

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
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Connecticut
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
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
MISS GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin
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
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1912.

No. 746.

Published by Louis F. Post
Eliworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1896, at the Post Office
at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

The Land Question in Great Britain.....	673
Panama Canal Tolls.....	674
A Policeman's Thrift.....	674
Two Companionable Claimants.....	674
Lorimer's Comeback at the Chicago Tribune.....	674
Farmers and Farm Taxes.....	675

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

St. Paul's New Popular Charter (C. J. Buell).....	677
---	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Land Question in Great Britain.....	678
Prohibition Party Convention.....	682
Republican Revolt in Iowa.....	682
The Unseating of Lorimer.....	682
National Educational Association.....	683
Proportional Representation.....	683
News Notes.....	684
Press Opinions.....	685

RELATED THINGS:

The Vision (Gertrude Colles).....	688
Little Tales of Fellow Travelers. 7. (Chas. H. Shinn).....	688
The Liberal Forward Policy.....	639

BOOKS:

The Singletax Exposed.....	690
Land Value Taxation.....	692
Periodicals.....	692

CARTOON:

The Sad Truth (Arthur Young).....	692
-----------------------------------	-----

EDITORIAL

The Land Question in Great Britain.

The third of a significant series of by-elections was won for the Liberals of Great Britain last week by R. L. Outhwaite. These successes take their special significance from the fact that the victorious candidates are what would be known in the United States as Singletaxers, and that their campaigns were not only unreserved but aggressive along Singletax lines.



Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, the youngest King's Counsel at the British bar, Recorder of Liverpool, and a member of Parliament who resigned a sure constituency two years ago to contest a hopeless one on the land question issue, was the first to win in this recent series of victories. Although he lost in his hopeless contest of two years ago, he was eminently successful in his main purpose, which was the emphasizing of the land question in Liberal politics. At the North-West Norfolk by-election in May he was triumphantly returned to Parliament, and his victory is being celebrated in London (even as this issue of *The Public* goes to press) at a Trocadero dinner over which Alexander Ure presides and which more than 40 members of Parliament have announced their purpose of attending. Mr. Hemmerde's victorious campaign was speedily followed by another of like kind, and with like result—Sydney Arnold's for the constituency of Holmfirth. The third is Mr.

Outhwaite's at Hanley. Mr. Outhwaite is a Singletaxer of Imperial reputation, who, like Mr. Hemmerde and Mr. Arnold, made the land question his slogan and swept the field.



In response to, if not in consequence of, such evidence as this of the popular strength in Great Britain of the Singletax method of industrial socialization, indications are now abundant (as a perusal of our News Narrative and Press Opinions of this week will disclose) of a contemplated advance by the Liberal ministry much farther than heretofore in the direction of Henry George's proposals for abolishing industrial monopolies by abolishing monopoly of the land.



Panama Canal Tolls.

Something very like pettifogging is the position of the United States government with reference to the discriminatory tolls at the Panama Canal. This canal is either an international enterprise managed by the American government for the general good on equal terms, or it is a national enterprise for national benefit; and that it is the latter the American government has not the face to claim. Then the American government must concede it to be the former. But if it is the former, if that canal is an international affair, the American government has no right in good conscience to impose any tolls upon the commerce of other nations which it does not impose upon our own. To insist upon doing so is in effect to claim the right to make a national monopoly of the whole carrying trade through the canal. And by charging the tolls and then refunding them nothing can be gained but a reputation for bad faith.



A Policeman's Thrift.

Upon resigning from the Chicago police force not so very long ago, the wealth of a canny policeman proved to be about four times as much as his total salary during twenty years of service. Graft! Not necessarily—not in the sense in which you mean; not criminal graft. At any rate he didn't get caught. His graft seems to have been quite legal. He bought building lots and sold them as Chicago grew, thereby legally putting into his own pocket profits of communal growth. This is graft, to be sure, but it is a kind of graft that the law allows. "I have paid but \$50," said this policeman in explanation, "for many a lot that I

have sold only a year or so later for \$500." When you realize that his profit of \$450 a lot means food, clothing, shelter—labor in some of its manifold forms—and that the fruits of this labor go not to those who do it, but to the thrifty policeman who bought a space on the planet for \$50 which he sold for \$500, you begin to recognize the graft character of his profit. Somewhere in the complexities of business the \$450 which that policeman gets without earning it, others earn without getting it.



Two Companionable Claimants.

For the honor of having expelled Mr. Lorimer from the Senate, there are two claimants besides the legitimate ones. William Randolph Hearst claims it, along with the phenomenon of dawn at cockcrow, the invention of sleep, etc., etc.; Theodore Roosevelt claims it a logical result of his having refused to shake hands with Lorimer. Roosevelt's is somewhat the stronger claim of the two, by inference from the fact that whereas he did not shake hands with Lorimer and Lorimer was subsequently expelled from the Senate, he did shake hands with the unsavory Boss Cox of Cincinnati who has not been expelled from the Senate. To be sure, Cox was never in the Senate, but neither was Lorimer, by the terms of the decision; and anyhow this is only a detail. Apart from that advantage, however, Roosevelt's claim and Hearst's are upon an equal footing. Did these two modest men graduate from the same megalomaniacal institute or are they only a coincidence?



Lorimer's Comeback at the Chicago Tribune.

Whatever may be the merits of the Lorimer case, Senator Lorimer's excoriation of the owners of the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News is justified by the facts. It is absolutely true that valuable property rights of the public schools of Chicago have been turned over to them without consideration under newspaper pressure.



Both the Chicago Tribune company and the Daily News company owned leases of school land in the heart of the business district of Chicago in 1895. These leases had 90 years to run, but under their terms the ground rents were to be readjusted every ten years. In 1895 the Chicago school board was induced to cancel those readjustment clauses, thereby transforming a ten years' tenure (so far as rentals were concerned) into a

90 years' tenure on the rental basis of the abnormally low values of the hard times of the '90's. By this transaction (engineered, by the way, by the Tribune's own lawyer, who was a member of the school board at the time) the school children of Chicago have been swindled out of millions of dollars. Even now, when the transaction is less than twenty years old, the Tribune's ground rent is hardly more than half as much as it would be if the ten-year revaluation clauses were still in force. The story of this grafting affair is written in the printed record of the proceedings of the Board of Education of Chicago and in the reports of the Supreme Court of Illinois.



Upon a recent court decision in its favor in the matter, the Tribune prides itself. So did the simple old Negro witness when asked on cross-examination if he hadn't once been indicted for stealing chickens. "Yes, sir," he replied, "I certainly was; but I came out, sir, with a perfect bill of health, completely exonerated, sir." "Prove your innocence, Uncle?" "No, sir; not to say prove it, sir; but I was acquitted with flying colors, sir." "Perhaps there was an alibi?" "No, sir; that wasn't what my lawyer called it, certainly; he called it the statute of limitations."



FARMERS AND FARM TAXES.

Why is it that monopolists appeal to farmers when they need votes to help them get away with monopoly plunder? Is it because the farmer really is an "easy mark" for monopolists? or is it only because the monopolists think so?

The farmer vote on taxation in Oregon and Missouri next fall may throw light upon the question; for in those States the exemption of farm property is then to be voted on. Tax reformers there are proposing to exempt from taxation the values of all farm buildings, clearings, cultivation, fencing and other farm improvements, and to exempt besides all farm produce, animals, tools, machinery and other farming equipment—to exempt in a word, everything that farmers make.

Nevertheless, great land monopolists and their hired agents and newspapers are urging farmers to defeat that reform. They even predict that the farmers of Missouri and Oregon will defeat it, so confident are they that the farmer is an "easy mark" for them.

If the farmers of Oregon and Missouri do vote against those exemptions, the great land grabbers will have good right to go on laughing in their

sleeves. Think of it! A proposal to exempt farming property from taxation, voted down by farmers!



How could anything so absurd be possible?

We shall not even try to guess. A bare assumption that it is possible would reflect upon the intelligence of those Oregon and Missouri farmers. But we may explain how the monopolists expect to make it possible.

In those States land monopolists are publishing campaign documents, addressed especially to farmers, through which they try to make farmers believe that the proposed tax exemptions of farming property would ruin farmers. Their argument is much the same in both States. In the Missouri document it is well summarized in these words: "It would put the entire burden of supporting the government upon the shoulders of those whose lot in life it is to till the soil and labor with their hands." What would?

Would exemption of farming property "put the entire burden of supporting government upon those whose lot in life it is to till the soil and labor with their hands?" Would it?

The writer of that document would have to say so if he were under cross-examination. He tries to say, however, that the Missouri proposition is the Henry George proposition in disguise. But that amounts to the same thing, for *the Henry George proposition is to exempt everybody from taxation "whose lot in life it is to till the soil and labor with their hands."*

Henry George proposed to exempt all workers from taxation, and he considered farmers as workers. His proposition would exempt the workers, but not those who work the workers,—farmers who farm farms, but not farmers who farm farmers.

There's the rub with monopolists. They are workers of workers, farmers of farmers; and they want to keep on with that kind of working and that kind of farming, for "it's a snap." Therefore they send out a Macedonian cry to "those whose lot in life it is to till the soil and labor with their hands," to step up to the ballot box and vote down the proposed exemptions of farming property. As in the nightmare of the man who dreamed he had gone to hell, they are hunting around for farmers to hold between themselves and the fire "to keep off the heft of the heat."



Of course they don't put the matter in that plain way—those monopolists. They have respect enough for the intelligence of the farming com-

munity to know that farmers won't bite at a bare hook. They try to make farmers believe that location value is the principal value of farms. Their reason for this is that under Henry George's proposition, the exemption of improvements and produce is to be made up by higher taxes on location values. Incidentally, too, and like the legerdemain performers they are, they conceal the fact that the location values to be taxed higher are not the values of farming sites alone, but of city lots also, and of mineral deposits, railroad rights of way and similar monopolies of location. It is from such confusing juggles that the monopolists try to make farmers see that the exemption of improvements and the taxing of land values alone, would throw the whole burden of taxation upon farmers. In fact it wouldn't, as every farmer knows who stops to think. But the monopolists bank upon their belief that farmers won't stop to think.

If, however, farmers do stop to think, they will see clearly enough, as all other thoughtful men do, that the location value of the ordinary farm is its least value.

Let any ordinary farmer inventory his taxable property. He will find that if all of it were exempt except the farm site, the mere unimproved land, he could pay a much higher tax on the land of his farm and still pay less taxes than he does now.

The same thing is true of the village and town home-owner.

Nor is that all. Most of the great city values, most of the great railroad values, most of the great mining values, are land values. Under the proposed tax reform they would be taxed very much higher than now, which would make the taxes on small home owners' land, and all farm-land taxes, less than now. To exempt everything but land values and franchise values, is to lower the taxes of all "whose lot in life it is to till the soil and labor with their hands."

This must be true, also, on general principles. For the Henry George proposal is to tax monopoly and exempt industry, to tax privilege and exempt toil. How can the exemption of industry be a burden upon industry? How can the exemption of toil be a tax upon toil?



In the land monopoly campaign document for Missouri there are thirteen points against exempting toil from taxation.

A fatal thirteen for Missouri farmers will those points be if they are influenced by them to vote against tax reform in Missouri next fall. But a

fatal thirteen ought they to be to the Missouri land monopolists who are just now hunting for farmers "to hold between themselves and the fire."

The *first* point is that the State should be just in taxation; a sound principle, indeed, but one that requires the taxation of location monopoly and the exemption of toil and its products, which is the very essence of that Missouri tax reform proposal.

The *second* point is that this would make two opposing classes—taxpayers and non-taxpayers; but if it did the taxpayers would be those who have special privileges, whereas these are now the biggest non-taxpayers.

Then comes the *third* point, that young farmers would abandon agriculture, which is to imply that young farmers are so ignorant that they don't know that agriculture would thrive better if it were untaxed than under the tax burden it bears now.

The *fourth* point knocks the bottom out of the third; for it assumes that the Missouri tax reform would destroy land value. If it did, can't any sensible young farmer see that it would make places to farm obtainable for the asking, so that not only would his farming go untaxed but his chance to farm for himself would be easy to get.

The *fifth* point assumes that "the supply of raw materials produced from land" would be decreased; which goes to show that the big land monopolists think the farmer easily fooled. If by "raw materials" they mean land, then the "raw materials" are not "produced from land;" if they mean any kind of materials that are produced from land, such materials would be exempt from taxation and therefore likely to be more plentiful rather than more scarce.

On the *sixth* point those land monopolists run again into conflict with their fourth; for while in the fourth they assume "the destruction of land value," in the sixth they assume "increase in the market rental of farm lands occupied by tenants," which is as much as to say that the cheaper your land is the higher your rent will be. Has any real farmer ever thought so?

The *seventh* point is like the sixth, for it assumes "increased market rentals of city property." Every one who observes knows this to be absurd. Market rentals of city property do not go up as the value of the property goes down.

Now note the *eighth* point. It predicts "the abandonment of homes surrounded by lawns" in cities, because of "the enormous taxes levied against ground." This ignores the fact that most city residents don't have lawns now, but are corralled in stuffy spaces; and it disregards the probability that

with their buildings and furniture altogether untaxed, residents of cities would gladly pay fair taxes for lawn space in proportion to its desirability.

In the *ninth* point there is an unintentional hint at the source of this Missouri document itself; for here the plea is for Big Business, which strikes its roots deep in land monopoly and thereby sucks up the earnings of those who toil for the benefit of those who don't.

When our Missouri tractarian gets to his *tenth* point he indulges again in some of that kind of loose writing of which a newspaper reporter once said it might better be called "tight writing." Here he talks about "taxing the major part of the incomes" of "those who earn their incomes directly from working upon the land." But the proposition is not to tax any one's earned income; it is to exempt earned incomes altogether from taxation.

The *eleventh* point infers the destruction of small farming because "the amount of land necessary to support a family by its product over and above taxes and expense of cultivation would be increased." That is a unique bit of mental gymnastics. As if exemptions for producers could lessen their production, because monopolizers of productive opportunities instead of themselves were taxed! To exempt producers and tax monopolizers of productive opportunities is to increase production.

The *twelfth* point assumes a reduction of the farmer's income "to merely what could be produced on the poorest land," a twisting of an economic formula that should make even the farmers' horses laugh. That ambitious farmer-fooler seems totally incapable of realizing, although he states its equivalent again and again, that if opportunities for farming could no longer be monopolized profitably by farmers of farmers, those opportunities would be a drug in the market. In consequence "the poorest land" in use—for it is not the absolutely poorest land that is involved in the point, but *the poorest in use* (land of high grade if unused land were not monopolized)—would be highly productive. Farmers' incomes would consequently be greatly increased instead of greatly diminished by Henry George's plans—the incomes, that is, of farmers who farm farms.

Finally we have the fatal *thirteenth* point: "The lands of the country," says this monopolistic "friend of the farmer," "have passed from hand to hand on the strength of the nation's original grant in fee simple," and "to take or destroy its value now would place an unfair and unjust burden upon present"—farmers? No, indeed, not "upon present

farmers." The sleek monopolist forgot his farmer there. Not upon present farmers, but upon "present owners," does he say that this "unfair and unjust burden" is to be placed. And who are those owners, pray? Measured by land *value*, which is the proposed measure of the proposed tax to which Missouri land monopolists object, farmers are not owners to any great extent. Land value in New York City alone, twice the value of all the improvements there, would equal a path of farm land worth \$100 an acre two miles wide all the way around the globe at the equator; and working farmers don't own enough of it to count. So of every other great city. What pitiful tommyrot it is, all that begging of the farmers who toil, to get in between owners of great land values and the fire. And what a hogwash of an argument, this appeal to working farmers in the thirteenth point to vote against a plan of taxation which they say would place "an unfair and unjust burden upon present owners" of land, after having in the sixth and seventh points assumed that land would command "increased market rentals" if it were so taxed!



Some of the thumb marks of that pamphlet prove its authorship to have been of plutocratic, monopolistic, corporation, Big Business origin. Yet it reads so much, on the whole, like a travesty of the standard books in opposition to Henry George, that we find it difficult to avoid a suspicion that the author may be a Singletaxer palming off a practical joke. His name is E. B. Silvers and his book, "Single Tax a Fallacy," bears a Kansas City imprint. If Mr. Silvers is a genuine anti-Singletaxer, his skill in exposing the weakness of his own cause should put Mallock to the blush.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

ST. PAUL'S NEW POPULAR CHARTER

St. Paul, Minn.

The new charter for St. Paul which was adopted at the Spring election in May, is one of the best yet adopted by any city, and it is the product of a civic club. There had been a charter commission for years, which spent much time and some public money in charter drafting without producing anything that they themselves or any one else could agree upon. At last the Current Topics Club undertook the job with no official authority, and their work was endorsed at the election by the people of the city by a tremendous majority.

The drafting committee appointed by the Current Topics Club consisted of John W. Bennett, Chairman (lawyer and editorial writer); Hugh T. Halbert (lawyer); G. Winthrop Lewis (lawyer); C. J. Buell

(lecturer); W. G. McMurphy (editor Daily News); Tyler McWhorter (cartoonist, Pioneer Press); Rev. E. B. Woodward (St. Clements Episcopal Church); Rev. John D. Reid (Unitarian Church); H. D. Frank el (lawyer), and C. Harold Richter (artist).

To meet the requirements of the Minnesota Constitution, the charter had to provide for a mayor and a council. It provides for a Mayor, comptroller and six commissioners who constitute the City Council. The Mayor is empowered to assign the six commissioners to their respective duties, and has power to re-distribute them at the end of six months. This throws the whole responsibility for the general administration of city affairs on the Mayor. All these eight elective officers are subject to a Recall election on petition of 25% of the voters; and all acts of the council are subject to an easy working Initiative and Referendum.

The business of the city is divided into the following six departments, aside from Mayor and comptroller: Commissioner of Finance is city treasurer and general financial officer of the city; Commissioner of Public Works in charge of public works (streets, sewers, bridges, collection of garbage, work house, etc.); Commissioner of Public Safety (police, fire, health, public baths); Commissioner of Education (schools, library, auditorium, art galleries, museums), aided by an unpaid advisory board of education (one elected by the voters of each of the twelve wards, and eight to twelve elected by the teachers), this board having no power except to advise; Commissioner of parks (all parks, playgrounds, except school playgrounds and all public buildings) aided by a city architect who is building inspector; Commissioner of Public Utilities, who is president of the water board and has charge of city lighting, city markets, all public utilities owned or acquired by the city, and public service corporations. The Commissioner of Finance, Commissioner of Public Works, and Commissioner of Public Utilities constitute the water board. All elections are non-partisan, fifty voters being necessary to put a candidate on the primary ballot and no party designation being permitted. The chapter on franchises and public service corporations is extraordinarily strict.

The only organized opposition to this charter came from the Socialists, who objected to the clause prohibiting party names on the ballots.

To adopt the charter required that three-fifths of all voting at the election must vote for it. Yet it secured considerably more than the required three-fifths of affirmative votes.

All the daily papers strongly urged the adoption of the charter, which was largely due to John W. Bennett of the Despatch, and W. G. McMurphy of the News. There would probably have been more organized opposition, but most of its opponents—Big Business and corporations—had no idea it could secure the needed three-fifths vote. The charter was on a separate ballot and this helped much. The Current Topics Club committee would gladly have adopted the Grand Junction and Spokane plan of one election with preferential voting, but feared it might cost votes. They are now of the opinion that the charter would have received just as many votes had that plan been embodied in the document. The people of the city were ripe for a change. Many perhaps did not know very definitely what they voted for; but

they adopted a good charter by an affirmative vote of 22,215 to only 4,485 in the negative.

C. J. BUELL.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, July 16, 1912.

The Land Question in Great Britain.

At the by-election for Hanley on the 13th, R. L. Outhwaite, the Liberal candidate, and an active and prominent Singletaxer who fought his campaign on Singletax lines, was elected to the Parliamentary vacancy caused by the death of Enoch Edwards, a Labor member, by a plurality of 4,953 over the Labor candidate and 654 over the Unionist. This result emphasizes the significance of E. G. Hemmerde's victory a short time earlier, at another by-election, and of Sydney Arnold's at a second, and, confirming political opinions as to the popularity of the democratic side of the land question, tends further to strengthen the expectations of an advance in radicalism on that question by the Liberal party. [See vol. xiii, pp. 779, 900, 924, 947, 961, 996, 997, 1083, 1156; vol. xiv, pp. 327, 891, 897, 1030, 1101, 1170, and current volume, pages 204, 363, 541.]



American newspapers are characteristically wanting in news of this development in British politics, but a glance at London newspapers indicates that a revolutionary crisis is near at hand of even greater general interest than that of 1909, the news of which did not bestir American papers until it was a year old or more.



The London Daily Telegraph (opposition) of June 28 indicates the situation, saying that:

Evidence is forthcoming that the Government are formulating a policy of land and housing reform as the basis of an appeal to the country at the next general election. They are now awaiting the labors of the Committee on Imperial and Local Taxation—a body which was appointed a year ago, and whose report is expected in the course of the coming autumn. . . . Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have informed his political friends that the Government intend to remain in office until July, 1914, but in some quarters it is believed that a general election may occur even before the present year is out. The Prime Minister claims that twenty years back he was associated with Lord Haldane, Sir Edward Grey, and others in a movement for securing to local authorities part of the value of land due to the enterprise, expenditure, and energy of the com-

munity. Practically that was the policy embodied in the famous Budget of 1909. In May, 1911, more than 170 Radical and Labor members memorialized the Government in favor of a development of that policy. They formed a deputation to the Premier and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and represented that the separate valuation of land would provide a foundation for giving the people a more equitable distribution of the burdens of the state, and would open up the land to those who could make the best use of it. Both Ministers expressed their sympathy with the views of the deputation. Mr. Lloyd George especially admitted the urgency of the problem, but pointed out that it must obviously be considered in connection with the readjustment of Imperial and local taxation which was then engaging attention, and suggested that some members of the deputation should lay their opinions before the Committee which the Cabinet had brought into being. That advice, it is understood, has recently been acted upon. Mr. Asquith declared the question to be of great importance, both in its urban and its rural aspect, and for the moment he thought the rural aspect the more urgent of the two. So matters went on until the end of November, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer hastened down to Bath and attended the annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation. He . . . indulged in this significant declaration:

What is the most urgent need of Britain today? It is the regeneration of rural Britain, and you will not do that without a complete reform of the land laws. What is happening now? You have got millions of robust citizens driven by the present system from the healthy environment of the soil to the allurements of our great cities. Hundreds and thousands, if not millions, pass into other lands. I am not surprised. When the just rewards of labor are given to those that labor not, and where those who do toil are requited with wretched wages and still more wretched houses, you will not keep the laborer on the land.

There is no reason why the new policy of the Cabinet should not be settled immediately after the Taxation Committee have reported. Since the election of Mr. Hemmerde for North-West Norfolk communications have passed between the Government and the Radical land-taxers, and there is every prospect of land reform being a prominent feature in the Radical programme at the next general election.

Another opposition London paper, the Express, of June 28, confirms the Telegraph's prognostications:

When Mr. Lloyd George under his "great" Budget of 1909 undertook a valuation of all the land in England, the "Express" predicted that the valuation would be used for the purpose of land nationalization, and not, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his henchmen declared, merely for the purposes of the comparatively light taxation under that Budget. Developments in the last few days prove the truth of this prophecy. Mr. Lloyd George is preparing for another great attack on the landowners which will make his previous efforts look small. His plan is nothing less than a tremendous scheme of land taxation, based on the Singletax, the economic

heresy promulgated thirty years ago by his American namesake, the late Mr. Henry George. . . . The new Liberal policy was outlined yesterday in the leading article in the "British Weekly," the organ of the advanced Radicals.



The leading article in the British Weekly of June 27 (the paper referred to above as the organ of the advanced Radicals), from which the Express copiously quotes, outlined the anticipated new Liberal program in this way:

There is an unmistakable thrill in the air. We are on the eve of a new departure. . . . Those who have read Mr. Massingham's article in the Daily News on Monday on "A Land Programme: Liberalism and the Laborer," and those who have duly noted the hints given by Mr. Francis Neilson,* M. P., in his constituency on Saturday, those who are trained to watch the newspapers, may have some shrewd idea of a change coming which will make politics again to glow. . . . Liberalism cannot live in torpor. When a Liberal Government confines itself to administration and to piddling action it keeps losing all the while. Assuredly this is not the plight of the Government at the present moment. They are engaged in legislation of a most arduous kind. Their measures of home rule, Welsh disestablishment, and franchise reform give infinite scope for discussion and for opposition. In a manner the fight will be maintained till the end arrives, and maintained with fierceness. But the masses in this country are not troubling their heads over Welsh disestablishment and home rule. . . . The British people have made up their minds that Ireland shall have home rule and that Wales shall have disestablishment. . . . The masses are not vitally affected by the measures now debated, and it is to the awakening of the masses that we must look for another era of Progressive government. We must continue the campaign against wrong. We do not need to leap on any policy that offers, as the horse that will carry us back to power. But what we do need is the honest development of our own party principles. This development must be carried out till it sets free the British people from the yoke of the Tory oligarchy and reinstates them in the possession of their liberties. What can the Government do? They have done much; they have prepared the way for more. They have passed old-age pensions, checked the power of the Lords, secured great and needful reforms in finance, defended free trade in the most effective manner, and last, not least, have passed the insurance act. These were great achievements, and the insurance act was a great conservative measure in which Mr. Lloyd George played the part not of a mere politician, but of a disinterested and highminded statesman. . . . Notwithstanding the mighty work which he has accomplished, we believe that Mr. Lloyd George thinks he has made no more than a beginning. At Marple Mr. Neilson said, after referring to the insurance act, that he did not want only that kind of

*One of the leading Singletaxers in Parliament along with Wedgwood, Hemmerde, Raffan, White, McGhee, Whitley, Outhwaite and others.

legislation. He wanted to go deeper and remove all the causes that made the insurance act necessary. He wanted to deal with the problem of poverty at its source. He wanted the people to have a proper life, proper air, proper houses, and a proper water supply, and opportunities to use the land that God intended for them, and to be individualistic and independent in their existence. The act was not the end, but the beginning. Of that he was assured by Mr. Lloyd George, who had a deeper, a more profound work to do. He was getting impatient, and when he got impatient something happened—and something was going to happen. One or two things had been let slip this week by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Masterman that showed the Government had been going along the lines that he had wished for so long. People were beginning to realize that they were right when they said they had wasted years and years in tinkering, in giving the people palliatives, and what they had to do was to go out and tell the people what their case was, and they would respond. For Liberals and for progressives there is only one way, and that is the way of justice and not of charity. . . . Mr. Massingham, who may very possibly know that he is pushing at an open door, outlines the kind of measure that the times require. Pointing out that Mr. Hemmerde and Mr. Arnold held their seats on a policy of land reform and land taxation, on the abandonment of defense and the substitution of counter-attack, Mr. Massingham affirms that no one can defend the land system, and that when it is assailed the average Tory candidate is as helpless as a beetle on its back. The standard of land reform needs to be raised boldly and definitely. . . . Mr. Massingham makes certain definite suggestions. The laborer wants (1) land, (2) decent house room, (3) better wages, and (4) personal independence. Here we emphasize Mr. Massingham's saying that the farmer must be included. It is by the uniting of the farmer and the laborer that success can be achieved. Any policy that lays additional burdens on the farmer without relieving or assisting him is bound to fail. We would also suggest that the new policy must be a policy not only for the country but for the town; in short, for the nation. We believe that the limitation of the power of the landlord in towns is as important as it is in the country. In a word, the land problem, as Mr. Massingham says, must include all branches of workers, must be based on the transference of the burden of local taxation from improvements to land, and must inaugurate a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital value and of compulsory building. . . . We doubt very much whether any great measure of land reform will accomplish its purpose or stir a conquering enthusiasm without the policy of a minimum wage. We cannot tell how far the Government have gone in preparing a definite programme. It is obvious that problems of the greatest complexity will be raised, and it may well be that facts will have to be collected on a very large scale before a policy can be announced. The success of the Irish land measure and the effect of the small holdings act in Scotland may have to be pondered. Anything like precipitate action must obviously be avoided. To raise high hopes and then to disappoint them is the most fatal of all methods. But the Government

which addresses itself to this great task is equal to its undertaking. We may predict without much fear of error that by autumn the solution of the main problem will be reached, and the chief lines of the new programme settled. It is fairly obvious that while much may be done through the Budget, the greater part will have to be accomplished through special legislation. That legislation cannot be carried to its end in the present Parliament. But whenever it is promulgated the by-elections will mainly turn on it, and the general election will be decided by it. There will still be keen interest in home rule and in Welsh disestablishment on the part of very large classes, and they will be thoroughly debated. But the minds of the masses who have the decision in their hands will be concentrated on the land measure.



Further light on the general situation may be had from the London Times of the 27th, which in its political notes said that—

the new Liberal land policy is being discussed. All that can be said of it at the moment is that it has not assumed definite shape. But there have been pourparlers between the important group of Liberal land-taxers and members of the Government. This group, which includes Sir Albert Spicer, Mr. Neilson, Mr. Morrell, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Raffan, and a number of others, did a good deal of campaigning in North-West Norfolk in support of Mr. Hemmerde, who is at one with them. The memorial presented by the land tax group last year to the Prime Minister in favor of land and taxation reform was signed by 172 Liberal and Labor members. In the forefront of their programme is the proposal to make land values available for public needs, and there have been some recent indications that the Government are inclining to the use of the land valuation for other purposes than those of the Budget of 1909-10.



Following these pronouncements came the London Daily Express of the 29th, with this disclosure of the incipient campaign:

A vigorous campaign in support of the taxation of land values—which is, as the "Express" pointed out yesterday, Mr. Lloyd George's new plan of campaign—is already being carried on throughout the length and breadth of the land, and Unionists will have to bestir themselves to defeat the Chancellor's latest electioneering scheme. A "Land Values League" has been established in many of the great towns, especially in the north, and all these leagues are connected with a "United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values," which has a vigorous headquarters and "press bureau" in Tothill-street Westminster, while the "English League for the Taxation of Land Values," carries on a ceaseless campaign from its office in the Strand. An immense quantity of pamphlet literature, with alluring titles, such as "How to Get Rich Without Working," "The Crime of Poverty," and "Real Land Reform," is being scattered by a special "publication department" of the "English League," in the Strand, and cheap editions of the books of the late Mr. Henry George,

the American inventor of the Singletax scheme, are being placed on the market. There is no doubt that there is a widespread and growing interest in the question, an "Express" representative was told yesterday at the offices of the "English League," "and in addition to the work being done by our own lecturers and members of the League up and down the country, the 'Young Liberal' men are everywhere taking it up. A notable fact is that we do not give, but sell, our literature, and we dispose of hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and large quantities of books. For instance, a fourpenny edition of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty,' in which he expounds the taxation of land values, has been published recently, and the first edition of 10,000 copies is already sold out. A shilling edition of 'Protection or Free Trade?' in which he also discusses land values, has reached a sale of 35,000 copies. The interest in the land values question is so great that Messrs. Dent & Co. have added 'Progress and Poverty' to the Everyman Library, and we hear that they are altogether astonished at the immense demand for it. Last week alone we sold 200 copies of a new shilling book entitled 'Land Values Taxation, in Theory and Practice.' In addition to this we issue a monthly journal called 'Land Values,' which has a large sale." It is clear that Mr. Lloyd George has been "captured" by the land values taxers, and Mr. Frederick Verinder, the secretary of the "English League," makes it clear that it was the land values taxers who were responsible for the land clauses of Mr. Lloyd George's 1909 Budget. They got up a petition urging the Government to "make a beginning with the tax on land values in their next Budget," and the valuation scheme was the result. More recently 168 M.P.s have signed a memorial to the Prime Minister urging the Government to take various steps, including the levying of a Budget tax on all land values. In a pamphlet entitled "Form 14: What Next?" Mr. Verinder gives away the whole Radical game, for he shows that the object of the Budget was not to impose the small land taxes which have yielded such a paltry sum to the Exchequer, but to set up a valuation which can be used for the taxation of the whole of the land of the country. It is likely that Mr. Lloyd George's new campaign will have the support of the bulk of the Socialist party. Such confirmed Socialists as Mr. G. N. Barnes, M. P., and Mr. Ben Riley, a member of the executive of the Independent Labor Party, are among the chief supporters of the "English League." . . . Further light is thrown on the Radical plot against the land by a letter which Mr. William Jones, M.P. for North Carnarvonshire, and one of the Government whips, has written to Mr. R. E. Jones, chairman of the Liberal Association in his constituency. After referring to the franchise bill, home rule, and Welsh disestablishment, Mr. William Jones writes: "It was not for the purposes of child's play that the Parliament Act of 1911 was passed. By means of that act we expect to deal with the land question, leaseholds, the housing problem, and the livelihood of the working classes, so as to foster strength in the weak, to give better hope to the poor and needy, to lighten the cares of life, and to extend liberty and equality on the foundations of justice to the great body of the community."

Mr. R. L. Outhwaite, now a member of Parliament, showed the significance of Mr. Hemmerde's election from North-West Norfolk, and also of his own subsequent election from Hanley, in a leading editorial over his initials in *Land Values* (London) for July, published before his own election, the result of which confirms his inferences. In that editorial Mr. Outhwaite said:

All those Liberals who understand not Liberalism shook their heads when a by-election in North-West Norfolk was announced, and viewed the case as hopeless. But instead of a funeral march a clarion call was sounded, and with new life and vigor the cause went forward to victory. Such was the happy result of Mr. E. G. Hemmerde having secured the nomination. He tossed on one side all the political stock-in-trade of officialism, proclaimed a land value tax crusade to rescue the village from the bondage of monopoly, and called on the tillers of the soil to strike a blow for emancipation. For the first time the English village had the chance to declare itself on the land value tax issue, for the first time the man with the hoe had the opportunity that has been presented to the man of the forge, of the loom, of the mine; and the village has shown greater unanimity than the city, the laborer a keener appreciation, a finer enthusiasm, than his industrial fellows. There is no miracle in this. He who looks over the fence and sees idle acres he may not till, best knows that idle acres mean idle men. No "capitalistic" dust clouds his eyes to prevent him seeing in land monopoly the enemy; he knows the truth, and only waits for it to be proclaimed. And therein lies the pathos of the villagers' plight that this by-election has revealed. To the rural constituency is called the whig, to the village where is kept burning the fire of the old Radicalism, where the old faith in equal rights still lingers, is sent the plutocrat. The peasant is offered the husks; he sits below the salt at the Liberal table and he sits in silence. He has borne his part in victory after victory; lord and squire, parson and Tory farmer have showered their blows on his bare back; they have crucified and recrucified him for his faith, and he has remained true. And when emancipation was in sight, in the days when the Budget of 1909 was being framed by a son of the village, those whom the laborers had made Liberal members of Parliament thwarted his invention to levy a general land values tax, saying that the village would oppose what the town demanded. The North-West Norfolk result is the answer to this chicanery. For the first time in England the village has had a chance to pass judgment on it, and the verdict is unmistakable. Never again will whig opportunists be able to countermine the land-values men who are sapping the foundations of rural land monopoly. This election has made a profound impression in Liberal circles because it came just when calculated to have a maximum effect on future policy. When the ship is on a summer sea following an accustomed course the officers are indisputably in command. But when bearings are lost off a lee-shore and the storm blows, then the captain will heed the seaman who knows how to steer through the shoals. In such case now are those in command of the Liberal Party. The old

ports are closed or are closing, the old political voyages can be made no more, before lies an unknown sea and storm follows upon storm. So this declaration as to how the course shall be steered came when circumstances made for its being heeded, and it has not fallen on deaf ears; the Norfolk villagers lit a beacon when eyes were straining into the night, and it has been seen. The strength of the Land Values Taxation programme lies in the fact that it satisfies demands, the overlooking of any one of which would bring disaster at the polls. As North-West Norfolk has shown, it offers the only hope of shaking Toryism in its rural citadels. It provides a potent remedy for the disease made manifest by labor unrest, and so links up the town and rural worker in a common cause. At the same time it offers a measure of relief to the tradesmen and manufacturers to whom the insurance act is the last straw in the imposition of burdens at the hands of a Government to whom they looked for a lightening of the load. Finally, only by way of the Land Value Taxation philosophy can the Liberal Party be indoctrinated anew with Liberalism, and this is perhaps the crying need of the moment. The rank and file of the party are tired of having to wait for Cabinet pronouncements to know the faith they are expected to hold. They do not see salvation in being housed and planned by Mr. John Burns, nor do they think that a cozy corner in a Sydney Webb labor compound will satisfy unrest; they do not want to toll under the jurisdiction of Mr. Snowden's Compulsory Arbitration Court, nor have their names entered in a State Stud Book so that they may get a ticket of leave to marry from Mr. McKenna, counter-signed by some professor of eugenics, as proposed in the Bill for the Care of the Feeble-minded. Liberals do not want a Blue Book for a Bible, but do demand that in the sphere of economics there shall be enforced the mandate: Thou shalt not steal. When it is proclaimed that once again Liberalism stands for economic freedom, and that the straight road to emancipation is to be taken, an irresistible army will rally, and happily there will be missing those who, full of time-serving years and purchased honors, now retard advance. North-West Norfolk has shown that in that day the villager will play his part, and for the first time Liberal victory will mean fulfilment of his hopes, the dawn of liberty, the breaking down of the barriers that stand between him and the long-promised land.



Prohibition Party Convention.

Nearly 1,000 delegates attended the national convention of the Prohibition party of the United States, which opened at Atlantic City, N. J., on the 10th. The platform, adopted on the 11th, demands "a political party which will administer the government from the standpoint that the alcoholic drink traffic is a crime and not a business," and favors—

the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; Presidential terms of six years and one term only; uniform marriage and divorce laws; extermination of polygamy and suppression of the traffic in girls; suffrage for women upon

the same terms as to men; court review as to post-office decisions; protection of the rights of labor without impairment of the rights of capital; settlement of all international disputes by arbitration; Initiative and Referendum; tariff to be fixed on the basis of accurate knowledge secured by a permanent omni-partisan tariff commission; elastic currency system adequate to industrial needs; abolition of child labor; equitable graduated income and inheritance taxes; conservation of mineral and forest preserves; clearly defined laws for the regulation and control of corporations transacting an interstate business; greater efficiency and economy in Government service.

Eugene W. Chafin of Arizona and Aaron S. Watkins of Ohio, the candidates of four years ago, were nominated on the 12th for President and Vice-President of the United States, respectively. [See vol. xiv., p. 1268.]



Republican Revolt in Iowa.

Extraordinary action was taken by the Republican State convention of Iowa on the 10th, in its session at Des Moines, by the adoption of a State platform reported by the committee on resolutions, which contained the following plank:

The Republicans of Iowa believe in the rule of the people. We believe that the popular will, when fairly expressed in convention or primary, should be faithfully observed. Grave and serious abuses of the convention and caucus system of nominating our national candidates have brought the party to a condition in which great numbers of our loyal adherents question the integrity of the nominations made by our national convention. However, we urge upon every Republican to stand loyally by all of the party nominations made in the State, in districts and in counties, leaving to his individual conscience the controversy over the national nominations.

A minority report omitting the above plank and endorsing the national platform and candidates was urgently pressed by Governor Carroll, but was defeated by 773 to 342.



The Unseating of Lorimer.

William Lorimer's election as Senator of the United States from Illinois was decided on the 13th by the United States Senate to have been invalid, and his seat declared vacant from the beginning. [See current volume, page 492.]



After a long deadlock in the legislature of Illinois on the choice of a Senator, Mr. Lorimer (Republican) was elected May 26, 1909, by 55 Republican and 53 Democratic votes. Senator Hopkins, whose term had expired and who had been nominated as his own successor by the Republican voters at the primaries, was thereby dis-

placed, although the legislature was strongly Republican in political complexion. Charges of bribery brought about an investigation through a special committee of the United States Senate (of which Senator Burrows of Michigan was chairman), and a majority of this committee, including its chairman, reported in favor of Lorimer's retaining his seat. A minority report took the ground that, irrespective of Mr. Lorimer's own connivance (of which there does not appear to have been any proof), the fact that there was corruption in connection with the election invalidated his election. In the Senate the majority report was sustained by 46 to 40, March 1, 1911. But two months later the Illinois Senate, by 39 to 10, charged that the election had been secured by bribery, and thereupon the United States Senate, June 1, 1911, voted unanimously for a new investigation. This investigation was conducted by the standing committee on privileges and elections, which decided, March 28, 1912, by 5 to 3, that in the absence of proof of his own culpability, Mr. Lorimer was entitled to the seat. But the minority report was adopted. It is as follows:

Resolved, That corrupt methods and practices were employed in the election of William Lorimer to the Senate of the United States from the State of Illinois and that his election was therefore invalid.

Mr. Lorimer had spoken two days in his own behalf on the floor of the Senate, and when the vote was taken on the 13th the resolution prepared by the minority of the committee, carried by 55 to 28. As eight Senators were paired and two were absent without pairing, the full record would be 59 for the resolution and 32 against it, Mr. Lorimer not voting. The majority against Lorimer included 26 Republicans and 33 Democrats; in favor of Lorimer there were 23 Republicans and 9 Democrats. Of the Senators who voted against him when the Senate had decided in his favor, Senator Jones (Republican) of Washington was the only one to vote in his favor on the 13th, and of those who had voted in his favor on the former occasion, the following voted against him on the latter: Senators Cullom (Illinois), Briggs (New Jersey), Curtis (Kansas), Simmons (North Carolina) and Watson (West Virginia), the first three being Republicans and the last two Democrats.

National Educational Association.

E. T. Fairchild of Kansas, the choice of the progressive element in the National Educational Association, was elected president of the association at the fiftieth annual convention which was held last week at Chicago. [See vol. xiv., pp. 659, 678, 948, and current volume, page 227.]

At this convention the progressives gained complete control of the affairs of the association, after three successive victories—that which resulted in the election as president of Ella Flagg Young at Boston two years ago, that in which Mr. Pearse, the retiring president, was elected at San Francisco last year, and that of the present year. Not only did the progressives win official control of the organization, but they secured also the adoption of amendments to its constitution, designed to make the association effective as an organization of teachers.

Proportional Representation.

A conference of members of the American Proportional Representation League was held at the summer home of C. G. Hoag, Tamworth, N. H., July 3 to 6, at which there were in attendance ex-Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, Robert Tyson of Toronto, William Hoag of Boston, Fiske Warren of Harvard (Mass.), Prof. Karl Schmidt of Tufts College and C. G. Hoag. The last was made secretary-treasurer for the United States, Mr. Tyson, however, remaining in that office for Canada. In describing the progress of the reform Mr. Hoag stated he had found that the proportional system gives satisfaction to the several cantons of Switzerland which use it for the election of their legislative assemblies, and that it is likely to be adopted for Federal elections in the near future. The Minister of Education for South Africa, Mr. F. S. Malan, was enthusiastic in praise of the Hare system as applied to the election of the South African Senate and the City Councils of Johannesburg and Pretoria. Count Goblet d'Alviella, a Senator and leading Liberal of Belgium, said that there was a strong movement in that country to extend proportional representation to elections in which it is not now used, and that, so far as already applied, the system gives general satisfaction. In France, proportional representation is the chief political issue, and the present Government has staked its existence upon its support of the reform. In Great Britain, such men as Lord Courtney of Penwith and Mr. J. H. Humphreys—who were most active in securing the adoption of a proportional system for South Africa—confidently expect that the same system will be adopted for the election of the Parliament of Ireland when home rule is established.

Regarding the application of proportional representation to the government of American cities, the Tamworth conference favored vesting the entire control of municipal government in a one-chamber council, to be elected at large by proportional representation, the vote of each elector to be effective for the election of only one member. The appointment and removal of all purely executive or administrative officers would be left to the council.

Two elephants is a crowd.—Baltimore Sun.

NEWS NOTES

—Royalist incursions, crossing the frontiers from Spain, are again harassing the Republican government of Portugal. [See current volume, page 132.]

—A cyclonic windstorm sweeping over Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan on the 13th wrought great damage and produced loss of life in all three States.

—The fifth North American Congress of Esperanto opened at Boston on the 9th. Nearly every section of the United States was represented. [See vol. xiii, pp. 805, 823.]

—The lower house of Congress passed the Clayton contempt bill on the 11th by 232 to 18. The measure provides trial by jury for those accused of indirect contempt of a Federal court.

—The Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin has called the first National Newspaper conference, to be held in Madison July 29th to August 1st inclusive. [See current volume, page 397.]

—At the annual meeting of the National Municipal League on the 9th in Los Angeles, William Dudley Foulke was re-elected president and Clinton Rogers Woodruff, secretary. [See current volume, page 470.]

—The City Council of Chicago on the 8th, at the instance of Alderman Healy, ordered an investigation of the taxing system. The committee on taxation, of which Alderman Healy is chairman, will conduct the inquiry.

—At the Presidential elections in the Republic of Panama on the 14th the Porras party won out, insuring the election by the electoral assemblies on August 30 of Dr. Belisario Porras. [See current volume, page 443.]

—By 222 to 1 the lower house of Congress on the 11th adopted the articles of impeachment presented by the judiciary committee against Robert W. Archbald as a judge of the Commerce Court. [See current volume, page 611.]

—At the reorganization meeting of the Democratic National Committee held at Chicago on the 15th, W. S. McCombs of New York, the personal choice of Woodrow Wilson, was elected as chairman to succeed Norman E. Mack. [See current volume, page 656.]

—General Huerta, commander of the Mexican Federal forces, has issued a proclamation conceding amnesty to all of the Orozco insurrectionists surrendering within 30 days. Pascual Orozco, Jr., declares that none of the revolutionists of good faith will accept amnesty. [See current volume, page 659.]

—"Cloudbursts" creating devastating floods occurred at Alton, Ill., at Denver, Colo., and in the State of Guanajuata, Mexico, on the 14th. At Alton four persons were drowned. The loss of property at Denver is put at \$1,000,000. Two cities were swept away in Mexico, and crops in a district of more than 10,000 square miles were destroyed.

—Thirteen persons were crushed and burned to death in the early morning of the 14th, near Western Springs, Ill., when the Omaha Fast Mail crashed into

the rear of the Denver Overland Limited, on the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, during a heavy fog. Both trains were headed for Chicago, and the Limited had stopped to cool a "hot box."

—Ex-Senator James W. Bucklin of Grand Junction, Colorado, has resigned as city attorney in order to devote the remainder of his life to the promotion of the Grand Junction plan of city government and the Singletax movement, his law partner, Henry Tuffer, taking his place as City Attorney. [See vol. xii, pp. 612, 1088, 1092; vol. xiii, p. 1065; vol. xiv, p. 1167.]

—A statue of Rollo, the Viking chieftain, was unveiled in the park at Fargo, North Dakota, on the 12th, in connection with the 11th biennial Saengerfest of the Norwegian Singers of America and the Sons and Daughters of Norway. The statue is a replica of one that was unveiled June 5, 1911, at Rouen, France, and is a present from Rouen to America.

—The General Staff of the army has arranged for a spectacular war game to come off during August. Twenty thousand men, including regular troops and national guardsmen, will fight a theoretical battle, the object of one army being to capture New York City. Aeroplanes will be put in active service and every other modern appliance used on the field of battle will be employed.

—An official call was issued on the 9th for the twenty-third session of the trans-Mississippi Congress to be held at Salt Lake City, Utah, from August 27th to 30th. The Governor of each State may appoint 20 delegates, mayors of cities 2 for each 5,000 population up to 10, and commercial and industrial organizations 1 for each 50 members, with a maximum of 10. [See vol. xiv, p. 1172.]

—The Democratic convention of Wisconsin, in session at Milwaukee on the 12th, nominated A. J. Schmitz and J. C. Karel as candidates for Governor at the primaries to be held in September. There is a demand in the platform for amending the State income tax law and submitting the amendment to referendum. This plank was secured by the Schmitz faction over the opposition of the Karel faction which advocated repeal of the law.

—A general strike began at Zurich, Switzerland, on the 14th as a protest against the admission to Switzerland of foreign workmen of doubtful character. Street cars were stopped by strikers lying across the rails; stores in the principal streets were closed as the strikers began to smash windows, and there were volleys of stones. The local authorities called out four battalions to check the disturbances and asked the Federal authorities to allow a battery of artillery which was passing through the city to remain.

—A petition for an amendment to the Colorado Constitution to protect commission government from the State Supreme Court was filed with 25,000 signers on the 5th. The petition is the work of citizens of Grand Junction, Colorado Springs and Pueblo. They fear that the attitude of the Supreme Court towards Denver may imperil their charters. The proposed amendment would legalize the cities that already have commission government, and make it possible for other cities to obtain it without fear

that the results of their fight for reform may be set aside by the courts.

—The United States is quarantining against bubonic plague from Porto Rico, Cuba, and certain other West Indian localities. Seventy men and four officers are fighting the plague in Porto Rico, and twenty-five men and five officers are guarding the exits from the island. Rats, which with their fleas are regarded as the plague carriers, are being systematically exterminated at all United States ports. [See current volume, pages 611, 659.]

—A contract between the South Park Commissioners and the Illinois Central Railroad, for adjusting property interests on the Lake Shore at Chicago, was approved by Judge Honore on the 10th as having duly conserved the rights and interests of the public and as being "in all respects a fair, equitable and reasonable agreement." The city took no part in the proceeding, and Judge Honore denied an application for an appeal. [See current volume, pages 133, 555.]

—The track and field section of the Olympic games at Stockholm closed on the 13th with the following standing for the athletes from the different nations: United States, 85; Finland, 27; Sweden, 24; Great Britain, 14; Canada, 7; South Africa, 5 (including the winning of the "Marathon" race); France, 4; Germany, 4; Greece, 4; Norway, 2; Hungary and Italy, each 1. An American Indian, James Thorpe, of the Carlisle Indian school, proved himself easily the greatest all-round athlete of the world in the Decathlon, which provided a variety of tests of speed, strength and quickness. There will be three weeks more of sporting events, including military riding, rowing and yachting. [See current volume, page 659.]

—Petitions signed by 11,000 voters have been filed with the Secretary of State of Maine, invoking the referendum on a ballot law passed by the legislature last April in special session. This makes the third successful attempt to invoke the referendum since the Direct Legislation amendment was adopted by Maine in 1908. In both of the former cases, the obnoxious act of the legislature was annulled. The act attacked in the present instance was passed for the alleged purpose of correcting defects in the election laws which came to light during a close contest over the repeal of the prohibitory amendment to the Constitution last September. This act was denounced by the Republican State convention last Spring, and the State committee was instructed to resort to the referendum; so the necessary signatures were procured through the Republican party organization—the first partisan attempt to invoke the Maine referendum. The act was passed by a Democratic legislature.

—Wholesale atrocities in the rubber industry in the Putumayo district in Peru, committed by native agents of a British rubber company against the Indian inhabitants, were given official publicity by the British foreign office on the 12th, through their issuance of reports to that office made by Sir Roger Casement, British Consul-general at Rio Janeiro, who more than two years ago was deputed by the British government to investigate rumored outrages. On the basis of the first Casement reports the governments of Great Britain and the United States

made active representations to the Peruvian government, urging reform of the abuses in the rubber district. Repeated demands having had practically no result, public sentiment throughout the world is appealed to by the publication of the Casement reports. The charges include slavery, torture and murder. According to the dispatches the returns show that the 1,200 tons of rubber collected in twelve years produced from \$5,000,000 to \$7,500,000, and entailed the death of 30,000 Indians whose bones are scattered through the forest and have made places resemble battlefields.

PRESS OPINIONS

The Forward Movement in British Politics.

Pall Mall Gazette (Unionist) June 28.—Mr. Lloyd George is preparing for a gambler's throw to re-establish his position in his party. We sketched his ideas in outline yesterday, and the "Daily Express" today has a very useful review of the sources from which they are drawn. The new policy is, in fact, a development of the Singletax proposal of Mr. Henry George, the American writer, which suggested the extinction of rent by taxing the landlord up to the full value of his land. . . . The whole thing is a party move, of course—a "little liver pill" to remove the torpor from which Liberalism is beginning to suffer. But Unionists must do more than meet the new movement with shouts of execration and cries of "Thief!" If Unionist candidates when tackled on the land question are "as helpless as a beetle on its back," the fault is their own. They have an infinitely better chance to become familiar with the intricacies of the land question than their opponents, and far more to gain from a solution on the basis of a wider distribution of ownership. In this matter we must be fearless and not too tender of the interests of mere wealth. An estate in land is a form of property which has special duties not to be divorced from its rights, and these duties consist, in the main, of a recognition of the rights of others. The merciless exploitation of the needs of leaseholders in towns and the denial of access to the land for the humbler classes in the country are real wrongs. The Unionist Party must set itself to think out and proclaim a drastic, but practical and equitable policy of land reform.



London Daily News (progressive Liberal), June 28.—The time for tinkering, as the "British Weekly" said yesterday, has gone by, and those who bear in mind the interview we published last month with Mr. Lloyd George and what has been said and written on the subject since, will be assured that when the Government next addresses itself to the question of the land, it will do so in earnest. We have two main reforms to achieve. Town housing has to be put on a basis on which slums will be a source, not of profit but of loss to the owner. Rural housing has to be so developed that it can neither be throttled by the land monopoly nor permanently prohibited by the fact that, as a pure investment,

cottages can seldom be made to pay. A reform of taxation in the direction which we have long advocated and Liberalism is clearly moving will meet the first difficulty. The second can only be surmounted either by a subsidy in aid of building or by such an advance in the wage of farm laborers as will enable them to pay a remunerative rent. The Government has for the time being rejected the first alternative. At the same moment the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said enough to make it clear that his sympathies are actively concerned with the other. His sympathies have a trick of being swiftly translated into action. Such a policy will sweep the country.



Chicago Tribune, July 14. (Cable Letter by T. P. O'Connor, M. P.)—The Tories, already stunned by the loss of their power in the House of Lords by Lloyd George's taxation on their land, and now by the abolition of the plural voter, are receiving a further shock by the clear announcement that the Liberals will put a large scheme of land reform before the constituencies in the next election. This announcement when, two weeks ago, it seemed to be inaugurated under the auspices of the leaders of the Henry George Singletax disciples in England, created last week considerable alarm among the moderate Liberals, but Premier Asquith, by quietly disclaiming all Singletax doctrines but at the same time approving the land reform program, has united the Liberals again and further affrighted the Tories.



The (London) Nation (Lib.), June 8.—The North-West Norfolk election is remarkable because, as we have said, for the second time in recent politics, Tory criticism of Radical Government was successfully met by a counter attack on the whole Conservative position. Mr. Hemmerde fought on the land question, which, be it remembered, has only thrice been raised by a responsible British statesman during the last generation—by Mr. Chamberlain at the election of 1885, by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at the Albert Hall in 1905, and by Mr. Lloyd George in 1909. On each occasion it has swept the field.



The (London) Nation (Lib.), June 29.—The Holmfirth election repeats, with a difference, the moral of the Liberal success in North-West Norfolk. Mr. Arnold, the successful candidate, fought on Mr. Hemmerde's policy of the taxation of land values, and a thorough policy of land reform, as well as on a retrenchment of armaments. Thus he was able to hold his own against two opponents—a Tory attacking the Insurance Act, and a strong local Labor member making play over the miners' discontent with the Minimum Wage Act. It was inevitable that he should lose votes to the miners' candidate, but it is clear that he lost very few indeed to the Conservative. The latter only secured 3,379 votes against 7,944 (4,749 to Mr. Arnold and 3,195 to Mr. Lunn) divided between the two Progressive candidates. This shows that Toryism without a policy, or with Protection as one, is still a hopeless proposi-

tion with the British electorate. And Liberalism again has its clear lead.



(London) Land Values, July.—In the Daily News and Leader of 24th June Mr. H. W. Massingham urges upon the Government and Liberals generally what he conceives to be the "lessons" of North-West Norfolk and Holmfirth. After writing nearly a column of more or less interesting journalistic matter he says: "What is clear is that the land program should include all branches of workers, that it should be based on the transference of the burden of local taxation from improvements to land, and that a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital valuation and of compulsory building must be inaugurated. With it must go, as an indispensable condition, the raising of the flag of the minimum wage." This is how we are helped by our friends. Those who made the issues both at North-West Norfolk and at Holmfirth will want to know what justification Mr. Massingham has for including in the land programme upon which the campaign was fought "a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital valuation, compulsory building, and the raising of the flag of the minimum wage." It is absolutely gratuitous. If anything was made clear at those elections it was that the rating and taxation of land values was demanded by the electorate as the road upon which the Government should go forward, instead of embarking on fancy schemes of land purchase, or forcing local authorities to build houses, or attempting to make men free by instituting an arbitrary "minimum wage." Yet Mr. Massingham favors the policy that has been so emphatically condemned, and actually presents it as a part of the approved "land programme." He encourages others to take advantage of the enthusiasm for the taxation of land values in order that something else may be introduced that will have a directly opposite effect. The taxation of land values is advocated as a means to break down land monopoly, to cheapen land, to remove the rates and taxes that burden industry, and to raise wages by giving access to land to those who will use it. But the lavish expenditure of public money for land purchase and house building will only increase the weight of taxation, raise the value of land, and strengthen the powers of monopoly. The two policies will not mix; they are mutually hostile and destructive. There is, we know, a Tory land reform school among Liberals who try to make this compromise, but they are up against a fast growing public opinion that will inevitably denounce and reject them as the enemies of reform.



Bryan.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (dem. Dem.) July 2.—When Bryan went to Baltimore nearly everybody thought that he would be the deadlock nominee. Bryan was conscious of what was in the popular mind. If he had put service of self above service of principle, his effort at Baltimore would have been to draw the Eastern element in the party to his support. But he opened fire on the representatives

of privilege at his first opportunity and has since fired broadside after broadside into them. His course won him the implacable enmity of the forces assailed and ruined his prospects of becoming the deadlock nominee. His course is refutation of the lie that he is self-seeking. As between serving principle and serving self he chose to serve the former. The man who does that is never anything but a patriot and it is always the lot of such men to be assailed by those whose judgment is warped by prejudice.



The Spokane Spokesman-Review (Rep.)—"It is hard," Mr. Bryan declared at the close of the Democratic convention, "to part with those who go from you, and it takes time to become acquainted with those who come to you." A note of sincerity rings through these words. It receives corroboration from the course of Mr. Bryan during the convention.



La Follette's (ind. Rep.), July 13.—Bryan at Baltimore, foregoing all chance of his own nomination, marshalling all his forces, braving Tammany and the trusts to rescue his party from their domination, carrying the convention for the adoption of the most progressive Democratic platform yet offered, and the nomination of the most progressive Democratic candidate available, was a towering figure of moral power and patriotic devotion to civic righteousness.



Sacramento Bee (ind.), July 6.—Bryan's breadth and generosity have been nobly shown in his kindly mention of Champ Clark since the latter's denunciation of him. Despite that extreme and most unjust provocation, Bryan has written of the Speaker as "universally beloved," and has declared Clark's defeat was no reflection upon his official record or his general merits. Despite the calumniators, there never has been good reason to suspect Bryan of bad faith toward Clark, or of scheming to gain for himself the nomination at Baltimore. His bold, aggressive course in the convention exalted him in the estimation of all patriotic and progressive citizens, but yet strengthened the antagonism of politicians and interests that might have been placated by a different course. In fact, if it be assumed that the great Nebraskan cherished a secret hope of the Presidential nomination, although in no sense a candidate, it is to his lasting honor that he was willing, for the sake of his principles and the cause of the people, to lay that personal ambition upon the altar of sacrifice. His fight against the choice of Parker for the temporary chairmanship, his fearless challenge to the Ryans, the Morgans, the Belmonts and the Murphys, his victory in inducing the convention to declare for Progressive nominations, made him the hero of the occasion and the redeemer of his party.



San Francisco Star (dem. Dem.), July 6.—When the Baltimore convention selected Governor Woodrow Wilson as Democracy's standard-bearer, it not only vindicated the fearless course, for a great

cause, of the peerless Bryan, but named the next President of the United States. . . . Roosevelt was "de-lighted," and so was Taft; and so were Wall Street and Lombard Street, with the program adopted by Ryan, Belmont, Hearst, Murphy, et al. They, "with all hell following," gloated over Parker's defeat of Bryan, and tolled the bells at what they supposed was his funeral. As subsequent events proved, it was their own funeral. Bryan "came back" the next day, while the band played "Annie Laurie," and thenceforth, to the very end, he was the acknowledged leader and guiding spirit of the Convention. He could not be cajoled, nor flattered, nor betrayed, by the enemy. He defied all threats and resisted all blandishments. He did not deny the charge that he was working to secure the Presidential nomination for himself—a charge made by scheming cowards who never did, never will, and never can understand the true greatness of his character. He simply rammed and jammed the lie down their throats by doing the very things no man would have thought of doing if he only wished to gratify vaulting ambition. For instance, the famous resolution, which will become historical, denouncing by name, and in their presence, the arch-conspirators who pose as Democrats, and all members of the "Privilege-hunting and favor-seeking class," was not calculated to give Bryan a two-thirds vote for President in a convention which had failed to give him a majority for temporary chairman! No, it was meant to make the Democratic Convention democratic. And it did so. When Bryan styled the New York delegation, Murphy's "ninety wax figures," or puppets moved about by Wall Street wires; and when he withdrew his support from Champ Clark because the latter and most of his friends in the convention had been too "yielding" to the corrupt combination there, did this in Bryan "seem ambition"? . . . If Champ Clark had not made William Randolph Hearst his chief adviser, we do not believe he would have been so non-committal when asked on which side he stood as to Parker for temporary chairman. One blast from his bugle-horn would have prevented Parker's selection, and made Clark the Democratic nominee for President. . . . Wilson's greatest asset when he entered the convention, was the fact that he had come out strongly against Parker for temporary chairman. That, with the splendid record he has made as an uncompromising Progressive during the past few years, together with Bryan's support and Hearst's vicious opposition, made him the Democratic nominee for President, to which high office we confidently believe he will be elected in November next.



G. O. P.'s new meaning: Goodbye, Old Party.—New York World.



The recall of bolts is one of the principles that can be judiciously considered at this juncture.—Pittsburgh Dispatch.



The Nebraskan orator makes an "O.K." rubber stamp come pretty near doing the work of a steam roller.—Washington Star.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE VISION.

For The Public.

I dreamed within a world where all was ordered,—
Suns rose and blazed and set,—as on our earth:
And yet it was a world whose confines bordered
The plains of dearth.

There ever, even when the day dawned clearly,
And when the heavens were azure, did there fall
Athwart the light, impalpably yet drearily,
A thickening pall.

Cold were the winter winds, icily fingering
The wayfarer in highroad, field, and mart:
Yet colder was the fear of want, and lingering,
That froze the heart.

And summer heat exacted in its fashion
From indigent and weak a fiery toll:
Yet fiercer was the heat of lust and passion
That seared the soul.

Men swarmed in cities and in market places,
And ceaselessly they bartered, sold, and bought;
But always with a blankness in their faces,
That stifled thought.

In sanctuaries echoed psalms and psalters;
With formal lips they prayed for daily bread;
But gifts heaped in profusion on those altars,
Reeked of the dead.

With quickened sight I watched black figures shifting,
Entrenched in every citadel of fame;
And sometimes when a veil between was lifting,
Consuming flame.

Then, as I dreamed, the air was rent asunder.
Unto the universe a dread decree
Was voiced, like to a mighty trumpet's thunder,
Deep as the sea:

"Hear thou the doom of God! Thy days are numbered:
Soon shall they pass as an extinguished beam."
While round me man in dense oblivion slumbered,
I dreamed a dream.

GERTRUDE COLLES.



LITTLE TALES OF FELLOW TRAVELERS.

No. 7. The Story of John and Mary.
For The Public.

He was a very plain old farmer, with a pleasant-voiced wife. They lived by a creek in California; several families of Indians lived in huts about a mile away up in the foothills. The Indian men could not find much to do, except a little sheep-

shearing. Perhaps they did not try very hard; perhaps the Mexicans with whom they worked often had too much cheap wine. But the Indian women went all over the valley, washing clothes for white people; they went about in hungry little groups—several women, five or six children of various sizes, two or three babies tied in willow baskets, and twelve or fifteen dogs. Some of the people would not feed any of them excepting the woman who actually did the washing; some cast food at them unwillingly. This plain farmer brought out sharp hoes and kept all hands busy a while in the garden, leading them himself and talking cheerfully with them until they had earned their dinners. Even the children were thus somewhat taught to pull weeds and to pile wood.

Then the rich rancher who had a title-deed to many thousands of pastoral and agricultural acres, including the worthless rock-pile on which these "beggars of Indians" lived, grew tired of seeing them around; he told them to clear out. The five or six families came to this plain farmer, who needs no name at present. He had been a dependable sort of a neighbor for them. They slowly told him their trouble.

"Where he poor Indian go? Who want poor Indian?" They did not blame the rich rancher; his action, though hard on them, seemed entirely natural.

The plain farmer sat down on the ground in their midst. The little children came to his knee. The mothers, drawing their red and yellow shawls around their faces, fixed solemn and unfathomable eyes upon him. In a group by themselves sat the stolid men. The farmer talked to the elders in very simple language, which they understood and believed. The men drank too much wine; sometimes were lazy. Too many dogs, besides. The men had better pick one man to make bargains about work; the women could do the same way about washing. Not good plan to take such a big lot of people around to the houses.

"That true scold," said one old man.

The plain farmer showed them a small and islanded piece of sandy land in a creek bottom, perhaps an acre in extent. "That grow corn, beans, potatoes. You cut willow, make brush fence. You hoe my field; buy that old barn, ten dollar; pull him down; make you lot of 'wickiups'." He indicated with his hands the sort of pointed huts or wigwams which the Indians called "wickiups," and liked to live in.

"How long Indian stay there?" asked one of the men. Rose a low murmur of assent.

"As long as I live," said the farmer. "I not rich man; no can give you. Law no let me give him to Indian. Mebbe some time different law. You can buy him some time, perhaps."

"Dat bully," said an old Indian, and the rest of them nodded gravely.

Then the farmer sent his team and moved their

worldly possessions: one two-horse load for all which was owned by half a dozen families, most of it merely the cast-off clothing and abandoned utensils of the Americans.

The farmer used to go down to the Indian settlement and visit with them, picking up a few of their words, urging them to send the children to school. His wife gave medicine to the sick babies. Some of the neighbors laughed, and said that they were liable to catch some sort of contagious disease from those low-down Indians. One man spoke to the farmer's wife, saying that, though she meant well, she was foolish; if one of the Indian babies died they would say she poisoned it, and might do something dreadful. "It isn't at all safe," he declared.

The farmer had a way of speaking to or about his Indian neighbors in exactly the same tone that he used when he addressed the wealthiest rancher in that whole valley. In fact, he stopped that same big land owner one afternoon as he drove past.

"Jack," he said, "I wish you would get this medicine for Wawa's little girl, and have the druggist charge it to me."

"Who in thunder is Wawa?"

"Why, that nice Indian woman that limps a little. It's her sister that does washing for your wife, you know; it's her younger brother that you set the dogs on last year because he was in your cherry trees."

The big rancher drove off, laughing, laughed half way to the village, told everyone that the farmer had gone daft about those Indians; but he got the medicine, and even drove up to the farmhouse with it.

However, he told the farmer's wife when she thanked him: "Why do you do so much of this, anyhow?"

"Because I like all of them," she answered. "I think those Indian women are really better than I should be, brought up under the same conditions."

"You like them?" he asked. "Just the same as white folks?"

"And why not?" she replied.

"Because—because—they are nothing but Indians," he said. "They don't care a darn for you, except for what you give them." And so he drove off.

A few weeks later the farmer's son was very ill, and word went around that he was likely to die. The servant came in to say that all the Indians were outside the garden fence, so the farmer went out to see what they wanted. There they sat on the ground, in silent rows, men, women and children.

"What can I do for you?" he asked.

"No'tin, 'tall," said one. "We wait. Hope he boy get well. You all same Indian man. You wife

all same Indian woman. You boy all same Indian boy."

All night long the Indians waited, sleeping on the ground by the fence, till at sunrise the father and mother came to thank them, and to say that now the white man doctor pronounced their son out of danger. Then the men and women, rising, spoke as with one accord, calling the farmer and his wife by their first names—a thing which they had never before done.

"Dat ver' good, John," one said. "Bye, John! Bye, Mary!" And so they went back to get breakfast in their wickiups.

The plain farmer, who came in some degree from Quaker stock, turned to his wife and fell very easily into the Quaker speech.

"Mary," he said, "now thee can better understand William Penn and his Indian neighbors. They will call us Mary and John as long as we travel together through life. Thee and me belong to their family now. So does our little John. But no one else will ever hear them use our first names in public. They have too much native dignity for that."

"You can have all the wind-fall apples in my orchard," said the farmer to the Indians one morning. A few weeks later, passing the huts, he heard the sound of blows; an Indian woman was whipping a boy: "No more you shake John's apple tree, make apple fall. Dat all same big cheat."

"How gentle and sweet-tempered they are," said the farmer's wife to her husband one night. "They tell me about all sorts of curious and interesting stories and traditions; they ask me very hard questions, too. The last one today was this: 'What for white man no use all he land?'"

"I tried to explain that. They came right back at me: 'What for he law no say if white man leave good land sheep-field, no plow, no use, he no can have?'"

"By George!" exclaimed the farmer, "that would have pleased the Prophet of San Francisco!"

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.



THE LIBERAL FORWARD POLICY

Explanation, Through the London Daily Express of
June 29, 1912, of the Basis of the New
Issue in British Politics.

From several sources more or less inspired comes the information that the Government is formulating a radical policy of land reform on the lines of the taxation of land values, to be put before the people in the near future. In view of this, interest is naturally aroused as to what is exactly the principle of the taxation of land values and what its advocates claim would be the result of the application of the principle.

By "land values" we mean the values which

most plots of land have, apart from any structure or improvements in or on them. In other words, land value denotes the unimproved value of land itself, as distinguished from any additional value due to the expenditure of labor or capital upon it.

Land values arise from the universal need of mankind to make use of the free gifts of nature—the land and the stores which it contains. They vary according to the natural advantages attaching to different pieces of land, and according to the need and ability of the population to make use of these advantages.

To be more precise: the unimproved value of any plot of land—whether urban or agricultural, whether it has minerals or stone beneath it, or water on it—depends first on the degree of its superiority to the worst land in use, and, secondly, on the numbers, energy and ability of the community.

It is unjust that unimproved value of land, which is created by the community and required for public uses, should be appropriated by private individuals. From this injustice numerous evils flow, which would disappear if taxation were levied according to the unimproved value of the land.

Public revenues have now to be raised by taxes and rates on the processes, products and earnings of industry. The result of such taxation is that industry is hampered, earnings are diminished and the commodities are made scarcer and dearer.

For example, the present local rates, so far as they are levied on the value of buildings, restrict the supply of buildings and increase their cost. Under the present rating system the use of land is taxed; but land, however valuable it may be, if it is not used, is not taxed. The result is that landholders often find it advantageous to withhold land from uses to which it could be put with advantage to the community. The development of fresh districts and the full utilization of the old, which are matters of vital importance to a growing population, are thus delayed and prevented.

In particular, the present rating system, which exempts valuable land from taxation if it is vacant, and imposes heavy burdens on new premises as soon as they are occupied, is the chief cause of the prevalent lack of house-room, with its attendant evils of overcrowding and high rents. In general, while taxation is not levied according to land value, landholders are enabled to set up a kind of land monopoly, which hinders the normal development of the community; the price to be paid for the use of land of all kinds is artificially inflated; a powerful privilege class is created whose principal interest is to secure the largest possible profit at the expense of the rest of the community; the natural opportunities for labor and production are restricted, and earnings, in spite of all increase in productive power, tend to remain at the bare subsistence level.

If we taxed land according to its unimproved value, the natural outlets for industry would be more freely available to labor and capital. Landholders would no longer be encouraged to keep back some land from use and enabled to exact inflated prices for other land. The production of wealth—of buildings and all other material commodities—would be stimulated.

If urban and suburban land were taxed on its true unimproved value, irrespective of the use to which it happens to be put or not to be put, the iron girdle of land monopoly which now confines every large town and industrial center, every village and hamlet, would be broken through, and we should have more and cheaper dwelling houses, shops, offices, warehouses and factories. If rural land were taxed on its true unimproved value, greater facilities would be granted to cultivators, allotments and small holdings would be more numerous, and the land would be used in ways more advantageous to the workers.

If mineral and stone-bearing lands were taxed on their true unimproved value, whether they happened to be worked or not, mining industry would be stimulated and its products cheapened. A further stimulus would be given industry by the concurrent remission of the taxes and rates which are now levied in the processes and products of industry.

As land comes to be more fully used and the restrictions and penalties on industry are removed, wages will correspondingly tend to find their level as the fair and full return for exertions. When fair conditions prevail, labor will freely and naturally be applied to land so as to yield the greatest total produce, and that total produce will be divided in just proportions between rent and wages.

When the landowner's monopoly power is destroyed by the taxation of land values we shall have free bargaining, which will produce just contracts, without any need for the State to regulate the terms on which we may live and work.

BOOKS

THE SINGLETAX EXPOSED.

Single Tax a Fallacy. By E. B. Silvers. A Refutation of the Theory of Single Taxation as Announced by Henry George. Special low price edition. Price, 50 cents. Convention Publishing Co., Kansas City, Missouri. 1912.

Mr. E. B. Silvers has had the misfortune to write a book. "Oh! that mine enemy would write a book!" said a great man of antiquity.

In this book, Mr. Silvers elaborates the strange idea that taxation originated in the proposition that each citizen ought to contribute equally to the support of the government; in other words,

that the people joined themselves into a government as they would join an improvement association or club, and, therefore, each one contributed his share to its support.

This is a pleasant dream, but it has no foundation in fact. History tells us a very different story about taxation originating in conquest, and being established by the sword.

The "farmers of the revenue" were the earliest tax gatherers. The right to tax a province was sold to the one who offered the most for it, and then this "farmer of the revenue" would descend on the helpless province and make as much as he could out of it.

They would have laughed at the idea of voluntary contribution. If anyone was suspected of having hidden property, they would torture him until he paid up.

This system of "farmers of the revenue" was general until the French Revolution, and has survived up to the present day in Turkey, Persia and China.

Mr. Silvers' assertion that the intention was to tax the individual citizen, and not to tax property, is absurd in the extreme. The very opposite is demonstrated by every page of history. A great French statesman said that the science of taxation consisted in getting as many feathers from the geese as possible without making them squawk.

Mr. Silvers asserts that the poll tax is the fundamental unit of our tax system. He seems to be blissfully unaware that the poll or head tax was originally levied against the feudal lord, according to the number of serfs he had under him, just the same as he was taxed so much a head on the number of cattle, sheep, hogs or other domestic animals he possessed.

Originally, therefore, the head tax was a just tax, for it was paid by the feudal lord himself because he was profiting by the labor of the serfs under his control.

The poll tax, therefore, far from being the ideal foundation of our tax system, as Mr. Silvers asserts, is a relic of barbarism and a survival of the dark ages. For this reason it has long ago been abolished by every civilized nation on the earth. It survives here and there locally, but the only principal nations of the earth wherein the poll tax is still levied to any extent are Russia, China, Turkey, Persia and the United States. In the United States it has been abolished in all but twenty States, and the twenty States that still have it are our most backward and least progressive States.

Mr. Silvers begins his book by saying that he does not claim to be a theoretical political economist, and he demonstrates it in his book by contradicting himself over and over again.

On page seven he says that the Mohammedan

may as well dispute the Koran, the Christian the Bible, as for the Singletaxer to renounce "Progress and Poverty" by Henry George. Then on page 100 he says that many persons who claim to be Singletaxers renounce Henry George's works on the subject.

On page ninety, Mr. Silvers says: "Increase the taxes on the lot and you increase the ground rent." He repeats this four times on page ninety, four times on page ninety-four, and again on page ninety-five. Yet, on page seventy-nine, he had said that the Singletax would destroy all land values. Now, these two opposite statements cannot both be true. But at the top of this same page seventy-nine Mr. Silvers says that any increased tax would compel a corresponding rise in market rent.

When we find any statement in this book that we do not agree with, all we have to do is to read a little farther to find it contradicted by the author himself. We may then quote Silvers against Silvers. On many pages he says that the Singletax would be equivalent to public ownership of all land; but reading farther we find him saying that it would cause ownership of all land to be concentrated in the hands of a few very rich private individuals.

After telling us that it will ruin all our farmers and make farming unprofitable, we find him, on page ninety-three, saying that the market price of the farmers' products would be greatly increased. He had better not preach that out in the country districts of Missouri, or he will have the farmers tumbling over each other to vote for the taxation amendments to the Missouri Constitution.

One may not be surprised, therefore, to find him saying that the Singletax will prevent land from being put to its best use, in spite of the fact that the greatest improvements on land are made by lessees of ground—lessees who pay all the taxes and all the ground rent besides; in other words, who pay the full economic rent.

Mr. Silvers says that the general property tax system which we have in Missouri is the proper and just system, in spite of the fact that most civilized nations have abolished this system of taxation. Even China has joined the other civilized nations in abolishing the general property tax.

Finally, Mr. Silvers says that land has an intrinsic value one thousand miles from the nearest habitation because a man could make a living on it by his own labor. In this statement he confuses utility value and value in exchange, or price. Let him try to sell that land to anybody else and he would find that it had no exchangeable value whatever—no price that he could realize for it—and it would continue to have no exchangeable value until settlers began to crowd around it and

all the free land of equal quality was occupied. Then it would begin to have a selling price, and that selling price would steadily increase as population became more dense and pressed more and more on the means of subsistence. This selling price of land measures accurately the economic advantage of the owner over the landless people around him. It also measures accurately the value conferred on the land by the pressure of population. The user of the land will not be able to raise any more bushels of wheat or corn or produce on the land selling for \$100 an acre than he did when it was worth nothing, and he will continue to raise just as much on it when this selling price has been decreased to a certain extent by taxation—in other words, when a part of this value which has been conferred on the land by the pressure of population has been transferred to the State to be used for the benefit of all the people who have created it.

Mr. Silvers says on page forty-three "that every recipient of the benefits of the government should pay therefor in proportion to his ability to pay and the material benefits he receives."

These two propositions of taxation are contrary in principle and mutually destructive and irreconcilable.

To pay in proportion to benefits received is the basis of the Singletax and is the principle embodied in the amendments proposed to the Missouri Constitution.

But to pay in proportion to ability is unknown as a taxation principle outside of the ransom collected by robber chiefs from the friends of the captives.

The only readable passages in the book are the extensive yet garbled extracts from Henry George.

W. P. HILL.



LAND VALUE TAXATION.

Outlines of Lectures on the Taxation of Land Values.

An Explanation with Illustrative Charts, Notes and Answers to Typical Questions, of the Land Labor and Fiscal Reform Advocated by Henry George. By Louis F. Post. Published by The Public, Ellsworth Building, Chicago. 1912. Price, 30 cents.

I am much pleased to see this fourth edition of Post's *Lectures on the Single Tax*, revised and finely printed, at so popular a price. "Progress and Poverty" is a text book and a condensed text book, adapted best to studious minds; but these lectures are not only clear, but they take up, as old John Swinton said, "first things first."

Anyone who has assimilated the illustrations about the origin and character of bread, used as a simple sample of Wealth, has a "straight edge" to which he may refer all questions of Capital as opposed to Labor or Wages.

Having to answer questions constantly, especi-

ally in public, I have, ever since the first edition came out, gone over "Answers to Typical Questions" at least once a year for my own benefit. They are one product of a three years' lecture trip of Mr. Post, where each new question and the answer was preserved for further consideration. Mr. Post's admirable practice was to ask, "Is that answer satisfactory?" and answers that appeared most generally sufficient were afterward discussed, combined, condensed and substantially adopted.

Anyone who knows those answers will be delivered from the temptation to gain a cheap triumph by "putting down" an enquirer with a smart but inconclusive reply.

BOLTON HALL.

PERIODICALS

The American.

Senator La Follette concludes in the American for July his instructive as well as brilliant story of his own life in American politics. He climaxes with Dolliver the awakened, Taft the putty ball, and Al-drich the architect—of his own fortune.



Everybody's.

C. P. Connolly closes in the July Everybody's his suggestive series of articles on "Big Business and the Bench." One of the effects of this work of his has been a good deal of "smoking-out." Another is a better understanding of some of the reasons why so much is said and done to hedge about the bench with superstitious confidence. That judges are men, to be judged by the use they make of their ermine and not by the fact that they wear it, is a valuable lesson to learn.

The Sad Truth.

Arthur Young in Puck of June 26. Reproduced in The Public by courteous permission of the Editor of Puck.



Investigator—"But surely your children are already old enough to work?"
Coal-Miner's Wife—"No. Their faces deceive you. They have already worked enough to become old."

If the Weather Man is on a vacation, he'd better come home; if he isn't, he better take one.—Inter Ocean.



An Indianapolis public school teacher some time ago received in her room a small boy from the Ken-

tucky-Tennessee borderland, and she set about teaching him the intricacies of addition. She found he could run up or down a column of figures readily, but she could not make him understand how to "carry" from one column to another when the total was more than nine.

Finally the teacher called on one of the little girls

SINGLE TAX and ECONOMIC LITERATURE
 Books of all Publishers. Write for Lists.
 H. H. TIMBY, Ashtabula, Ohio. Box 227

THE CHICAGO SINGLETAX CLUB
 Meets every Friday at 8:00 p. m., at 508 Schiller Building
 July 19, H. W. McFARLANE, "A Rational Money System."
 All are welcome. Ladies invited. Discussion. Literature for sale.
 James B. Ellery, Sec.

IMMORTALITY CERTAIN
 Swedenborg's great work on the life after death, 400 pages, 15 cents, postpaid. Stamps taken.
 PASTOR LANDEBERGER, Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

IDEAL STOCK AND FRUIT FARMS
 In Taney Co., Missouri, 3 miles from railroad at Hollister, where stock winters on the range. No sheep diseases; herders realize 100%; plowing begins in February; 440 acres, 60 cultivated, 160 fenced for pasture; frame house, barn, smoke and spring house; 1500 fruit trees, partly bearing; well watered; valuable timber; productive soil; price \$15 per acre. Also 160 acres, unimproved, at \$5.00. Also 280 acres, timbered, 2 miles from railroad at Pine Top, \$15 per acre.
 J. E. BURBANK, 4 Parker St., Malden, Mass.

When You Select a Shorthand School .
 be sure that it teaches
BENN PITMAN PHONOGRAPHY
 The Standard Shorthand of America. Written by more than half the Government employees. Taught in the best schools. Briefest, most legible, most easily mastered.
 Published by the Phonographic Institute Company,
 Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Benn Pitman, Founder. Jerome B. Howard, President.

POST'S
Illustrative Charts
 The fourth edition of Post's Chart Lectures on the Singletax, rearranged and enlarged, under the title of
OUTLINES OF LECTURES ON THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES
 is now ready for delivery, postpaid, at the price per copy of **Thirty Cents**; twelve copies for **\$3.00**. Address
THE PUBLIC
 Ellsworth Bldg. CHICAGO

The Presidential Campaign months will be the opportunity to catch the attention of people who are vaguely progressive—and nothing more.

Tens of thousands of voters are beginning to realize that, as there is certainly a cause for most things, there might possibly be just a diminutive chance that there is a reason for social mal-adjustments.

They can see plainly enough that monopolies and special privileges are unjust and that huge trusts are very liable to become dangerous. The state of their bank accounts has by now about convinced them that Protection hasn't made them rich.

In fact they are ready for some solution that is sane and constructive—that will appeal to their reason. And we want to make it easy for our propagandist readers to reach these people with The Public. The Public will give special attention to the Presidential Campaign and we are making a special rate for Campaign subscriptions.

THIS IS WHAT ONE DOLLAR (\$1) WILL DO

During the month of August, \$1.00 will pay for eight subscriptions from the first issue after receipt of the names to the issue giving the election results.

Note that to lists of names received after the first week in August, we cannot send the number (or numbers) missed. Here's a case where the early bird does really catch more worms!

Single subscriptions from the first issue in August to the issue giving the election results will be accepted at 20c.

Stanley Bowmar, Manager.

in the class and told her she would give her a dime if she could make the newcomer understand the process. Next day the little girl called to claim the money.

"How did you make him see it so quickly?" inquired the teacher.

"Oh, I told him when he got a number of two figures to put down the one on the right and tote the other across, and he knew what I meant right away."—Indianapolis News.



The President and the ex-President each wished the nomination; each has got one. Everybody ought

FREE LITERATURE ON FREE ECONOMIC SUBJECTS

If interested write for FREE ECONOMIC LITERATURE, pertaining to Direct Legislation, Public Ownership or Single Tax. Please state in which subject you are especially interested, and mention The Public.

F. H. MONROE, President

HENRY GEORGE LECTURE ASSOCIATION, 536 S. Dearborn St., Chicago

The Public

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

Terms of Subscription.

Yearly	\$1.00
Half yearly50
Quarterly25
Single Copies05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 or more.

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

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

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one, stating with what issue the change is to take effect.

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 furnished on application.

Advertisements bring grist to the publisher's mill. Please mention The Public when you write to our advertisers.

to be happy, and the Democrats are.—Philadelphia Record.



"Have you a lawyer, Mose," asked the court.

"No, sah."

"Well, to be perfectly fair, I'll appoint a couple. Mr. Jones and Mr. Brown will act as counsel."

"What's dat?"

"Act as your lawyers—consult with them and prepare to tell me whether you are guilty or not guilty."

"Yes, sah."

Mose talked to his lawyers for a few moments in husky whispers. The judge caught only the several

In India

the women still go down to the river banks and wash clothes by rubbing them over stones.

They are unprogressive. But they are no farther behind the times than the American women who still boil clothes and hard-rub on a washboard. The women of India don't weaken their clothes by boiling, at least.

The truly modern way of washing is the Fels-Naptha way. No boiling to weaken the fibre; no hard-rubbing to wear and tear.

Following directions on the red and green wrapper.

times repeated word alibi. Then Mose arose, scratched his head and addressed the court.

"Jedge, yoh honah," he said, "cou'se I'se only an ign'ant niggah, an' Ah don' want toh bothah yoh honah, but Ah would suttinly like toh trade yoh honah one ob dese yeah lawyahs foh a witness."—Kansas City Journal.



There is often a marked difference between a good business man, and a good business man.—Puck.

Louis F. Post's Books

Ethics of Democracy

By Louis F. Post. A series of optimistic essays on the natural laws of human society.

In rich blue cloth, with portrait of the author, postpaid (originally sold at \$2.00) . . . \$1.25

SUBJECTS: The Democratic Optimist; Individual Life; Business Life; Economic Tendencies; Politico-Economic Principles; Democratic Government; Patriotism; The Great Order of Things.

Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce

By Louis F. Post. A discussion of marriage and divorce with reference to rational moral principle.

In blue cloth, postpaid (originally sold at \$1.00)75

CONTENTS: Marriage; Eternality of Marriage; Polygamy, Polyandry, and "Free Love"; Successive Marriages; Marriage Ceremonials; Divorce; Marriage after Divorce; The Sanctity of Marriage.

Social Service

By Louis F. Post. Concrete business applications of principle.

In blue cloth, postpaid (originally sold at \$1.00)75

In blue paper, postpaid.40

A monversonation on the laws of human relationship, including competition and equality of freedom, and culminating in the great law of Mutual Social Service.

The Taxation of Land Values

By Louis F. Post. Fourth edition of chart lectures on the Singletax, rearranged and enlarged.

In stiff red paper covers; charts printed in colors; postpaid30

SUBJECTS: Taxation Methods; Land Value Taxation as a Tax Reform; Land Value Taxation as an Industrial Reform; Answers to Typical Questions.

The Open and the Closed Shop

By Louis F. Post.

In grey paper covers, postpaid.05

CONTENTS: Open Shop and Closed Shop Compared; The Closed Shop and the Jobless Man; Origin and Significance of the Jobless Man; Abolishing the Jobless Man by making the Earth an Open Shop.

THE PUBLIC'S BOOK DEPARTMENT
Ellsworth Bldg. Chicago

The Tariff Question

Those who want the tariff question to be understood by the voters of this country have now an opportunity to do effective propaganda work with a minimum expenditure.

They can get for the bare cost of printing any number of copies from one to one thousand of what is probably the greatest work ever written on the subject,

Henry George's

"Protection or Free Trade."

This work—a masterpiece of logical reasoning—has been reprinted from the Congressional Record. Each copy is in a franked envelope, ready for mailing.

The regular price of

"Protection or Free Trade,"

in paper covers, is 30 cents postpaid, but these Congressional Record copies (the remailing of which will cost you nothing since they are in franked envelopes) can be had at the rate of

Two Copies for Five Cents, or
Forty Copies for One Dollar

One million copies are ready for distribution.

Stamps or currency accepted.

The Joseph Fels Fund Commission

Cincinnati

Ohio