nobles enlarged their estates in other ways.

In Domesday Book many millions of acres were reserved as commons. Squatters settled on these lands and lived on them freely and happily. About the fifteenth century the first of these commons was enclosed. Then for three centuries the process of enclosing went on until in 1867 over eight million acres had been taken from the commoners, and that mostly without any compensation. To whom did they go? The landlords being paramount in the legislature simply appropriated them to themselves. The commons were secretly merged in the possessions of the lords of the manor. Sad to relate, also, many of these "Enclosure Acts" were passed during the period of the Napoleonic wars when a great many of the people interested in them were absent. These lords of the manor at the same time absorbed many of the church lands.

Furthermore, to preserve these estates in their own name and family, they passed the Statute of Entails. Thus by absorption of small holdings, church lands and commons, by intermarriage and by entail, the land of the many gradually and permanently passed into the private ownership of the few. Large estates, the free gift of the Crown, grew larger, and the small ones disappeared, until a few thousand men practically own the whole of Great Britain. The land there is said to be in fewer hands than in any other country. The six hundred peers in the House of Lords own about one-fifth of the country.

This brief sketch of the land shows that the titles to it are not based on justice or equity, but on robbery, extortion, and violence. And this is true of all older countries. Nor are we unfamiliar

even here with the words "land grabbing" and "land frauds."

A further injustice in England, moreover, has been effected in the evasion of taxes by the nobility. At present they only pay on a valuation made centuries ago, when the land bore no ratio whatever to its present value. But how shall this state of things be remedied?

The Budget.

The necessity for raising about eighty million dollars more to pay the running expenses of the country has brought matters to a crisis. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lloyd George, has proposed to meet the emergency by taxing land values. He desires to tax unearned increment 20 per cent. That is, this tax will be enacted when on sale of the land, on leasing it, on transfer at death, or on revaluation every fifteen years in the case of property held by corporations, it has been found to have increased in value without effort or expense on the part of the landlord. Certain lands are exempted. He would also tax the site value of undeveloped land one half penny in the pound per annum. And he would put a duty of one shilling in the pound on the annual rental value of the right to work minerals and of mineral way-leaves. Previously the lessee of the minerals had to pay the taxes and also pay the lessor for rights to work, and the lessor simply paid a nominal tax to the Crown for the land altogether independent of its new value. The Budget also makes due provision for the revaluation of the whole land, and the method and principles thereof. The most scrupulous care has been taken to separate land values from improvement values, since this tax is intended to fall exclusively on the land and not upon industry.

The Lords and the Budget.

The Lords took little time to consider the bill. It was too revolutionary: Now the question is referred to the people. The government, however, tends to place more emphasis on the question of the House of Lords than on that of taxation of land values. If the referendum is made on the latter issue, then the House of Lords will be left untouched, and its supremacy tacitly admitted. But if the House is "mended or ended" then the lesser question of the land and many other reforms will be readily settled. What then is involved in the question of the House of Lords?

The House of Lords.

The House of Lords is composed of 606 members, of whom 478 are hereditary and 128 non-hereditary peers. It is a house of landlords, representing no one and responsible to no one in

particular. It has the same legislative powers as the House of Commons, except as to finance. The House of Lords has remained almost unchanged since the fourteenth century, when the Commons and Lords formed separate bodies. It is almost entirely composed of Conservatives. Its power of absorption is extraordinary. Though the Liberal party has appointed more Liberal peers in the last 50 years than the Conservatives, yet it has seemed to be the fate of these peers to become in time Conservatives to protect their own interests, and defend their property.

A few of the peers are eminent and learned men, but the majority take no interest in legislation. They absent themselves from the sessions, and some have even never appeared within the walls of the Upper Chamber. The House of Lords seldom gives much time to the consideration of bills submitted to it by the Commons. But the worst feature of the House of Lords is its partiality. During the last thirty years at least it has neither rejected nor mutilated a bill introduced by a Tory government. It can always get laws enacted to serve its own purposes through the Tory government. While, on the other hand, it has rejected or mutilated bill after bill presented by Liberal governments from generation to generation. It is impossible for any Liberal government to institute any reforms so long as the House of Lords exists as at present constituted.

The late Duke of Devonshire said in 1884 that "no Liberal government ever possessed the confidence of the House of Lords." And Mr. Joseph Chamberlain remarked truly: "During the last 100 years the House of Lords has never contributed one iota to popular liberties or popular freedom, or done anything to advance the common weal. It has protected every abuse, and sheltered every privilege. It has denied justice and delayed every reform. It is irresponsible without independence, obstinate without courage, arbitrary without judgment, and arrogant without knowledge. Their claim to dictate the laws which we shall make, the way in which we shall govern ourselves—to spoil, delay, even reject measures demanded by the popular voice, passed after due discussion by the majority of the People's House, is a claim contrary to reason, opposed to justice, and which we will resist to the death."

The present Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, invited the Liberal party "to treat the veto of the House of Lords as the dominating issue in politics—the dominating issue because in the long run it overshadows and absorbs every other." This he said two years ago when the Lords had thrown out

several important measures then passed by the Liberal government. The Liberals, however, were unable to force the issue; the people did not regard the bills then vetoed of sufficient importance. But the opposition to the present constitution of the House of Lords has been growing steadily, and the Liberals may be able to carry the day now, because of the apparent popularity of the present budget.

What Will the Electorate Do?

On the other hand you can never be certain what the people will do. The electorate is undoubtedly recognized in England as the final authority in politics. But the electorate has given the world several great surprises. In 1893 when Gladstone's Home Rule bill was rejected, the existence of the House of Lords was seriously menaced. But the people turned the Liberals out then and saved the Lords, even though they had elected the government on that issue—Home Rule. The people were not ready for the change. The Lords are human; the people are human, too. Their virtues and vices are alike. The Lords are Conservatives; at heart the people are of the same order. The people pride themselves in their aristocracy with all its imperfections and weaknesses. Hence their support of the House of Lords in an extremity, one might almost say, in spite of themselves.

The popular will is in a constant state of flux. And it can never be relied on until based soundly on a sense of justice, justice for one and all alike. When the majority of the British people can rise above traditional prejudices and party politics, and judge the great questions brought before them from a sense of justice, regarding the welfare of the whole people as of infinitely greater importance than that of the few, then we may look for greater steadiness in the expression of the public will that makes for an advance in national achievements that will enable the country to hold its place among the most enlightened and progressive nations in the world. Whatever may be the result of the coming election, there can surely be no doubt that the campaign is an educative power there, and here, too, which will make itself felt sooner or later for the good of mankind. There is an eternal issue of justice involved in the budget which has been rejected by the Lords.

The Commons question the right of the Lords to interfere with the finances of the country. The Lords have never attempted to do so before. Precedent in a matter of practice, however, does not settle the rightness or wrongness of the action. There is no written constitution in Britain. There-

fore, in spite of the recent vote of the Commons declaring the action of the Lords "a breach of the constitution and a usurpation of the privileges of the House of Commons," the Lords can do as they please unless the people determine otherwise. The people have never expressed a definite opinion. They may support the Lords in the coming elections for aught anyone knows.

Why the Lords Fear the Budget.

But why did the Lords risk interference in financial matters? Why play such a high stake? Because the clauses in the Budget taxing land values threaten the existence of the Lords. Their final purpose is to obliterate feudalism, and place all natural resources in the possession of the public to whom they rightfully belong. In other words, the ultimate aim of the Budget is to restore the land to the people. This is revolutionary. The Budget, however, seeks to attain this object by exceedingly slow degrees.

In the first place the provision for a valuation of all the land according to its present value is revolutionary. The land tax on the ancient assessment, which is nominal, would thereby be increased. The peers object. So far they have contributed practically nothing toward the upkeep of government in return for incomes received from the people, which have increased a thousand fold. The revaluation would make their past evasion of taxation too glaring an injustice. They resent the taxation. Is it to be wondered at? Would you expect them to treat with equanimity a bill that proposes to deprive them of special privileges which they have enjoyed for centuries? Naturally they resent interference with their rights. They stigmatise it as confiscation. They forget that they robbed the people for generations, robbed them of the land, robbed them of evaded taxes, robbed them of immense incomes. Well did Mr. George exclaim that a duke cost more than a Dreadnought, and was much more dangerous. The landlords cannot believe that it is they themselves who have been guilty of confiscation. They have been so long accustomed to the enjoyment of their privileges, which the people have not only tolerated but justified by sustaining the House of Lords when assailed, that they recognise no injustice in the situation.

The Need of the Provisions of the Budget.

A few illustrations, however, will demonstrate that the Lords have no just cause for rejecting the Budget. In the town of Harrogate the corporation after arbitration bought some 5 acres of land for \$83,400. That land was rated for taxation at \$125. The same corporation purchased an-

other property of some 52 acres for \$125,000 which was rated at \$150. The burial board in the same city negotiated recently for more ground. The landlord asked \$5,000 an acre. That same land had been assessed at \$1.25 per acre. Think of it! In each of these cases the government received no benefit from the increased value. The landlord got it all, though he had done nothing to create it. The people, who had done everything to make that increased value by their industry and enterprise, got nothing. Nay, worse, the landlord gained an added taxing power over their industry through the possession of this unearned wealth. He will invest it and draw interest on it. That interest comes out of the products of labor. Is it unjust then that on such sales as the above 20 per cent of the increased value of the land should go to the government—to the people? Cases of sale of the above description could be multiplied almost without end. The Lords relieved the people of the burden of taking care of the land. In return for this they lease or rent or sell at the highest possible figure, and pay taxes on a valuation made centuries ago when the land possessed a mere nominal value.

The same injustice is noticeable in the taxation of large estates relative to the small householders in the cities. Clumber, the seat of the Duke of Newcastle, 121 acres in extent, is rated at \$1,675 per annum; Wellbeck Abbey, the seat of the Duke of Portland, rates at \$5.00 an acre; while Thoresby, the seat of the Earl of Manvers, rates at almost \$2.50 an acre per annum. If a single acre or part of an acre of these estates was required by a railroad or a corporation, the value would doubtless be placed at many hundreds of times that at which it is now rated. There are cases where land assessed at \$5 and \$8 an acre, sold for \$4,750 and \$5,000 an acre when wanted by a railroad company.

So in the case of mines and minerals. The value of this kind of property is fabulous, yet the landowners pay tax only on the assessment of the land according to its ancient valuation. The lessees of the mine have to shoulder all the burden of taxation, and all the risk, too.

Then it is the common practice in Britain, as in this country in cities, to hold lots out of use to increase their prospective value, and escape just taxation meanwhile. When forced into use, the lessee needs again to bear the increased taxation. Mr. George's tax on such undeveloped land, of one cent in every \$5 of value, according to the new valuation, will do much to rectify this evil.

Under existing conditions the land is a gold

mine to the landlords. They know it full well, and they will never part with it so long as they can keep the Entail Act in existence. The people improve the land, building cities, railroads and factories, and opening up mines, spending untold millions on these improvements, and the landlords derive the greatest benefit from it all without doing hardly anything in return. The more the people labor to improve the land,—the more they put into it,—the more they are taxed by the landowners for their enterprise.

There is but one result. When a comparatively small body of men who hold the land charge those who live and labor on it the last penny for their right so to live and labor on it, then unemployment, poverty, degradation and vice necessarily follow. When the few take the lion's share of product and give practically no service in return, then the many must suffer. That they do suffer is testified by the fact that there are about one million officially listed paupers in the land. And physicians agree that the race has deteriorated of late. The nation could not get men with the old time physique to serve in the army in the recent Boer War.

Money must be raised in some way to pay the increased and increasing expenses of the Government. The taxation of land values is the method rejected by the Lords. Their purse is affected by this proposal. There is no part of a man that is so sensitive as his pocket. But the Lords have not the slightest compunction in lightening other people's pockets. They do not hesitate to propose as the alternative method of raising the revenue a tariff, a tax on imports, a tax on the poor man's bread. Their proposal means that the laborer shall pay further toll on the necessaries of life; it means that the few shall still further be benefited at the expense of the many; it means the protection of the capitalist, to the increased impoverishment of the consumer.

Why This Is the People's Budget.

On the other hand, the present Budget aims at relieving industry, and placing the increased burdens upon the shoulders of those best able to bear them. It aims at putting a new tax on values which result from monopoly; values which are not the fruit of the monopolists' efforts or enterprise; values which at present are either inadequately taxed or not taxed at all; values which are the creation of social growth and the activity of the State, and therefore rightfully belong to the State. This is therefore "A People's Budget." In the words of the able Chancellor of the Exchequer:

"This is a war budget. It is a budget for waging implacable warfare against poverty."

LOUIS G. HOECK.

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, January 4, 1910.

The British Parliamentary Campaign.

The elections for the new Parliament will begin on the 14th and end on the 28th. In the short whirlwind campaign before Christmas the Liberals seemed to be carrying everything before them. T. P. O'Connor, writing from London on the 1st to the Chicago Tribune, finds this condition on his arrival from America (vol. xii, p. 1256):

The Liberals are fighting unitedly and enthusiastically everywhere, with all the leaders in the fighting line, except Haldane, who is temporarily ill. The Tories are dispirited. They are divided, with no leaders and no decisive leader. Chamberlain can only issue manifestoes from the sick room. Balfour has just emerged from the bed, and the death of Lord Percy removes a potent young genius. There is a similar weakness in the program. Little attempt is made to justify the rejection of the Budget by the peers, and the experiment of sending peers to the popular platforms to speak for themselves dissolved in a side splitting and universal roar of rough popular laughter. These lordly but unaccustomed orators were pursued by popular and telling questions, to which their inept answers added force. . . . Divided and discouraged on the questions of the lords and the tariff, the Tories fall back on the German navy scare and home rule. The navy scare has risen from the grave with more ghastly folly and panic than even during the Dreadnought agitation. George Wyndham, though an able Tory leader, ventures to ask, "What is the good of trade if the Germans are in possession of English soil?" . . . It is astonishing how home rule has rushed to the front since Asquith's speech.* Everybody, foe and friend, united in regarding Asquith's speech as bringing back the Liberals to Gladstone's policy of full home rule, and several Tory journals even say Asquith's position is more home-rule than Gladstone's. The Irish, on the other hand, interpreting Asquith in the same way, enter this election with more hope, enthusiasm and union than any since 1886. In England they are working everywhere in a cordial alliance with the Liberals, while the Liberals are everywhere speaking out on home rule with a clearness and courage unknown since Gladstone's retirement. In some cases Liberals who had opposed home rule for twen-

ty years and remained outside the Liberal ranks are returning and adopting home rule as the only settlement of the Irish question.

From the cable dispatches we learn that in an address to the Dundee electors Winston Churchill declared on the 28th that, "The forces of reaction are out for a double event. They are gambling with the rights and freedom of the nation, and they are running a tremendous risk to win a tremendous prize. That prize is no less than the complete tying up of the democracy, both through its politics and its industry." In an address in London on the 31st, Lloyd George argued against the protection policy of the Conservatives, asserting that unemployment was more prevalent in protectionist countries than in England, and citing as an example the United States which he described as "the protectionists' paradise, where customs officers line the shores like cherubim, with flaming swords, keeping every foreign made article out of this garden of Eden; but once inside, you find the serpent of hunger, want and unemployment hissing in every grade."

On the other hand, the enfeebled Joseph Chamberlain issued an address to the electors of West Birmingham on the 29th, in which he advocated tariff reform and reciprocity with the colonies, and attacked the Budget as placing a heavy burden of taxation upon the people and increasing the number of the unemployed. The address further asserted that home rule for Ireland, as is promised by the Liberals, would not only injure the friends of England there, whose interests were safeguarded by the present control, but the danger to all would be greater, since Great Britain now was threatened by foreign nations as never before. After alleging that the Liberals desire a single chamber rule, the address concluded with a criticism of the government's lack of preparation for the national defense.

Mail advices are fuller and more picturesque. The Westminster Gazette of the 10th thus reports what it calls "Gems from the Peers":

Lord Willoughby de Broke, at Lincoln last night, mentioned his "qualifications" for appearing on the platform. He was, he said, a peer, a Tory, a landowner and an Englishman. The Budget, he declared, was saturated through and through with the poison of Socialism. Radical and Socialist ideas had been thrown into a common hotchpotch. The two parties were going to fight upon the same platform, and they hoped some day or other to share the same plunder.

At Stamford Hill Viscount Hill deprecated the suggestion that the Peers did not want to pay. It must not be supposed, he said, that the richer men in the country were shirking the payment of their share of taxation. Then he went on to argue that

*See The Public, vol. xii, pp. 1208, 1253.

the Budget would hit the workingman hardest, the inference being, of course, that the Peers were actuated by a desire to benefit the worker by rejecting the Budget!

Lord Dunmore had a warm time at Barking. "I want to tell you," he said to his audience, amongst whom were a good many Radicals, "why I supported Lord Lansdowne's amendment." "To further your own interests," came the prompt reply. His lordship was somewhat taken aback, but he proceeded: "We wished to have the Budget referred to the people—" "Because it touched your pockets," came the answer, and there was a roar of merriment. Later, his lordship asked what had this "so-called" Liberal government done. At least twenty members

of the audience supplied him with a list of the measures passed during the past four years. So he turned to unemployment. "What is the only way to give employment to the people?" he asked. "Clear the House of Lords out of the way," came the prompt reply.

+

In his great Lancashire campaign Winston Churchill, speaking at Southport on December 4, thus arraigned the House of Lords, as reported in the Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of the 6th:

I say the House of Lords had no right to reject the Budget. Custom, precedent and authority are



Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill Speaking at Southport, Lancashire, December 4, on the Case Against the Lords, From the Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of December 6.

against them, and all the great men of the past, all the moderate and impartial men of the present. . . . The whole movement of the world is against the gradual intrusion of the House of Lords upon legislation. As democracy becomes more numerous and educated, more varied, more complex and more powerful, it is necessary that the House of Lords should recede and retire. It is necessary that it should count less and less. Most men expected that gradually, as things happen in the history of our country, the House of Lords would pass peacefully and painlessly away. That would have been a natural evolution (laughter). Much better for us, and much better for them (renewed laughter). But what do you see? On the contrary, the House of Lords put their claims higher every year. They now claim to reject every bill, no matter by what majority it is supported, in the House of Commons, or how newly elected that house is (hear, hear). They claim to tinker, tamper and meddle with every kind of subject, many of which they very imperfectly understand. They have mutilated the principal legislation of this Parliament until at last a climax has been reached, and by a violent act the executive government has been brought to a standstill; and so we come to a dissolution, in which the House of Lords comes face to face with the electors in a fierce collision which must involve a constitutional change (cheers). The control of finance is the root of all civilized government. The whole plan of the executive and the administration depends upon finances. The power of finance cannot be exercised by two chambers, unless those two chambers act together in general unity. And you are brought to this clear alternative. Finance must be given wholly to one chamber, as it has been in the past, or else both chambers must be elected simultaneously (cheers). The alternative brought about is the absolute breakdown of the constitution and the administrative machinery. I must say it with composure and deliberation, that is why we as a government will not be willing to discharge the responsibilities of government, whatever our majority, under the state of things which the action of the House of Lords has created (loud cheers). Is it not of real advantage to the country that there should be two great parties, each capable in turn of providing responsible government administration for services to the crown? Does not that fact, that men of both parties and millions of working men have a chance from time to time to help to choose the government—does not that associate the whole body of the nation in one way or another in the high duties and with the glorious inheritance of the British Empire (cheers)? How much better our system of government has worked upon this balance than in those countries where there is a permanent governing class, with all the interest of wealth and privilege massed around them keeping the rest of their fellow countrymen in sullen subjection by force of arms. That is the position of more than one European country today. A powerful Imperialist and militarist combination, holding all the power and confronting the vast Socialist party, utterly estranged from the fundamental institutions of the state—that is a condition which everyone who cares about the future of our country and who understands the story of these famous islands would labor and would struggle to save us from (hear,

hear). But that is an inevitable result of the change in the constitution which the House of Lords has now attempted. If no Liberal government were able to pass any measures except those which commend themselves to a permanent majority of their political opponents; if every Liberal government could only hold office from year to year by the favor and upon the sufferance of their bitter foes in the House of Lords; if at any moment, upon some pretext or other, a Liberal government was liable to have the whole structure of the nation's finance brought clattering about their ears, it is certain that the reign of two great parties, differing widely, no doubt, in conviction, in sentiment, in character and motive, but united in a common loyalty to the crown and empire, would be closed for ever, and we would be face to face with a period when parties should necessarily be grouped upon violent lines, and when brute force and class hatred, instead of forbearance and public spirit, would become the characteristics of British political life (cheers). It is from these perils that we rely upon the genius and sagacity of the British electors to preserve at this juncture the foundations of the state (loud cheers).

* *

The Nicaraguan Revolution.

José Santos Zelaya, the deposed and fleeing President of Nicaragua (vol. xii, p. 1255), arrived at the City of Mexico on the 29th. He declares himself to be still the titular President of Nicaragua. Dr. Zelaya is reported to have sent messages to the recently inaugurated President, Dr. Madriz, urging the liberation of Zelaya's son-in-law, Joaquin Passos, arrested in connection with the looting of the Nicaraguan treasury (vol. xii, p. 1255). General Estrada, leader of the revolutionists in the east, remains firm in his determination not to recognize the election of Madriz. This refusal receives endorsement from Cardenas, a former president of Nicaragua, who was overthrown and exiled by Zelaya twelve years ago. Cardenas is now in Costa Rica. Estrada is reported to have entered upon a westward campaign, with Managua, the capital city, as his objective point. He has published a proclamation outlining his policy for a provisional government. He states that it will abolish all monopolies; restore individual rights; encourage mining, agricultural and commercial industries; guarantee the freedom of the press; initiate free elections; and establish schools on the highest ideals. Immigration will be favored and foreigners will be guaranteed rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by the native born.

* *

"Conservation and Equal Rights."

Speaking before the University Club in New York on the 27th, Gifford Pinchot made an address on the above subject which he had been scheduled to deliver before the People's Forum at New Rochelle on the previous day, and which had been sidetracked by a blizzard. Though de-

livered modestly to a group of publishers, the address has apparently blown a blizzard through the Administration entourage, and imperils the impending investigation of Mr. Ballinger as a whitewash (vol. xii, pp. 1156, 1201). Mr. Pinchot is reported as saying:

The American people have evidently made up their minds that our natural resources must be conserved. That is good, but it settles only half the question. For whose benefit shall they be conserved—for the benefit of the many, or for the use and profit of the few? The great conflict now being fought will decide. . . .

Special interests have made repeated attacks on the United States forest service, and these attacks have increased in violence just in proportion as the service has offered effective opposition to predatory wealth. Since the forest service called public attention to the rapid absorption of the water power sites and the threatening growth of a gigantic water power monopoly, the attacks upon it have increased with marked rapidity. I anticipate that they will continue to do so. Still greater opposition is promised in the near future. There is but one protection, an awakened public opinion. That is why I give you the facts. We must face the truth that monopoly of the sources of production makes it impossible for vast numbers of men and women to earn a fair living. Right here the conservation question touches the daily life of the great body of our people who pay the cost of special privilege. And the price is heavy. That price may be the chance to save the boys from the saloons and the corner gang, and the girls from worse, and to make good citizens of them instead of bad; for an appalling proportion of the tragedies of life spring directly from the lack of a little money. Thousands of the daughters of the poor fall into the hands of the white slave traders because their poverty leaves them without protection. Thousands of families, as the Pittsburg Survey has shown us, lead lives of brutalizing overwork in return for the barest living.

The people of this country have lost vastly more than they ever can regain, by gifts of public property, forever and without charge, to men who gave nothing in return. It is true that we have made superb material progress under this system, but it is not well for us to rejoice too freely in the slices the special interests have given us from the great loaf of the property of all the people.

There is no other question before us that begins to be so important, or that will be so difficult to straddle as the great question between special interest and equal opportunity; between government by men for human welfare, and government by money for profit; between the men who stand for the Roosevelt policies, and the men who stand against them. This is the essence of the conservation problem today.

The "Insurgent" Movement.

At a "dollar dinner" given by the "Progressive Republicans" of Iowa at Des Moines on the 1st, Senator A. B. Cummins opened violent war upon

the "standpatters." The Chicago Record-Herald reports him as saying:

Upon an occasion like this the only materiality of the suggestion I have been making is that it affords strength and standing to remember that we who are following the progressive banner are not a horde of wild-eyed, tumultuous anarchists who have precipitated ourselves into the calm and quiet of a standpat community, but are simply fighting a battle which has been in progress since the world began, and that all the victories which our civilization recalls with gratitude and pride in the whole course of 2,000 years are the victories of the progressives over the standpatters. It helps us also to be serene and confident in the faith that the standpatters will go down before our assault just as they have gone down in the conflicts of twenty centuries of warfare. . . . For years the standpatters successfully resisted the demand for a revision of the tariff, but finally the progressive force in the rank and file of the party compelled the national convention to recognize the necessity and justice of a revision; and to make sure of an adequate change in the duties, the party for the first time in its history defined with accuracy and emphasis the doctrine of protection. It was then speedily discovered that while the convention was progressive the Congress was standpat. I do not attempt to obscure or to minimize the extent of our defeat, but if any one harbors the delusion that the passage of the recent tariff law ended the fight for fair and reasonable protective duties, it would be wise for him to at once reform his conclusion.

♦ ♦

A New Morgan Merger.

"The greatest banking institution in the world," as the Chicago Inter Ocean describes it, was formed in New York on the 3rd, when J. Pierpont Morgan merged his own trust company with those of Thomas F. Ryan and Levi P. Morton. This brings the total banking capital under Mr. Morgan's control up to \$1,809,000,000.

♦ ♦

"The Strike of the Forty Thousand."

The Triangle lockout and strike of waistmakers—eight-tenths of them women and girls—in New York (vol. xii, pp. 1133, 1227), was followed by a strike of ten thousand waistmakers in Philadelphia, starting on the 20th, for shorter hours, higher wages and a recognition of their union. A mass meeting held at the Arch Street Theater on the afternoon of the 22nd, was addressed by Mother Jones, Mrs. Raymond Robins, president of the National Women's Trade Union League, and Agnes Nestor. The theater was filled a half hour before the meeting began, and an overflow meeting was held at the Labor Lyceum. Six Philadelphia firms had surrendered to the demands of the strikers by the 22nd.

♦

In New York seven employers yielded on the

22nd, and the Triangle company was obliged to shut down, owing to the desertion of fifty "scab" employes. Since then it has been estimated that at least a half of the strikers have won out. Mass meetings were held simultaneously at Beethoven Hall and Manhattan Lyceum on the afternoon of the 27th, at which propositions that the strikers return to work on the "open shop" basis were unanimously rejected. A huge mass meeting was held on behalf of the strikers on the evening of the 2nd at Carnegie Hall. Of the crowds the press reports say: "At 5 o'clock the people began to gather for a meeting scheduled for 8 o'clock, and by 7 o'clock there were such crowds in front of Carnegie hall that the quiet neighborhood began to wonder what was happening. The police had arrived by that time and their presence contributed the more to the wonder of the neighbors, but there was no disorder of any kind; the crowd merely was waiting to get into the hall and try to get good seats. As it was, some had to stand up all evening, and the meeting lasted until 11 o'clock." "Workhouse prisoners"—girls who had served terms in the workhouse on charges of having committed acts of violence while picketing—sat on the stage. Among the speakers were Bolton Hall, Morris Hillquit, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Martin W. Littleton, and Miles M. Dawson, attorneys of the strikers, and Leonora O'Reilly.

+

Of the facts and developments of this strike William Mailly, writing in the Independent of the 23rd, says:

To sum up, three things are notable about this strike: In every shop there are always a few girls in the lead. Some of these have been agitating for a long time, some are new and are having their first experience as leaders. But these leaders are invariably the best paid, the ones who get the most wages, in each shop. They are the ones who have less reason to complain. They have carried their sisters along with them by very force of their own determination and the spirit of resistance to the general conditions prevailing. One has but to associate with these fine, high-strung, intelligent and courageous girls to appreciate their moral caliber and their capacity for self-sacrifice and devotion.

Secondly, while the majority of the shirtwaist makers are Jews, and the union business is usually conducted in Jewish, yet they have succeeded in getting 3,000 Italians to strike with them. It has been difficult to reach the Italians heretofore and get them into the union. Now the start has been made and a separate Italian headquarters established, with special Italian literature and Italian speakers, it is believed the workers of this nationality are permanently enlisted in the union cause.

Lastly, the comparatively minor role played by men, both in numbers and in direction, is something new in the history of labor strikes in this country. The principal union officials are men, it is true, but the strike has been inspired by women; it is mainly women who have done the picketing, been arrested,

fined, run the risk of assault, received ill-treatment from police and police courts alike, and shown themselves eager to sacrifice without stint to bring about better conditions in the shops and factories.

+ +

San Francisco Votes for Municipal Ownership.

By a margin of 2,465 votes over the necessary two-thirds majority (vol. xii, p. 699), the voters of San Francisco declared on the 30th, according to the press dispatches of that date, for the municipal ownership and operation of the Geary Street Railway and its extension on the east to the ferry building and on the west to the ocean shore. This proposal has been rejected three times in the last five years. The total vote polled was 43,081, the record vote for a special election. The figures stood 31,185 for the bonds and 11,694 against. The supervisors are now authorized to bond the city to the extent of \$2,020,000. A special dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald states that—

Possibly more than anything else the vote represents an expression of dissatisfaction with the methods and service of the United Railroads. The car system of the city under the present private monopoly admittedly is not good. . . . Without doubt the active campaign made by the United Railroads and their paid agents against the bonds did much to help the bonds. For weeks the city has been plastered with posters urging the people to defeat the bonds. In some of the papers said to be friendly to the corporation a strong and sometimes bitter campaign was waged against the proposed municipal line. The workingmen took the view that if the proposed line was so bitterly opposed by the United Railroads it must be to the advantage of the people. . . . Under the proposed bond issue the present cable line on Geary street will be replaced with a modern underground electric line. It is likely, however, that there will be a bitter fight in the courts before actual work can be begun. One of the points is that the saloons were permitted to remain open during the voting, which, it is claimed, is in violation of the state law.

+ +

Indiana's New Accounting Law.

Indiana (vol. xii, p. 1235) is about to put into operation a new accounting law, under which examiners, who will work in pairs—a Democrat with a Republican—will examine into the books of all county, city and town officials and township trustees—all offices in the gift of the electorate. The Auburn (N. Y.) Citizen says of the new law, that it is the most comprehensive system of examination ever carried into execution in one of our States. The Citizen explains further:

The theory of the law is that men wholly unacquainted with bookkeeping and ignorant of the details of office work are elected by the people and make many mistakes in the transaction of official business. This ignorance leads to the collection of larger fees in some cases and smaller fees in others than are provided for by law and also to contracting

for supplies that are not needed. In other cases illegal fees are charged purposely and with intent to defraud, and bidders for supplies and county work are let in on the ground floor through favoritism or for a division of the profits. . . . In addition to ferreting out abuses and seeking to prevent graft the work of the new accounting board is to be largely educational. In connection with it a system of uniform accounting for all public offices has been devised, and books and forms to be used in keeping records and making reports have been prepared, and all officers will be required to adhere to them.

+ . +

Boston Under Her New Charter.

Boston will hold her first election under her new charter (vol. xii, p. 1091) on the 11th. The provisions for the nomination of non-partisan candidates for Mayor and for a smaller council of eight members, upon nomination papers signed by 5,000 voters each, have produced political activity on somewhat new lines. James J. Storrow, a prominent banker (vol. xii, p. 1154); Mayor George A. Hibbard, former Mayor John F. Fitzgerald and Nathaniel H. Taylor, a journalist, are the mayoralty candidates. Mr. Storrow has thus announced his platform:

I am a candidate for Mayor because I hope to advance the welfare of all the people of Boston.

I don't want to be called a reformer. I don't want to be called a business candidate. I do want to be called a candidate who stands for clean, practical, progressive government.

I don't pretend to be any better than 100,000 other men in Boston. I have made mistakes. If you elect me Mayor I may make some more. I can only promise to do my level best in the interest of all.

Boston is too often spoken of as a corporation. I see in the city government some people working for all the people. I won't ask any city employe to work any harder than I will.

We must all work together to make Boston a better city. We want Boston to be the ideal city of homes and industry.

I shall try to keep the streets in the tenement sections of the city as clean as Tremont street.

I am opposed to giving any special privilege to any corporation or to any individual.

The problem is how to spend \$85,000,000 during the next four years so as to get the most for the people of Boston.

It is a big problem. It will require hard work. It will require systematic planning.

We must not put our money into miles of useless unconnected sewers. Sewers must be built, but they must be built for use.

Money must be saved for schools, more streets, better streets, cleaner streets and other things the people need.

A small part of the money wasted, if put into the hands of a determined, intelligent and tireless Board of Health would prevent much sickness and save many lives.

Why should we not have a Board of Health famous for its efficiency? Why should not our city be

known all over the country for its good streets and its clean streets?

Good and efficient government means that Boston will go forward. It will be a gain to the laborer, the mechanic and the merchant.

If extravagance reigns at City Hall, if the debt continues to pile up, the tax rate to increase, capital will become timid, industries languish and our people suffer. The growth of the city will be stunted and more men out of work.

He who sets class against class is an enemy of the people. To attain his selfish end he divides the house against itself.

I do not intend to be a routine Mayor. I will cooperate with any group of citizens to get new industries for Boston, new steamship lines, better railroad facilities, and do anything in my power to build up the city.

+ +

Mayor Gaynor Installed.

William J. Gaynor assumed his duties as Mayor of New York (vol. xii, p. 1095) on the 1st. On the same day he offered the position of Park Commissioner for Manhattan and Richmond to Herman Ridder (vol. xii, p. 968), the publisher of the Staats Zeitung. After considering the offer, Mr. Ridder declined it on the 3d. Other appointments were given out on the 2d. Calvin Tomkins has been appointed Commissioner of Docks, and Edward W. Bemis is to be First Deputy Commissioner of Water, Gas and Electricity. Professor Bemis has been, under Mayor Johnson, the head of the water department of Cleveland, which, Mayor Gaynor says, "it is conceded he has made the model water department of the country" (vol. xii, p. 1026).

+ +

Close of Mayor Johnson's Administration.

On the 1st Herman C. Baehr succeeded Tom L. Johnson as mayor of Cleveland.

+

One of the last acts of the retiring city council was to authorize at its final meeting on the 27th, the erection of a rostrum, by Thomas G. Fitzsimons as trustee, for a memorial to the late Dr. L. B. Tuckerman, father of municipal ownership, as he has been termed by his admirers. City Clerk Witt had had a model of the rostrum in his office for some time.

+

On the day before his assumption of office Mr. Baehr announced that Supt. Jas. F. Jackson of the Associated Charities was to become Superintendent of Charities and Correction, a new office; and that R. R. Christian, defeated candidate for the Republican nomination for city treasurer, would be made superintendent of the Warrensville farm.

+

At the City Hall on the 1st, in welcoming his

successor to the office from which he was retiring, Mayor Johnson thus spoke of his nine years' service, reports the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"I have served the people for nearly nine years," he began. His voice began to break then and it was with a perceptible effort that he continued. A hush that reached to the furthestmost corner of the open rooms fell over the assemblage.

"I have had more of misfortune in those nine years than in any other period of my life," continued Mr. Johnson. "As that is true it is also true that I have had more of joy. In those nine years I have given the biggest and the best part of me.

"I served the people of Cleveland the best I knew how."

Then turning to his successor he said: "I thank you very much and wish you success in every way."

The Cleveland Press of the 1st thus sums up the work of the retiring Mayor and the promises of the incoming Mayor:

What Citizen Tom Did When Mayor:

Won long battle for lower street car fare.

Started the group plan of municipal buildings.

Took "keep off the grass" signs from the parks.

Added \$17,000,000 to public service corporation valuation for taxes. Later lopped off by the Republican state board at Columbus.

Fought for a better municipal code after street railway interests had knocked out the old code.

Established free public bath houses and developed bathing beaches.

Eliminated 16 grade crossings.

Secured annexation of Newburg, Brooklyn and Corlett. Municipal lighting plant came in with Brooklyn.

Made garbage collection and reduction a municipal institution.

Gave clean streets, and more miles of paved streets and sewers than all his predecessors combined.

Reduced price of electric street lighting from \$87 to \$57 a lamp a year.

Reduced price of street gas from \$32 to \$12 a lamp a year.

Established municipal ash and rubbish collection.

Was chief figure in securing Paine municipal code and civil service law.

Established boys' farm at Hudson.

Started Cooley farms at Warrensville.

Developed park, boulevard and playground systems.

What Mayor Baehr Promises:

To secure a new union depot.

To build a high level bridge.

To erect a new city hall and push the completion of the group plan.

To straighten and deepen the river and improve harbor facilities.

To complete negotiations with the passenger steamship lines for use of East Ninth street pier.

To reduce running expenses of city. He has begun by cutting \$500,000 from appropriations ordinance.

To run the city as he would a big business establishment.

On the afternoon of the 1st Mr. Johnson left Cleveland for the East for a five weeks' rest. Upon his return he will take up quarters in his new offices in the American Trust Building.

NEWS NOTES

—The French Chamber of Deputies (vol. xii, p. 1139) passed a high tariff bill on the 29th, by a vote of 365 to 42.

—The aged Leo Tolstoy (vol. xii, p. 1163) is reported to be suffering from bronchitis and inflammation of the liver, and to be very ill.

—The home of Lincoln Steffens at Riverside, Conn., was seriously damaged by fire on the last day of the year.

—The American Institute of Architects held its annual convention in Washington on December 14, 15 and 16. I. K. Pond of Chicago was elected president.

—Herbert John Gladstone, youngest son of the "g. o. m.," or "grand old man," is to be the first Viceroy of the Federated States of South Africa (vol. xii, pp. 875, 891, 915).

—Colonel James Gordon of Okolona has been appointed to the United States Senate by the Governor of Mississippi, in the place of the late A. J. McLaurin (vol. xii, p. 1256).

—D. O. Mills, banker and philanthropist, died suddenly at his home near San Francisco on the 2nd, in the 85th year of his age. Mr. Mills was the founder of the Mills hotels for men in New York.

—Philip S. E. Griffith, of Greenfield, Mo., was nominated by the Republicans of the 6th Missouri District on the 28th, to succeed the late David A. De Armond in the United States Senate (vol. xii, pp. 1163, 1256).

—A general strike is threatened by so-called anarchists at Barcelona, Spain, unless amnesty shall be granted to those still in prison on charges of having taken part in the disorders of last summer (vol. xii, pp. 780, 825).

—The Turkish Grand Vizier, Hilmi Pasha, has resigned with his entire cabinet (vol. xii, p. 469). Disagreements among the more radical factions, among which Hilmi Pasha belonged, are held to be the cause of the resignations.

—The editor of The Public, who sailed on the Lake Champlain from St. John's, N. B., for Liverpool on Christmas day (vol. xii, p. 1225), cabled from Liverpool on the 5th that he had arrived at that port on time, had had good weather, and was well.

—The seismograph in the weather bureau at Washington recorded violent earth shocks on the morning of the 1st, originating apparently about 2,000 miles south of Washington. Shocks have been reported from the Yucatan peninsula in Mexico and from the West Indies.

—The centenary of the birth of William Ewart Gladstone was commemorated on the 29th, not alone in England, but also in such countries as Greece, the Balkan provinces and Armenia, where the memory

of his efforts to protect the weaker and vassal nations is still cherished.

—The sixty-first convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science was held in Boston from the 27th to the 1st. The feature of the opening day, according to the press report, was the address of Byron W. Holt on the subject of "Gold Depreciation and Its Effects."

—Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Superintendent of the Chicago public schools (vol. xii, p. 1144), was elected on the 30th, by the Illinois Teachers' Association in session at Springfield, as the President of the association. It is the first time that a woman has been elected to this position in this State.

—Carl Zerrahn, one of the most widely known music conductors in the United States, died at Milton, Mass., in his 84th year. Mr. Zerrahn was one of the German political refugees of 1848. He was the musical director of the Handel and Haydn Choral Society of Boston for upwards of forty years.

—An ordinance adopted by the Minneapolis city council in 1907, requiring the Minneapolis Street Railway company to sell six tickets for twenty-five cents, was declared to be invalid by the Supreme Court of the United States, on the 3rd, as being an impairment of the contract implied in its franchise.

—When 300 feet of the false structure of the McKinley bridge now under construction over the Mississippi River at St. Louis was knocked out by an ice jam on the afternoon of the 31st, seventy men were thrown into the whirlpool of ice, broken timbers and girders, about twenty of them losing their lives.

—With its issue of the 1st the ownership of the Chicago Record-Herald passed from Frank B. Noyes to Herman H. Kohlsaat. Mr. Kohlsaat is reported as stating in an interview that "the political views of the Record-Herald will remain the same—the paper will be independent, both in national and local affairs."

—The American Political Science Association held its annual meeting in New York last week. The following officers were elected: President, Woodrow Wilson, Princeton; first vice-president, Edmund J. James, University of Illinois; second vice president, Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard; third vice president, W. F. Willoughby, Washington.

—At the meeting of the Chicago Single Tax Club (vol. xii, p. 1188), on the 31st, at 508 Schiller Bldg., the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Henry H. Hardinge; Vice Presidents and Chairmen of Committees, A. A. Worsley, Otto Cullman, George A. Schilling, Edward C. Moeller, John Weller, Geo. V. Wells, Chas. Cillske, Frederick H. Monroe; Treasurer, George C. Olcott; Secretary, A. Wangemann.

—Pasadena, Cal., has gone into competition with the Edison Electric Lighting Company, which has a practical monopoly of electric light and power in Southern California. The municipality has fixed a price for electrical energy which is said to be the lowest in the United States, and which the Edison company declares is below cost; but the manager of the municipal plant declares that the city can "make money at this rate, pay our interest on our bonds,

and establish a sinking fund to cover all depreciations."

—Professor Ira Howerth, known to the labor world through his articles in the American Federationist, will deliver a course of six lectures on the four Thursdays in January and the first two in February, at the Lewis Institute, Robey and Madison Sts., on Modern Social Problems. The same course is to be given on Tuesday evenings from January 4 to February 8, at Abraham Lincoln Center, Oakwood Blvd. and Langley Ave. Course tickets, \$1.50; single admissions, 35 cents. Tickets are sold to groups and clubs, at reduced rates.

—Ohio law requires that during the winter season the vestibule for the motormen on all trolley cars shall be heated to a temperature of at least 60 degrees. The measure was intended to insure the safety of passengers, as well as the comfort of the men handling the controllers, the argument being that a half-frozen and shivering operator is not competent to run a car. An indictment charging the president of the Cincinnati Traction Company, W. Kesley Schoepf, with violation of the law was returned by the Cincinnati grand jury on the 30th.

—Tentative steps for the formation of a National Anti-Trust League were taken in Washington on the 30th. The plan is to boycott all combinations that increase the cost of living. When prices soar, the league members, by stopping the use of such articles or commodities as have gone above legal level, will put them back again by refusing to furnish a market. The women of the country, being the housekeepers, are to be taken into membership on the same terms as men. Among the speakers at the meeting of the 30th were Champ Clark, minority leader in the House, and six other members of Congress.

—By the collision of a heavy freight train with the rear-end of the Montreal express on the New York Central on the morning of the 31st, Spencer Trask, who was dressing in his private compartment at the end of the train, was instantly killed, and another passenger and a porter were seriously injured. Mr. Trask was the head of the banking house which bears his name. Mrs. Trask is well known as a writer of poetic dramas and volumes of verse (vol. xii, p. 1101). Their four children died in rapid succession some twenty years ago during an epidemic of scarlet fever.

—Mail advices give fuller details for the Russian proposals for suppressing the autonomy of Finland (vol. xii, p. 1211). According to the London Nation "it is proposed to transfer to the competence of the Douma the following categories of Finnish affairs: Finance, the military system, the use of the Russian language, Justice, Education, Customs, Posts, Railways, Shipping, the Right of Association, the Freedom of the Press, the Right to import foreign literature, the treatment of Russian residents, the Police system. The Nation summarizes the Russian program as being, "in short, to make Finland virtually an ordinary province of the Empire."

† † †

For Nature has given, nor to him, nor to me,
Nor to any one else, of these acres the fee.

—Horace, "Satires."

PRESS OPINIONS

The Liberal Voice in the Parliamentary Campaign.

The (London) Nation (Lib.), Dec. 11.—At present, the only articulate voice in the country is that of Liberalism. The party which can in a week produce such speeches as those of Lord Morley, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and the wonderful Lancashire series of Mr. Churchill has fairly earned its right to interpret the intelligence and good feeling of the British people. On Friday week, at the National Liberal Club, the Chancellor of the Exchequer—who, if the Liberal organizers know the A. B. C. of their business, will at once be set the all-important task of winning London and the home counties—made one of the most powerful orations in the history of political combat. Every stroke told, and some of the phrases, such as the saying that "every grain of freedom is more precious than radium," belonged to a high order of thought and expression. The leading points of Mr. George's speech, which every speaker and writer on the people's side should study, were the impressive contrast between the representative and national quality of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, the damning proof that the revolutionary act of the Lords was the work, first, of its least trustworthy members, and, secondly, of featherheaded journalism, the biting dissection of the character and record of the chief wreckers. These made up a strategic attack such as John Bright himself might not have disowned. In Lancashire, Mr. Churchill's campaign, made up partly of massive and convincing argument, partly of brilliant and cogent raillery, is carrying all before it.

+

The (London) Daily News (Lib.), Dec. 7.—In a battle between wealthy privilege on the one side and the democracy on the other, wealthy privilege can have as much advertisement as it will pay for; and it will pay for a great deal. At such times it is comforting to remember that everything cannot be bought. The great complaint of the candid Conservatives is their poverty in platform speakers. Why? Because the younger men with conviction, eloquence and political force are nearly all in the Liberal or the Labor camps. It is not by accident that Conservatism has to whistle for them in vain. They turn their backs on it just as naturally and inevitably as Peers born in the purple, even if their fathers were Liberals, turn towards it. They are the living strength on which we must rely to counteract the dead weight of Mammon in politics; and there is every indication that in the coming struggle they will be worthily generaled.

+

The (New York) World (Dem.), Dec. 27.—Easily the first figure in the political contest now waging in Great Britain is David Lloyd-George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The rage with which his opponents assail him is their tribute to his talents. . . . Mr. Lloyd-George is of and from the people. By birth and sympathies he is bound to them. Success has not dulled his insight or chilled his ardor as a

reformer of the conditions in which the British masses live. . . . Speaking at the National Liberal Club a few days after the House of Lords threw out the Budget, Mr. Lloyd-George quoted Carlyle's remark, "It is wonderful how long a rotten institution will hang together, so long as it is not roughly handled," and added: "It is time it were handled firmly. You cannot with menacing speeches cast down even the most rickety and gimcrack of idols." As for the favorite Tory argument that the House of Lords was controlled by men of business and achievement, he replied: "You have got just a few in the House of Lords, and the rest of them are of no more use than broken bottles stuck on a park wall to keep off poachers. And that is what they are there for—to keep Radical poachers off their lordly preserves." Lord Lansdowne had been forced into rejecting the Budget against his own better judgment, "but having been forced, seeing no way out of it, being in the trap, he thought he might as well eat the cheese, and not leave it for the consumption of any other mouse or rat."

+

The Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury (London Correspondence) (Lib.), Dec. 15.—The Tories are suffering severely from the immense superiority of the Liberals on the platform. They console themselves with the reflection that, though their campaign in December will be less vigorous and less weighty than that of the Liberals, they will make up for lost time in January. I doubt whether this will be the case. The truth is that the Liberal speakers all over the country are possessing the minds of electors with the real issues which are to be decided at the election, and when the Tories take to the platform in greater force in January they will find that most of the electors have decided how they will vote. It is hoped that the leader of the opposition will address five or six meetings in January, but it is not at all certain that he will be sufficiently strong to undergo so great a strain. In any event the leader of the opposition will be quite unable to hold back the great wave of democratic feeling which is running in the country. The prospects of the Tory party become more and more gloomy, and between their championship of the Peers and their advocacy of food taxes it does not seem that they can possibly improve their position.

+ +

New Figures on the Cost of Living.

The Oklahoman (Oklahoma City), December 26.—The cost of living in the United States increased eleven per cent in the year between Dec. 1, 1908, and Dec. 1, 1909. This figure represents the average advance in the price of ninety-six commodities. This is a stupendous increase. It presents a situation so momentous that President Taft felt called upon to discuss it in his message to Congress, although he did not deal in figures. The increase cited may be accepted as authentic, having just been announced by Bradstreet's. One of the most noticeable effects of increased cost of living has been the forced demand of labor for higher wages. Wages, however, have not advanced in proportion to the cost of living. The only conclusion to be reached is that the working men and their families have

been forced to a trifle lower standard of living. The President sought to explain the reason of the increase. He said: "The proportionate increase in the output of gold, which today is the chief medium of exchange and is in some respects a measure of value, furnishes a substantial explanation of at least part of the increase in prices." Any political economist of standing in the country will agree with us, we think, that the President did not state the chief reason of the increased cost of living. The real "substantial explanation" is high tariff rates, and the resultant tendency toward monopoly. Economists all agree on this point. The President adds that "it is well to note that the increase in the cost of living is not confined to this country, but prevails the world over." This is true. But the cost of living is advancing from two to three times faster in the United States than in other leading nations. It is a noticeable fact that in nearly every instance the increase in the cost of living in a country is proportionate to the height of the nation's tariff wall.

Philadelphia Record, Jan. 1.—There is no denying the fact that the rise in wages has not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. A few hundred thousand have become possessed of the natural resources of a nation of one hundred million, control the raw materials of industry and the means of distribution; and behind a protective tariff wall this minority levies tribute and takes the cream of prosperity from consumer and producer alike. The breach of a promise given at Chicago in 1908 to remedy this evil, even in small part, was the meanest piece of political sculduggery of the year. There is compensation in the thought that the night is never so dark as just before dawn. Let us live in the faith that this is as true in economic politics as it is in nature; that we are approaching the day when the crusts of the millions will be as evenly spread with the butter of prosperity as is the fine white bread of the hundred thousands.

Pinchot's New York Speech.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.), Dec. 29.—In his address at the University Club in New York, Gifford Pinchot spoke of the conservation issue as a moral issue. It is part of a very broad question that has to do with the chances for getting on in the world. Shall opportunity be reserved for the few or extended to the many? If we proceed from one form of monopoly to another we must put the many more and more at the mercy of the few, must greatly increase the army of dependents. Already "the people of this country have lost vastly more than they can ever regain by gifts of public property, forever and without charge. It is true that we have made superb material progress under this system, but it is not well for us to rejoice too freely in the slices the special interests have given us from the great loaf of the property of all the people." On the one side enormous accumulations of wealth have resulted, but on the other "thousands of families lead lives of brutalizing overwork in return for the barest living," and "an appalling proportion of the tragedies of life spring directly from the lack of a little money." That Pinchot's sympathies are on the right side is ob-

vious. He has not been compelled to struggle against poverty himself, but he realizes what the struggle means. He is a keen observer who is affected personally only in so far as his activities in office have brought him into conflict with the influences that he denounces. He is at the center of a very bitter fight, but he is in no wise dependent upon the emoluments of office. No one can deny that he is animated by intense sincerity.

Why the Crops Were Big.

La Follette's Magazine, January 1.—We thought it would happen; and it has. Senator Depew has attempted to vindicate the new tariff law. He made a speech in the Senate from which the following is quoted: "With the passage of the new tariff bill, we enter upon a period of prosperity unknown in the history of this or any other country. From results gathered by careful examination all over the country, there will be an increase in the production of winter wheat, spring wheat, corn, oats, barley, and rye in 1909 over 1908, in round numbers, of one thousand one hundred and sixty-nine millions of bushels, or 27 per cent, and that 27 per cent increase is in comparison with a normal year. There will be an increase in the hay crop in the same period of over three millions and a half of tons." We shudder at the thought of the dismal crop failures that would have resulted from the passage of a new tariff law different from the one given to the country by Aldrich and Cannon!

Mayor Johnson's Administration.

Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 3.—Under Mayor Johnson's administration the city has seen wonderful progress. The natural and steady increase in population and wealth has demanded the services of a competent chief executive, and Tom L. Johnson has shown himself to be the right man for the position. He has, as far as possible, established the merit system in the public service. He has been awake to the necessities of public improvements. He has made substantial progress toward the elimination of grade crossings, he has encouraged and facilitated harbor improvement, he has enlarged and popularized the parks, he has introduced modern methods in the institutions of municipal charity and correction, he has doubled the size and efficiency of the police force, he has not neglected the special improvements needed by each section of the city. All this, and more, Mayor Johnson has done in addition to carrying to a triumphant conclusion his nine years' fight for lower street car fares and a management of street railways affairs in which the rights of the people must be considered.

Some Thoughts of "Three-Cent Tom."

The Mirror (St. Louis), December 30.—You'll occasionally hear, "Poor Tom L. Johnson!" But I don't know. He hasn't as much money as he had, but that relieves him of the trouble of keeping track of it. He was beaten for Mayor of Cleveland, but that job was no sinecure. He may not be so young as he was, but that means he's stopped piling up future regrets for himself. He was king of Cleve-

land for ever so long, but he knew right well that Cleveland would some day turn him down. His is or was at least a cheerful temperament and he can make the most of his consolations as he prepares to leave the office his occupancy of which exalted into a coign of world-wide fame. And his chief consolation is that he has not failed in his main purpose. His idea has won out, in Cleveland.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

A MAN IS PASSING.

For The Public.

A Man is passing. Hall him, you
Who realize him staunch and strong and true.
He found us dollar-bound and party-blind;
He leaves a City with a Civic Mind,
Choosing her conduct with a conscious care,
Selecting one man here, another there
And scorning labels. Craft and Graft and Greed
Ran rampant in our halls and few took heed.
The Public Service and the Public Rights
Were bloody bones for wolf and jackal fights.
Now, even the Corporate Monster licks the hand
Where once he snarled his insolent demand.
Who tamed it? Answer as you will,
But truth is truth and his the credit still.

A Man is passing. Flout him, you
Who would not understand and never knew.
Tranquil in triumph, in defeat the same,
He never asked your praise nor shirked your blame,
For he, as Captain of the Common Good,
Has earned the right to be misunderstood.
Behold! he raised his hand against his class;
Aye, he forsook the Few and served the Mass.
Year upon year he bore the battle's brunt
And so, the hiss, the cackle and the grunt!
He found us, striving each his selfish part.
He leaves a City with a Civic Heart,
Which gives the fortune-fallen a new birth
And reunites him with his Mother Earth,
Which seeks to look beyond the broken law
To find the broken life, and mend its flaw.

A Man is passing. Nay, no demi-god,
But a plain man, close to the common sod
Whence springs the grass of our humanity. Strong
Is he, but human, therefore sometimes wrong,
Sometimes impatient of the slower throng,
Sometimes unmindful of the formal thong,
But ever with his feet set towards the height
To plant the banner of the Common Right.
And ever with his eye fixed on the goal,
The Vision of a City with a Soul.

And is he fallen? Aye, but mark him well,
He ever rises further than he fell.
A Man is passing. I salute him, then,
In these few words. He served his fellow-men
And he is passing. But he comes again.

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.

Cleveland, Ohio.

HOME LESSONS IN ECONOMICS.

For The Public.

Sunday morning at the Breakfast Table.

Papa: Willie, you and Edith stay for Sunday school after church.

Willie: Oh, papa, then must we go to church too?

Papa: Certainly, to church and Sunday school both. Do you think I'm going to let you grow up like heathens?

+

Some hours later. The early Sunday dinner is on.

Papa: Well, Willie, what did you learn at Sunday school today?

Willie: The golden rule.

Papa: Let me hear you say it.

Willie: Do unto others as ye would men should do unto you.

Papa: That's right. I'm glad to see you pay some attention to what you are learning.

+

The dinner goes on. A little later the conversation between mama and papa and a visiting uncle drifts around to business matters, particularly to the discussion of a recent "corner," and the profits made by a certain daring young operator. With the lack of logic characteristic of the feminine mind, mama ventures a timid reminder of the fact that a number of people lost heavily, and that it was rumored several suicides occurring just then had some connection with the "corner."

Papa: That's business, can't be helped.

Willie: But oughtn't we do to others as we'd want them to do to us? Doesn't that mean we oughtn't to want to harm others? The golden rule says so.

Papa: That's all very well, but it's not business. A man would go to the wall pretty quick if he acted on that plan. You've got to *do* the other fellow before he *does* you, in business.

Willie: Then why do they teach us the golden rule in Sunday school?

Papa: Don't talk nonsense. Anyway, you children are talking much too much at table. Little folks should be seen and not heard.

G. I. C.

+ + +

HENRY GEORGE AND SOCIAL REFORM.

By Dr. Phil. C. N. Starcke of the University of Copenhagen. From "Gads Danske Magasin," for September, 1909. Translated for The Public by C. M. Koedt, Former Consul for Denmark at Chicago.

Seventy years have passed since the birth of Henry George. Only 70 years. And only 30

years since the publication of his famous work, "Progress and Poverty." The movement which his book has set agoing, and the change in the conditions of labor for social progress which it created, are so immense that one involuntarily starts on being reminded that it is only 70 years since Henry George saw the light of day.

Henry George has this in common with all great reformers of society, that he is filled with the deepest sympathy for those on the suffering side of life. With some, this sympathy leads to direct and immediate endeavors to redress the misery found. With others compassion transforms itself into hatred against those whose income is abundant, and wrestles with plans for reforms which merely take from one and give to another. Henry George is far removed from both. His doctrine is the manliest announcement of justice. Not benevolence, only justice, is able to elevate humanity. And he possesses the most luminous belief in the power of the ethical values. Justice and nothing else is able to solve the social question. It is both the most convenient and most effectual order of society.

The efforts men of a good heart unfold to redress the prevailing misery by giving alms, do not stop up the wells from which misery flows; they often miss their mark, since alms often fall to the unworthy. Private institutions, great organized humane measures, the whole humane relief legislation, which those liberally inclined have promoted so strongly, do not prevent that ever new and greater hosts of sufferers arise. These measures engage only with symptoms of society's disease, but do not enter into the causes themselves. They remain, therefore, in a social aspect, not only without result, but may even act hurtfully. One must especially hesitate at a benevolent legislation, because this is apt to deprive people of their self-esteem. To live off the benevolence of others is incompatible with independence; and to depend upon benevolence as an insurance, weakens men's virile sense of responsibility and tempts them to drift with the stream.

The only thing a man can demand is his right, which is precisely this, that the results of one's labor belong to him, and that no one must appropriate results where he has performed no labor. To guard justice is the business of society. The citizen can demand no more; it is his own concern to work, if he wishes to enjoy.

This principle, that everyone has a right to the result of his own labor, Henry George has in common with Social Democracy. But with Henry George this is a clear and fixed principle about the right to the produce labor yields; with Social Democracy it becomes the right, not only that labor be given a result, but a result of a fixed size. Social Democracy is forced to invoke the guardianship of the social power to manage distribution. It is concerned in reality not with the doc-

trine "the right of each to the results of his own labor," but to a right to be provided for. Thereby socialism enters into opposition to the doctrine of Henry George, as well in its practical social work as on its ethical basis. Socialism is not the same as the struggle of the lower classes to improve their condition. The struggle does not become socialism until it attempts to reach its goal through abolition of free competition. Socialism thereby expresses its doubt that a free working society can be arranged in a justifiable manner, and its doubt that the results of labor can be correctly determined.

But this changes the whole foundation. It is no longer justice, but a demand for maintenance, that is placed in the foreground. This demand is unethical, and stands in the class with mendicity. This is rendered conspicuous with great strength by Gustav Büscher, in a little pamphlet, "A Word to Socialists and Those Who Intend Joining Them" (Zürich, 1909. See *The Public*, vol. xii, p. 1071). Büscher is an adherent of Henry George, out of whose demands for justice he reproaches Social Democracy with both demolishing this belief, and creating a barren and hateful class struggle. Justice, he says, is not an empty term; justice never goes into the limitless, but has always a fixed proportion and a definite limitation.

When Social Democrats talk to the lower class about its right, it is never this or that certain right, but an undetermined right which ought rather to be called an insatiable demand to receive. As a consequence of Social Democratic agitation, society looms up before the underclasses as the great, wonderful power, which will produce all they are in need of. This is the obtrusive beggar's speech, the leader who in every property-owner sees a plunderer.

Like Henry George, Social Democracy labors for the reign of justice and love. But their discourse is quite different. The discourse of Social Democracy breathes hate and animosity against the upper classes. Henry George combines firmness and courage in demanding justice, anxious not to hurt the right of anyone. That to every right belongs a duty, to the right to have belongs the duty to work—this Henry George never for one moment forgets; while the violence in the demand to obtain the things one misses, leads Social Democracy to forget to talk about the demand one must make upon one's own self. During the hardest personal trials Henry George never forgot this. It never entered his mind to importune or appropriate gifts; he only endeavored to earn his own bread. Therefore he was ever far removed from the dream about a distributing social power, which should provide for the people; it was the right only he was intent on. Instead of talking about artificial arrangements for society, which through golden illusions of a far away future's paradise give comfort to

those who now suffer, he collected all his powers to demonstrate the fundamental injustice which creates the suffering in the existing society, and to strengthen the belief that as soon as the people obtain their rights they are in need of no charity.

Unlike the Social Democrats, he does not find the deep injustice in the liberty of individuals. On the contrary, for Henry George liberty is the condition for the richest possible unfolding of all powers. The injustice is caused by some having a monopoly, which enables them to appropriate the results of others' labors without working themselves. This monopoly Henry George found in the fact that private people can appropriate the value which land obtains simply by the growth of society. This value no individual can increase by his labor, nor decrease by his neglect. He can through his labor create other values of thousands of dollars on or in land, but these disappear again with his labor. To these he has a full and unimpaired title. But land value as such arises, grows and disappears with the development of society, and this value therefore can be claimed only by society as a whole. It is on account of appropriating this social property, that the individual diminishes the opportunities of life for his fellows, and forces them to work for him on conditions he determines.

This is precise and clear language, and it resounds now over the whole civilized world. The grievance over this injustice is not borne in envy of wealth; the demand made is not to live and be cared for by others, but to be enabled to build one's existence upon own industry, perseverance and ingenuity. Fetter the people, assign them their places each for himself, and take care that each one's appetite is appeased in the evening, if he has obeyed your commands during the day,—that is Social Democracy's road forward. Let men be free, let them work free, act free, and in the evening consume the bread they themselves were able to earn in the course of the day—one more, the other less—but take care only, no one appropriates the bread of others,—this is Henry George's teaching.

At the present time the state takes from all, because it has given away to some what it owned itself. Therefore, on the evening, the bread is torn from the hands of the many and placed in the hands of the privileged few. How this is accomplished, and how this will cease when justice has been satisfied and society received the produce of its work as the individual of his, Henry George has shown so clearly as to be easily understood the whole world over. Therefore Henry George's birthday is celebrated everywhere, not with official celebrations and solemn parades, but through that flow of joyful hope from the many whom his teaching has strengthened in the belief that it is possible to realize justice, and whose conviction he has grounded in the fact that it is along the

road of justice that proud and free peoples win happiness.

* * *

HE WHO WOULD REAP, MUST SOW.

For The Public.

"By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread,
Thou and thy sons forevermore."

Thus ran the edict the first man read
As he stood alone on a primal shore;—
Whispered by every passing breeze,
Thundered where mighty torrents pour,
Sung by the grass, the flowers, the trees,
Voiced by the ocean on its shore,
Flashed on the clouds in lines of fire,
Carved on the mountain's granite crest,
Limned where the lights of day expire
In gold and crimson in the west.

"The land I give, and the boundless sea—
All the riches they hold I give to thee.
But by the sweat of thy brow thou shalt make sweet
And earn the bread that thou wouldst eat.
As thou tillst the soil or sailst the deep,
Remember, that thou must sow to reap.

"Guard thyself that thou dost not reap
That which thy brother in sorrow sowed.
He who hath earned, alone shall keep;
Thou needst not carry another's load.
Let each have only his equal share
Of the treasures stored in the earth's broad
breast;—

Then thou shalt live as a free man dare,
And do thy work as to thee seems best;
And thy sons shall not labor pale and gaunt
That a few may have an unearned toll;
And thou shalt not feel the sting of want
That sears and dwarfs the human soul."

R. E. CHADWICK.

BOOKS

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

A History of the United States and Its People. From Their Earliest Records to the Present Time. By Elroy McKendree Avery. In Sixteen Volumes. Vol. V. Published by The Burrows Brothers Company, Cleveland. 1908.

Now that all the historical currents leading on to the beginning of the Republic have been traced to their confluence in his preceding volumes (p. 524), Mr. Avery begins the history of the United States as a nation with an interesting account of the economic and political conditions out of which came the Revolutionary War. It is interesting at this time to notice that one of the usually overlooked factors in causing that war was the effort of the landed class of Great Britain to reduce the William and Mary land value tax of four shillings in the pound, by substituting for it, in part, the stamp tax against which the American colonists protested.

Not to the stamp act or the tea act, however,

does Mr. Avery attribute the origin of the war, but rather to the revival of the old doctrine of prerogative in the form of a colonial policy. American interests were made subservient to British monopolies. Before the war broke out "the issue had been broadened from that of no taxation without representation, to that of no legislation without representation."

Beginning with 1763, just after the close of the French and Indian war, and covering the period down to the proclamation of the Declaration of Independence, this volume of Mr. Avery's ambitious work deals with some of the most exciting events of our national history. Among the more notable are the stamp act, the tea episode in Boston harbor, the tendency toward union, culminating in the first Continental Congress, Lexington, Bunker Hill, the Quebec campaign and the adoption of the Declaration.

It is interesting to note the tory animus which condemned such patriots as James Otis, Joseph Warren, and Samuel Adams as "black-hearted fellows whom one would not choose to meet in the dark," pretty much as the same spirit assailed the Abolitionists of half a century ago and assails the radicals of today.

Like its predecessors, this volume is richly illustrated, both in color and in black and white, with historical portraits, maps, and scenes. The same democratic spirit pervades the whole, except in the criticism of what the author calls "some indefensible political philosophy and some impracticable ideas" in the self evident truths proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence. Some echoes of scholastic denials of human rights are here distinguishable. But the story continues in the same interesting style in which it began, and the potency of the circumstances described for producing their historical climax is convincingly suggested.

If—

If the present 10,000 subscribers of The Public only could realize their power, what might they not do?

If each would during the year get one friend to subscribe! or

If 1,000 would get five each! or

If 100 would get twenty-five each—only two a month!

And if this process were kept up a few years, it is conceivable that true democracy would, through its influence alone, be removed from the category of iridescent dreams.

Be one to demonstrate the practicability of this formula.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—Songs of Democracy. By Charles Edward Russell. Published by Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. 1909. Price, \$1.25 net.

—The Martyrdom of Ferrer. By Joseph McCabe. Issued for the Rationalist Press Association. Published by Watts & Co., 17 Johnson's Court, Fleet St., E. C., London. 1909. Price, paper, 30 cents.

PAMPHLETS

Religious Liberalism.

A reply to the Rev. A. C. Dixon, D. D., of the Moody Church of Chicago, by the Rev. August Dellgren, B. D., of the Swedish Unitarian Church of Chicago, in defense of Christian liberalism, is published by the latter for seven cents postpaid (1529 Wellington St.).

+ +

Social Legislation.

The Rev. Dr. Ryan, professor of political economy in the St. Paul Seminary, and author of "A Living Wage" (p. 884), publishes through the Catholic World Press (120 West 60th St., New York, price \$1.00 per 100) "A Programme of Social Reform by Legislation," which aims to "describe all the legislative proposals that seem sound and worth striving for at the present time." Each of them is vouched for as in force in at least one country, and many as existing together in one or more countries.

+ +

Labor Legislation.

Three reports of the American Association for Labor Legislation (Madison, Wis.) are before us. One, by Irene Osgood, is a review of labor legislation of the various States in 1909; another is a summary by Charles B. Austin of the labor laws of the

various States in force in 1909; and the third is a summary by Edward C. Elliott of the legislation of the various States concerning industrial education in public elementary and secondary schools.

✦ ✦ ✦

The great financier, when a little boy, dreamed of being a pirate when he grew up. And his dream came true.—Life.

✦ ✦ ✦

Chairman (concluding an address of Introduction): "An' now, ladies and gentlemen, I hab de honor of presentin' to dis audience de speaker of de ebening—Professor Johnsing, of de Westville Seminary—

who will proceed to define de indefnable, depict de indelectable and unscrew the unscrewtable!"—Life.

✦ ✦ ✦

Father: "Well, Carolyn, how do you like school?"

Carolyn (aged six): "Oh, so much, papa!"

Father: "That's right, daughter. And now what have you learned today?"

Carolyn: "I've learned the names of all the little boys."—Harper's Bazar.

✦ ✦ ✦

"You've been struck twice by lightning? I thought lightning never struck twice in the same place."

"It doesn't, so far as I know. I was in a different

NEWSPAPER REVIEWS

of Louis F. Post's

Ethics of Democracy

Springfield (Mass.) Republican, December 3, 1904:

"A VOLUME of essays of exceptional quality and force * * * It would be difficult to speak too highly of these papers either in respect to penetration of thought or power of reasoning. * * * The volume is full of stimulating and illuminating discussion of vital subjects, and nowhere have the principles of democratic institutions found a more masterly exposition and defense than in this book."

Nashville (Tenn.) News, December, 12, 1903:

"MR. Post has done some thinking for himself, and no thoughtful reader can fail to find his book interesting and suggestive. His chapters on the trusts are a somewhat novel presentation of these outgrowths of present economic conditions and form some of the most valuable parts of the volume * * * Every real believer in democratic institutions can read this book with interest and profit."

Manchester (Eng.) Guardian, November 3, 1904:

"THE essays in this volume upon such topics as patriotism and self government breathe the best spirit of that enthusiastic Americanism which is so gravely imperilled by the new career to which the Republic is committing herself. But the economics are after all the backbone of the teaching. The distinctive feature here consists in the subordinate position given to the power of capitalism and the corresponding prominence given to land as the breeding-ground of economic abuses. Mr. Post writes on this theme with clearness and force, and his chapter entitled 'An Economic Exploration and Survey' is one of the ablest statements of elementary economics we have read."

Detroit (Mich.) Tribune, September 10, 1904:

"THIS book is a marvel of clear thinking and clear writing."

New York Nation, March 31, and New York Evening Post, April 2, 1904:

"IN the course of it there is a good deal of writing which may almost be called eloquent, and a good deal that is nearly incoherent. The drift of the whole is socialistic, but there is in it political economy of the most systematic kind, and political writing of a sound sort. The difficulty is that the author seems unable to distinguish what is sound from what is unsound, and the result is that we have a jumble instead of a book * * * On the whole it may safely be said that Mr. Post is not a guide to be implicitly followed, and that those who accept him as a teacher will find it exceedingly difficult to calculate to what conclusions he may not lead them."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat, March 20, 1904:

"THERE is something refreshing in the placid fashion in which Louis F. Post discusses all the familiar sins of the social and political world of today in his 'Ethics of Democracy' with-

place when I was hit the second time."—Chicago Tribune.

+ + +

"Mr. Burlaps," said the lawyer, proceeding to cross examine him, "you reside in the city, do you?"

"No, sir," answered the witness.

"In the country?"

"No, sir."

"Well, where on earth do you live?"

"In Oak Park."—Chicago Tribune.

+ + +

A happily married woman, who had enjoyed thirty-three years of wedlock, and who was the grandmother of four beautiful little children, had an amusing old colored woman for a cook.

One day when a box of especially beautiful flow-

3 SUBSCRIPTIONS

for

2 DOLLARS

Your own and two
new ones for a year

TO HELP US GROW

EMIL SCHMIED, Manager

out consigning the planet to any hot finish at the end. That all will come out right at last, he cheerily believes, though very much is far from right at present. There is no firing in the air * * * His book is made up of different essays, which may be taken together or singly, but the thread of the discourse runs through all of them."

Chicago Christian Century, July 6, 1905:

"THE book is sound morally. Its theories are founded on natural principles, and the constant protest is against artificial rights * * * In all the essays the Golden Rule is the moral monitor * * * He makes a splendid protest against eating bread in the sweat of some other's brow."

Chicago Tribune, March 5, 1904, (Review by George C. Howland):

"IT is a pleasure to find questions on which it is so easy to rant discussed in a serene, courteous fashion. Mr. Post's ideal democracy does not consist in a habit of dress or trick of manners, or adherence to a particular platform, but in a habit of looking at each question from the standpoint of abstract right."

The Outlook, February 13, 1904:

"THE chief merit of this volume is its fundamentally wholesome spirit. Mr. Post writes forcefully, sincerely, seriously and with apt turns of humor * * * He is rigorous and keen in applying moral tests to social conditions * * * When he cites biblical passages, he is generally illuminating in what theologians would call his exegesis—illuminating just because he does not intend his comments to be exegesis at all * * * There are gaps in his arguments. He raises questions he does not answer. He is often academic, as he admits he expects to be considered, and bookish. He writes, however, so as to stimulate the reader to find out for himself why his statements are true or why they are not."

Chicago Inter Ocean, January 14, 1904:

"IT may be said at the outset that Mr. Post is a democratic Democrat, one who really believes that the Declaration of Independence meant what it said in declaring that all men are born free and equal in respect of their natural political rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness * * * It is written by a man who has not permitted any person or periodical to do his thinking for him, and is vastly more democratic than the Democratic party and more republican than the Republican party."

New York Public Opinion, January 14, 1904:

"MR. Post's discussion of the place and value of foreign trade is one of the most satisfactory chapters in the book. He shows in a convincing manner the many fallacies in the arguments of those who would prove that an excess of exports over imports is always a desirable thing and a source and index of national wealth * * * One statement of the author's would seem to be fallacious, at least in its bald form. This is the one in which he denies the validity of contracts made by governments as effecting future generations."

Price, Postpaid, \$1.25

**Address: THE PUBLIC Book Dept.
Ellsworth Bldg. Chicago**

ers was left for the mistress, the cook happened to be present, and she said: "Yo' husband send you all the pretty flowers you gits, Missy?"

"Certainly, my husband, mammy," proudly answered the lady.

"Glory!" exclaimed the cook, "he suttently am holding' out well."—Ladies' Home Journal.

You Need "The People's Hour," that world-stirring new book of songs, poems and keenest prose; timely, dealing with vital problems for the workers. Reviewed in The Public Nov. 26. Address The Englewood Publishing House, 419 W. 97th St., Chicago

"THE SECRET OF THE BIBLE." One of the finest works ever written. It shows the True Nature of Divine Language, how it is to be interpreted according to a Definite Law, makes all its pages shine with a New Light, and convinces the Thoughtful Reader that it is the most profoundly Psychological and Practical of Books—THE BOOK. Pasteboard cover, 318 pages. Postpaid for 25c, stamps taken. REV. L. G. LANDENBERGER, 3741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

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

NOTICE
I wish to announce that I now have an office at 28 Jackson Blvd, in Suite 701, where I will be pleased to see my friends and patients. C. L. LOGAN, Osteopath.
Tel. Harrison 6296

TOM L. JOHNSON
WRITES THIS OF "SOCIAL SERVICE" THE NEW BOOK BY LOUIS F. POST:
"I am inclined to think it is destined to make more converts than any other book on political economy yet written except 'Progress and Poverty.'"
PUBLISHED BY
A. WESSELS, New York
SOLD BY
A. C. McCLURG & CO., Chicago
ALSO BY
THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago
Price, One Dollar, Postpaid

Women's Trade Union League of Chicago
ANNUAL MEETING
Sunday, January 9, 3 P. M.
Federation Hall, 275 La Salle St.
SECOND FLOOR
Election of Officers and Members of the Executive Board.
Polls open from 1 to 4 P. M. Speaker: Miss Mary McDowell.
The Strike of the Forty Thousand. (Story of the Waistmakers of New York)
Refreshments. All Welcome.
MRS. RAYMOND ROBINS, President.
EMMA STEGHAGEN, Secretary.

The Public
The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.
It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any consideration of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.
Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.
We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.
Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.
Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

Terms of Subscription
Yearly\$1.00
Half yearly......50
Quarterly......25
Single copies......08
Trial subscription—4 weeks......10
Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.
Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico
Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.
All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders on Chicago, or New York
Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.
Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.
Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

Advertising Rates
One page, each insertion.....\$20.00
Half-page, each insertion..... 10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion..... 5.00
One inch, each insertion..... 1.20
Half-inch, each insertion..... .80
Two columns to the page; length of column, 8 1/2 inches; width of column, 3 inches.
Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication