

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 STEPPENS, 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, JUNE 28, 1912.

No. 743.

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

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

EDITORIAL

Presidential Nominations.

The nomination of Mr. Taft at Chicago makes the nomination of Mr. Bryan at Baltimore a party necessity. Whether Mr. Bryan wishes it (as his enemies cynically say) or does not wish it (as he says himself and as we believe), Mr. Bryan must be nominated at Baltimore or the Democratic party will in all probability be defeated. This was manifest at the close of the Republican convention. It became a demonstration with the election of Parker as temporary chairman of the Democratic convention. The Democratic party cannot win under the Ryan-Sullivan-Taggart-Murphy trade-mark, and Bryan is probably now the only man whose nomination can save it from irretrievable disaster.

As an alternative, consider Speaker Clark first. We are not in sympathy with much that has been urged against Mr. Clark. He would make a better President, we are well inclined to believe, than most Progressives of either party seem to think. But he would not make a strong candidate; and from the point of view of party necessity, strength of candidacy is as important as competency for the office.

The only special strength that Mr. Clark could bring into the campaign is Mr. Hearst's support; and the price in public professions of gratitude which he has already had to pay for this,

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Presidential Nominations	601
Charities and Taxation.....	603
Tax Reform in Missouri.....	603
The Singletax Program (R. Bedichek).....	605

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Republican Presidential Nominations.....	607
Third Party Possibilities.....	607
The Democratic National Convention.....	608
The New Hampshire Constitutional Convention.....	609
The Labor Contempt Case.....	610
Progressive Charities	610
Tom L. Johnson's Memorial.....	611
Organized Real Estate Exchanges.....	611
Financing the Republic of China.....	611
News Notes	611
Press Opinions	612

RELATED THINGS:

Bryan! Bryan!! (Royd Eastwood Morrison).....	613
Found Something Going On (Ed Howe).....	613
Land Values Taxation in the City (Frederic C. Howe)	613
Taxing Land Values—Can the Tax Be Passed On? (Henry George)	614
Enter, Babe of Nations! (Paul May).....	616
Poverty and the Singletax (Louis F. Post).....	617

BOOKS:

Our Store-House	620
An Ecclesiastical Nazarene.....	621

CARTOON:

Flying Time (J. W. Donahey).....	621
----------------------------------	-----

has even now hardened against him vastly more strength than Mr. Hearst's influence can possibly attract. As the campaign goes on, the Hearst affiliation would be a growing burden to Mr. Clark. Democratic voters of the progressive variety would not find it easy to face the obtrusive fact that Clark's most conspicuous lieutenant in 1912 is a man who boasts that he defeated Bryan and elected Taft in 1908.



The best that may be said for Mr. Clark's availability as the Democratic candidate is that he, more surely than any one but Mr. Bryan—even more so than Bryan, in some quarters—can carry the party vote of the Democratic party. But he can draw no strength at all from the progressives of the Republican party—not if they have anywhere else to go; and if the Democrats nominate Clark against Taft, the Republican progressives will have somewhere else to go.



As another alternative to Bryan, consider Governor Wilson. Next to Bryan, Governor Wilson is apparently the strongest candidate the Democrats could name. He could not indeed carry as large a proportion as Clark could of the strict Democratic party vote. For this there are plain reasons. His conversion to Progressive policies is so manifestly genuine that the reactionary elements which first brought him into politics are against him to the last man and unalterably; his conversion is so recent that old-time Democratic progressives look upon it with suspicion; his unmasked contempt for the palaver and the venom of the Hearst papers arouses characteristic antagonisms from that source. But no candidate will be elected this year by the strict Democratic party vote. Neither will any candidate be elected by Hearst's support, although Hearst's methods of opposition may be conceded to be dangerous. Nor yet will any candidate be elected by old time Democratic progressives. If a Democratic candidate is elected President this year it will be chiefly, if not altogether, by the vote of those Progressives of both parties who, like Governor Wilson, are recent converts. It is this kind of support that makes Governor Wilson a stronger candidate than Speaker Clark.



But William J. Bryan would be stronger than either Wilson or Clark. He would be stronger than Clark, because he could carry not only the Democratic party vote in bulk, but also the Progressive vote of both parties. He would be stronger

than Wilson, because he could carry not only the Progressive vote of both parties, but also the bulk of the Democratic party vote.



Thus far our suggestions regarding the nomination of Bryan by the Democratic convention as a party necessity would apply regardless of the action of the Republican convention in choosing Taft instead of Roosevelt. They would apply with possibly greater force if Roosevelt were the Republican nominee. The only Democrat who could have defeated Roosevelt would have been Bryan; and we do not say this because we like to, but because the facts force it. But a moment's reflection will make it clear, we think, that Bryan's nomination is necessitated by Taft's. Not merely because Taft is the nominee, as would have been the case with Roosevelt the nominee, but because the circumstances of Taft's nomination make a third party inevitable *unless the Democrats take away its reason for being*. The inevitableness of the third party under those circumstances must be clear to every political observer. It may not be so clear that with a third party springing spontaneously out of the Republican convention at this crisis, any Democratic candidate except Bryan would be defeated, but to us this seems highly probable.



Consider it a moment without partisan or factional or personal bias. Mr. Taft personifies reaction to every Progressive of either party. The Progressive sentiment in the Republican party is so overwhelming that Mr. Taft's supporters were driven to devices shamelessly fraudulent in order to secure him a bare majority in the national convention. Of the minority, 344 sat in the convention on nomination roll call, but refused to vote. Immediately after the convention a conference of a clear majority of the uncontested delegates met and offered a third party nomination to ex-President Roosevelt. He responded with the advice that they meet at a later day in formal convention, promising to accept the nomination of that convention if tendered, but upon condition that the convention act with freedom and with the understanding that if it chooses another instead of himself he will support the other in the campaign as vigorously as if he were himself the nominee. What does all this signify? It does *not* signify—and this is the crucial point for consideration at Baltimore—it does not signify that the Democratic party can nominate a weak candidate and elect him.

What it probably does signify is that if the Democrats nominate a candidate whom the Republican progressives could not accept, the two principal parties will be split into three. And would the Democratic candidate consequently slip in between the fighting Republicans? This is what Mr. Clark's supporters may expect, but it is an expectation in which they are likely to be sadly disappointed if they get to the experiment. Nearly all progressive Republicans regard Mr. Clark as a life-long Democratic-party war-horse, and this makes him repugnant to Republican voters. His Progressivism is not apparent to them. The same feeling prevails largely among Democratic progressives, both of the old-time and of the recent-convert variety. With a large progressive Republican party in the field, therefore, the whole progressive Republican vote and most of the progressive Democratic vote would go to the third party. In those circumstances the chances are great that with Speaker Clark as the Democratic candidate, the election campaign would be a Taft-Roosevelt primary campaign over again before the summer was fairly gone; and that when the votes were counted, there wouldn't be any Democratic party left—at any rate nothing more than a remnant like that of the Whigs in the early fifties. If Governor Wilson were nominated, the situation might be different. In that event the contest would more likely be dual instead of triangular. It is inconceivable that the progressive Republicans would nominate any one against Wilson; for the progressive Republican vote would be almost united for Wilson, if he were the Democratic nominee. He would probably get all of this vote that either Roosevelt or La Follette could, and he would get a large proportion of the Democratic vote besides. But Governor Wilson might be deserted by Democrats, both progressives and those of the neutral or facing-both-ways variety, in sufficient numbers to turn the scale in favor of Taft. If, however, the Democrats nominate Bryan, not only can there be no formidable third party, but there would be no formidable Democratic defection. Political lines would then be sharply drawn between the reactionary Republican party on one side and the progressive Democratic party on the other, and every voter would go to his own place at the election—Reactionaries of both parties to Taft, Progressives of both parties to Bryan. The Democratic party, thus redeemed from the thralldom of the Interests, would thereupon become the party of progress.



Whoever has had opportunity to consider recent

tendencies of public opinion in both parties regarding Presidential candidates, must have been impressed with the current that has set in toward Bryan since the primary campaigning of Roosevelt and Taft. Not only has it become increasingly evident that none of the other Democratic candidates is in all respects equipped as he for titular as well as actual leadership at the present political crisis, but there are overwhelming manifestations on all hands among the rank and file, of a disposition to rally to his unsought, uncoveted and unattempted candidacy.



Charities and Taxation.

One of the proposals of the Charities and Correction Conference on "standards of living and labor," is somewhat wonderfully, not to say fearfully, made. Recognizing, though apparently in a dim and narrow way, that private monopoly of land values is injurious to the poor, this proposal is for the transfer of a greater share of taxes "from dwellings to land held for speculative purposes." The minority proposal, submitted by Benjamin C. Marsh and Dr. Alice Hamilton, which was defeated, went to the vital point more directly and clearly. It recommended "the gradual un-taxing of building and the laying of the tax burden upon the land values." Since the latter form of assault upon the same fundamental wrong was rejected in favor of the other, the proponents of the other ought to explain their *modus operandi* of distinguishing land "held for speculative purposes." If there is any effective way except the taxation of all land *ad valorem*, regardless of the purposes for which it is held, we should like to know it. The only other one we can think of is the confession of the party in interest as to his intentions! But the statement of the majority report is good enough for an abstraction; and for practical purposes with reference to the supporters of charities it may be better than if it were more specific. When you are dealing with the type of privileged person that Tolstoy alluded to in his remark that "the rich are willing to do anything for the poor except get off their backs," to be over-specific is to be under-prudent.



Tax Reform in Missouri.

A report by the committee on municipal finance and taxation of the Civic League of St. Louis, is of general interest and no little value, as indicative of an awakening tendency in professional and business circles with reference to public revenues.

The organization itself is conservative, and the two committee members who prepared the report—F. N. Judson, the nationally distinguished lawyer, and Professor Young of the Washington University at St. Louis—are very far from being reckless radicals. A report on taxation prepared by such men and promulgated from such sources could hardly be expected to make the blood leap in the veins of enthusiastic disciples of Henry George, and there is no probability of its having that effect. But its pronounced recognition of the merits of the Singletax as far as its authors see it clearly, and the halting spirit in which they question the other claims for it, make this report none the less significant as a tribute to the soundness of that reform.



The report has to do specifically with pending amendments to the Constitution of Missouri,* and especially with the one proposing the gradual application of the Singletax in that State. It describes the amendment in these clear and concise terms:

Bonds issued by the State or by its municipalities or other local units are to be exempted from taxation at once. . . . All other forms of personal property, tangible as well as intangible, are to be exempted in 1914, at which time poll taxes, the merchants' and manufacturers' tax, and business licenses of all kinds (except those imposed under the police rather than the taxing power) also are to be swept away. In the case of real property a differentiation is made between land and improvements on land. So far as improvements are concerned, the tax is to be reduced gradually, being levied on three-fourths of the assessed value in 1914 and 1915; on one-half of the assessed value in 1916 and 1917; on one-fourth the assessed value in 1918 and 1919, while thereafter improvements of all kinds are to be exempt. The real reduction would, however, be much less gradual, because improvements to the extent of \$3,000 on each homestead are to be exempt, beginning in 1914. After the year 1919, accordingly, land would remain as the sole object of taxation, except that public utility franchises are also to be taxed, and that it is further provided that the amendment "shall not be construed as limiting or denying the power of the State to tax any form of franchise, privilege or inheritance."



In commendation of that Amendment the Civic League's report argues that it—has the great merit of doing away with an antiquated, cumbersome, and inequitable system of taxation. The general property tax has been thoroughly discredited by the experience of Missouri and of almost every other State in the Union. The

*See *Publics* of October 6, 1911, page 1030, and Mar. 29 last, page 293.

business license tax is a departure from every sound principle of taxation, is grossly discriminatory, and has no defenders among competent students of taxation. The poll tax is obviously unjust and has already disappeared from the statute books of many American States. The deficiencies of the general property tax are well known. In principle it runs counter to the obvious fact that different kinds of property differ in their ability to bear taxes; in practice it leads to gross discrimination between localities and between individuals, to evasions, fraud and perjury, on the part of taxpayers, and, consequently, to lax standards in the tax administration. . . . Considered on its own merits, and apart from the defects of the present system, the proposed Singletax has certain positive advantages. Its simplicity counts in its favor. It can be efficiently and honestly administered. Its greatest merit, and one that can hardly be overestimated, is that it would effectively remove the sources of all but universal tax evasion, which is not only a school of perjury, demoralizing to our people, but is also a breeder of class hostility; and the moral gain in the removal of these sources of evil cannot be questioned.



Passing from those frankly admitted advantages of the Singletax, this Civic League report refers to others, of which however it cautiously remarks that they "stand possibly on a less secure footing than the ones already mentioned." The most important of these the report bases on the fact that—land unlike other forms of property, is not a product of human industry, but is given by nature. Taxes on land would not diminish its amount. Taxes on other forms of property must, in the nature of the case, exercise a repressive effect on industry. To remove taxes on the products of human industry would, it is urged, stimulate industry, increase the employment of labor and the demand for capital, and lead to the growth of the State in population and wealth. This argument, if sound, is, of course, weighty; but without denying it any validity, it may be submitted that the matter is not quite so simple as it may appear.

Whereupon the report condenses several conventional objections, which, however, it offsets with a confession that nevertheless it is easily possible "that an immediate and temporary effect of the introduction of the Singletax would be an increase in building operations." Proceeding then to a justification of the "unearned increment" tax of Germany and Great Britain rather than the tax proposed for Missouri, the report lingers longingly upon the general property tax which, if it *only* could be fairly enforced would be much better than "a system based on an alleged communal interest in a particular kind of property." The report thereupon advises that—

the Singletax on land and franchise values, proposed in the first of the two amendments to the State Constitution submitted by the Equitable Tax-

ation League, is, on purely fiscal grounds, preferable to our existing tax system in that it is simpler and that it can be more efficiently and more equitably administered.



No better tribute to the Singletax could be paid than this, by business interests that might be expected to avoid it if they could, fearing its democratic effects in industrialism, and from able experts who, though they balk at broad principles of communal readjustment, are forced by the logic of circumstances and their own common sense and sincerity, when confronted with the question practically, into the pathway of those very principles. To the Singletax movement this report should be all the more welcome from the manifest reluctance of its assent to radical Singletax doctrines. It is not a profession, the motives of which might be questioned outside the business circles from which it comes; it is a concession, the good faith of which it would be absurd for any one to question even in the absence of the deserved reputation of its authors for probity and ability.



THE SINGLETAX PROGRAM.

When any man of good intelligence, good conscience, a civic mind, and the courage of them all, begins investigating the Singletax, he is on the road to becoming a convert.

His investigation will sooner or later bring him to these conclusions: (1) That the Singletax is just; (2) that the Singletax is the most efficient, unescapable and easily collected tax that can be devised; (3) that the public income from the Singletax will be sufficient to defray the expense of vast government improvements of great utility, which cannot be attempted under the present system of taxation; and (4) that the Singletax will bring about a great equalization of industrial opportunity.



The first objection that rises in a conscientious mind, and in some minds that may not be so conscientious, is the thought of confiscation.

Here, for example, is our friend, John Smith, who has just bought a \$10,000 lot in our town and paid for it with good money of his own, which he has himself earned. Wouldn't the community steal that money from him if it adopted the Singletax?

The case can be disposed of logically in a manner that will doubtless suggest itself to any one at all conversant with human history, human

law, and the natural laws of human association. Smith's lot never was real wealth; neither Smith nor the fellow he bought of ever produced or owned it; its value does not come from either, but from social growth. It cannot be unjust, then, to deprive him of it. He has never owned what any one can claim just title to.

Any attorney of experience will tell you that stolen property belongs to the owner, no matter how innocent the purchaser was at the time of purchase. If John Smith bought of Bill Brown a \$100 horse which Bill Brown had stolen, any court in the land would restore the horse to its original owner regardless of Smith's loss of his own good \$100 of money. In the same fashion, when the people of one generation discover that their planet has been stolen by an earlier generation and is now held by purchasers, they would be perfectly justified in taking it back, willy nilly. This procedure would be, as Kipling puts it, to—

. . . push the logic of a fact

To its ultimate conclusion in unmitigated act.

The daily confiscation from the community of community values, seems to excite no remonstrance from the ordinary citizen. For instance, a friend who purchased a vacant lot last month sells it today for \$1,000 more than he gave for it. Its site-value had increased \$1,000 in one month. Why? Because of the number of new people who had come into the community. Site-value in this instance depends largely upon the number of people who daily pass by the site. If, for instance, it is worth \$1,000 when five hundred people pass it daily, then it may well be worth double that amount when 1,000 people pass it. (I make no effort to be accurate in figures; I use them merely to illustrate a principle.) Since the community, not the purchaser, has created this value—this increment, this premium—does it not belong to the community and not to the purchaser? Is it not clear that our present laws allow our purchasing friend to confiscate just that much of the community's earnings?

As a community grows, it needs more money to conduct its business; what more natural or equitable, then, than that this increased expense be met by increased premiums for sites, by those ground values which directly result from community growth?



If the Singletax were put into effect all at once, it would certainly work a hardship on our friend John Smith, and on all others of his class; but under our present system daily confiscations occur by those in the class with our other friend, and on

such a stupendous scale as to stagger the imagination.

Let us bear in mind, also, the iniquitous confiscations of the tariff. Mr. Wood is allowed to appropriate about ten of my hard-earned dollars every time I buy a suit of clothes, which ten dollars he uses in oppressing the mill-workers of Lawrence, Mass.

Why, speaking of confiscations, we have a government of confiscation. It is the rock upon which our whole system of taxation at the present time is based. What is the much heralded income tax but confiscation so far as it affects earned incomes?

Besides, the confiscation which the Singletax would work would have compensations in which John Smith would participate. They would come from the abolition of all other taxes, and from the throwing open of all natural resources and prohibiting their monopolization forever.



Thus far I have pursued this line of thought merely to show that if the Singletax had to stand or fall upon the question of whether it should or not be put into full force instantly and without warning, still it would have the justification of reason, still it would meet the demands of the severest logic and morality.

But that is not the method which Singletaxers are advocating at the present time in any place in the world. They are the most sweetly reasonable people on earth. They are not urging revolution, but progression. As the present system has grown up gradually, so let it be abolished gradually, without jar or jolt, without working hardship upon anyone—its great beneficence unfolding as a rose opens, petal by petal.

Singletaxers are working now to secure the permission of legislatures in various States for local option in taxation. That secured, then the community can experiment at will, just as the communities in Canada and the west coast are doing. They begin, not by abolishing all other taxes at one swoop and substituting the Singletax therefor. It is not in their power to do that. You find them increasing taxes on ground values gradually, and proportionately reducing taxes on improvements. This process can be continued and expanded as long as it promotes the general welfare, and be stopped whenever it hurts the general welfare.

It has the obvious advantage of discouraging land speculation, which nearly any well-informed man will concede is a bad thing, and of encour-

aging improvements, which any man, whether informed or not, knows is a good thing. The community that adopts it is at an obvious advantage, then, over the neighboring and competing community which does not adopt it. Sooner or later the competing community realizes this and goes into the Singletax business on its own account. And so the gospel and its practice spreads. The change is gradual, and everybody has ample warning.



Now let us see the position of our friend John Smith, who lives, let us say, in Oklahoma City.

Suppose we get from the Oklahoma legislature a law authorizing local option in taxation. Suppose we agitate the question in Oklahoma City to the point where a majority of the citizens believe in trying the matter out. At that point our friend John Smith, if he is a speculator, may become panicky and sell the vacant lot which he purchased recently, to someone who wishes to erect a building on it. He sees that the city shows signs of rebellion against his business of appropriating community values; so he takes his money and goes to El Reno, which we will suppose is *safe and sane* from the speculator's standpoint. Is Oklahoma City thus driving away productive capital? Not by a jugful. It is banishing capital which is used not in promoting but in *preventing* development. To El Reno, Oklahoma City can say, "Take him and welcome."

As community after community adopts the Singletax in some form or other, pickings for the speculator get leaner and leaner. Let us suppose that a manufacturer is then investigating the comparative merits of Oklahoma City and El Reno as a place to locate a large manufactory. He finds that improvements are taxed in El Reno more heavily than in Oklahoma City; that Oklahoma City instead of allowing speculators to appropriate community wealth takes it herself and uses it to conduct the affairs of the city, to improve streets, to build parks, to strengthen schools and the like. On the other hand, he finds El Reno bearing heavily upon capital productively employed, taxing it for money with which to run the government and allowing the land speculator to make off with local unearned increment. He sees Oklahoma City developing symmetrically and naturally, he finds El Reno distorted in its growth by the pulling and hauling of land speculators. Which of the two cities will he choose for the establishment of his plant?

Isn't it plain that Oklahoma City would have swapped John Smith the speculator, for a man

who desires to invest his money in productive enterprise?



When a sufficient number of communities have pushed the Singletax far enough, testing it step by step, and have found it good, then will be the time to attack the national problem.

But the change will be so gradual, the agitation will be so general, the public conscience will be so aroused against land speculation and landlordism, that most of the speculators will have been driven into using their money in productive enterprises, most of the land monopolists will have released their immense holdings, and those remaining will have had sufficient warning that the people mean to recapture their heritage.

R. BEDICHEK.

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, June 25, 1912.

Republican Presidential Nominations.

At a late hour on the 22nd the national Republican convention nominated President William Howard Taft for President, and Vice-President James Schoolcraft Sherman for Vice-President. [See current volume, page 581.]



After Elihu Root had been chosen as temporary chairman on the 18th, the important procedure of the convention was in the committee on credentials, which did not complete its work until the 22nd. It sustained the national committee's report in every particular and was itself sustained by the convention. Thus the temporary roll was made the permanent roll without a change. Upon the completion of the roll the report of the committee on permanent organization was adopted. It made the temporary officers of the convention the permanent officers. Henry J. Allen of Kansas having then made a statement in behalf of Roosevelt and Roosevelt delegates (the character of which will be given farther on), ex-Vice-President Fairbanks presented the report of the committee on platform, of which he was chairman. Walter C. Owen of Wisconsin presented the La Follette platform as a substitute, but this was promptly laid upon the table. The Fairbanks report was thereupon adopted by roll call vote. When California was called, and Meyer Lissner of the California delegation responded, "California declines

to vote," evoking a storm of applause, Chairman Root announced that the vote of California had been challenged and ordered the roll of the State to be called. This resulted in two votes for the platform (two Taft delegates) but silence from the rest of the delegation. The same question arose later on the vote for Presidential nomination when Massachusetts refused to vote both on call of States and on call of delegates. Chairman Root ordered the alternates to be called, but as only four responded this experiment was not further tried. Wisconsin voted "No" unanimously. The adoption of the platform was by the following vote:

Aye	666
No	53
Present (but not voting).....	343
Absent	16
Majority for adoption.....	254



Immediately upon the adoption of the platform the roll was called for nominations for President. Ohio was the first to respond. Warren G. Harding of that State nominated President Taft. The nomination was seconded by John Wanamaker and Nicholas Murray Butler. Michael B. Olbrich of Wisconsin nominated Senator La Follette, and Robert M. Pollock of North Dakota seconded the nomination. No other nominations were formally made. The voting began at once, 8:23 in the evening of the 22nd, and the result was as follows:

Taft	561
La Follette	41
Hughes	2
Roosevelt	107
Cummins	17
Absent	6
Present (but not voting).....	344
Taft's majority	44

Having nominated Vice-President Sherman for Vice-President, after Governor Deneen of Illinois and Governor Hadley of Missouri had refused to consider the honor, the convention adjourned at 10:30 p. m.



Third Party Possibilities.

Signs of a new party movement were plentiful from the moment when it became evident that all the contested seats would be awarded with a strong hand, by the Taft managers of the Republican convention, to the Taft faction. One of the first important statements definitely along that line came, however, from Governor Johnson on the 22nd. Governor Johnson was then reported as saying:

Developments since the convention opened have convinced me that there will be a new party in the field, headed by Col. Roosevelt, and that party will carry California by 120,000. The principle in-

volved is vital. No one nominated by this convention, with its tainted delegates, can be elected.

This movement began to assume tangible shape when Henry J. Allen of Kansas, prior to the presentation of the platform, read a denunciatory statement by Mr. Roosevelt and in behalf of a majority of the Roosevelt delegates, and followed it with a formal declaration that they could no longer share in responsibility for the convention. Having recited the circumstances that impelled them, Mr. Allen said:

We do not bolt. We merely insist that you, not we, are making the record. And we refuse to be bound by it. We have pleaded with you ten days. We have fought with you for five days for a square deal. We fight no more. We plead no longer. We shall sit in protest and the people who sent us here shall judge us.

The delegates represented by Mr. Allen were understood to be at least the 344 who were present in the convention when the Presidential nomination was made but refused to vote.

Mr. Allen's action in the convention was followed the same evening, the 22nd, by a meeting at Orchestra Hall of what the Chicago Tribune (pro-Roosevelt) of the 23rd describes as "the majority of the uncontested delegates in the Republican national convention." The following statement, offered by Senator Clapp of Minnesota and supported by Governor Johnson of California and Comptroller Prendergast of New York, was adopted:

We, delegates and alternates to the Republican national convention, representing a clear majority of the voters of the Republican party in the nation, and representing a clear majority of delegates and alternates legally elected to the convention, in meeting assembled make the following declaration: We were delegated by a majority of Republican voters of our respective districts and States to nominate Theodore Roosevelt in the Republican national convention as the candidate of our party for President and thereby carry out the will of the voters as expressed at the primaries. We have earnestly and conscientiously striven to execute the commission intrusted to us by the party voters. For five days we have been denied justice in the national convention. This result has been accomplished by the action of the now defunct national committee in placing upon the preliminary roll of the convention, and thereby seating upon the floor of the convention, a sufficient number of fraudulently elected delegates to control the proceedings of the convention. These fraudulent delegates, once seated, have by concerted action with one another put themselves upon the permanent roll, where they constitute an influence sufficient to control the convention and defeat the will of the party as expressed at the primaries. We have exhausted every known means to hold off this conspiracy and to prevent this fraud upon the popular will, but without success. We were sent to this convention bearing the most spe-

cific instructions to place Theodore Roosevelt in nomination as the candidate of our party for President, and we therefore deem it to be our duty to carry out those instructions in the only practical and feasible way remaining open to us. Therefore, be it Resolved, that we, representing the majority of the voters of the Republican party and of the delegates and alternates legally elected to the national Republican convention, in compliance with our instructions from the party voters, hereby nominate Theodore Roosevelt as the candidate of our party for the office of President of the United States; and we call upon him to accept such nomination in compliance with the will of party voters; and be it further Resolved, that a committee be appointed by the chair to forthwith notify Colonel Roosevelt of the action here taken, and request him to appear before us in this hall as soon as convenient.

Mr. Roosevelt appeared accordingly at 11:30 o'clock at night and spoke until 12:25 Sunday morning. In the course of his speech he said:

The time has come when not only all men who believe in Progressive principles, but all men who believe in those elementary maxims of public and private morality which must underlie every form of successful free government should join in one movement. Therefore I ask you to go to your several homes to find out the sentiment of the people at home, and then again to come together, I suggest by mass convention, to nominate for the Presidency a Progressive candidate on a Progressive platform—a candidate and a platform that will enable us to appeal to Northerner and Southerner, Easterner and Westerner, Republican and Democrat alike, in the name of our common American citizenship. If you wish me to make the fight I will make it, even if only one State should support me. The only condition I impose is that you shall feel entirely free when you come together to substitute any other man in my place if you deem it better for the movement, and in such case I will give him my heartiest support. Wherever in any State the Republican party is true to the principles of its founders, and is genuinely the party of justice and of progress, I expect to see it come bodily into the new movement; for the convention that has just sat in this city is in no proper sense of the word a Republican convention at all.

At a subsequent meeting, at which Mr. Roosevelt was not present, held at the Congress Hotel on the 23rd, with Governor Johnson of California presiding, it was unanimously voted, on motion of James R. Garfield of Ohio, that Governor Johnson appoint a provisional committee which, with himself, "shall confer with Col. Roosevelt for the purpose of devising a plan of action for the new organization."

The Democratic National Convention.

The Democratic convention at Baltimore followed close upon the heels of the Republican con-

vention at Chicago. It assembled on the 25th, and instantly the lines between reactionaries and progressives were drawn. [See current volume, page 564.]



When the sub-committee of the national committee met on the 20th at Baltimore to arrange for the temporary organization of the convention, Alton B. Parker (Democratic candidate for President in 1904) was chosen for temporary chairman of the convention by a plurality vote. The news of this action caused William J. Bryan, who was reporting the Republican convention at Chicago for a syndicate of newspapers, to telegraph Speaker Clark, Governor Wilson, Governor Burke (North Dakota), Governor Foss, Governor Baldwin (Connecticut) and Mayor Gaynor, urging them to join him in preventing the election of Parker as "the one Democrat who, among those not candidates for the Presidential nomination, is in the eyes of the public most conspicuously identified with the reactionary element of the party." Governor Wilson's response approved Bryan's purpose, saying that—

the Baltimore convention is to be a convention of Progressives—of men who are progressive in principle and by conviction. It must, if it is not to be put in a wrong light before the country, express its convictions in its organization and in its choice of the men who are to speak for it. You are to be a member of the convention and are entirely within your rights in doing everything within your power to bring that result about. No one will doubt where my sympathies lie and you will, I am sure, find my friends in the convention acting upon a clear conviction and always in the interest of the people's cause. I am happy in the confidence that they need no suggestion from me.

Speaker Clark replied with an appeal for harmony in the party and to that end the avoidance of controversy over every question but platform and candidates. On the 23d, Mr. Bryan, having meanwhile arrived in Baltimore, proposed that Clark and Wilson, as the two leading candidates, agree upon a Progressive as temporary chairman; and Mr. Hudspeth of New Jersey offered in behalf of Governor Wilson to accept Senator James of Kentucky (a supporter of Speaker Clark's candidacy) in order to avoid controversy. The proposals were ignored and on the 24th the outgoing National Committee agreed, by a vote of 31 to 20, to report Parker for temporary chairman. The 20 votes were cast for James. Upon the assembling of the convention at noon the following day, immediately after the nomination of Mr. Parker by the report of the Committee, Mr. Bryan nominated Senator Kern of Indiana in a pointed speech in which he appealed to the delegates to—

let the commencement of this convention be such

that Democrats can raise their heads among their fellows and say: "The Democratic party is unafraid. You can't frighten it with your Ryans or buy it with your Belmonts."

Senator Kern rose immediately upon the conclusion of Bryan's speech and pleading for harmony spoke directly to Parker asking that the two agree upon a chairman and then withdraw. Getting no response he suggested in succession as a compromise Senator O'Gorman of New York, Senator Culberson of Texas, Senator Clayton of Alabama, Senator Lea of Tennessee, Senator Campbell of Ohio, Governor Folk of Missouri and Senator Shively of Indiana. "Will Judge Parker meet me here?" he asked, stretching his hands toward the New York delegation. "Will you join me in a solution?" He paused, and there was no response. Then he called for Judge Parker to come forward, but there was no move. Finding his appeal useless Senator Kern closed with these words:

If this offer of harmony is to be ignored, only one man can take the lead of the hosts of progress. That's the man who has been at the forefront for sixteen years—William Jennings Bryan.

He had nominated Bryan in his own place for the temporary chairmanship and Mr. Bryan accepted. "If none other can be agreed upon," he began, "I will lead the fight myself."



The roll call began at 2:25 and Judge Parker was elected by 579 votes, to 510 for Bryan, 3 for O'Gorman and 1 for Kern. Significant votes with reference to States were—

	Bryan.	Parker.
Georgia	0	28
Illinois	0	58
Indiana	8	21
Iowa	13	13
Kansas	20	0
Massachusetts	18	15
Minnesota	24	0
New Jersey	24	4
New York	0	90
Ohio	19	29
Oklahoma	20	0
Pennsylvania	67	9
Texas	40	0
Wisconsin	26	0



The New Hampshire Constitutional Convention.

Reactionaries controlled the Constitutional Convention of New Hampshire, which adjourned on the 22d. All the important progressive measures were defeated—the Initiative and Referendum, the Recall, legislative freedom in taxation, woman suffrage, the Short Ballot, and home rule for cities. The affirmative vote for the Initiative

and Referendum was 157 and for woman suffrage 149. [See current volume, page 566.]



The Labor Contempt Case.

Daniel Thew Wright, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, delivered on the 24th the decision of that court in the case of Samuel Gompers, Frank Morrison and John Mitchell on charges of contempt in connection with the old Bucks Stove boycott case. His opinion, covering 72 typewritten pages, required two hours to read. It concluded with sentences of one year's imprisonment for Mr. Gompers, nine months' imprisonment for Mr. Mitchell and six months' imprisonment for Mr. Morrison. An appeal has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, which previously reversed a similar decision of the majority of Judge Wright's court. [See vol. xiv, page 1219.]



Progressive Charities.

At the conference of Charities and Correction at Cleveland, in the Section on "Standards of Living and Labor" on the 18th, at which Owen R. Lovejoy, Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Living and Labor, presided, "The Industrial Minimum" was discussed by Paul U. Kellogg, associate editor of "The Survey"; "Wages and Minimum Wage Boards" by Father Ryan of Minneapolis and Rabbi Coffee of Pittsburgh; "Family Budgets" by Margaret F. Byington; "Safety and Health" by John B. Andrews, and "Homes as to Light, Sanitation, Congestion and Home Manufacture" by Benjamin C. Marsh, Secretary of the Congestion Commission of New York. In the discussion of the last topic named above, Mr. Marsh spoke frankly of the impropriety of leaving organized charities under the control of men (he specified several by name) whose property interests or points of view cause them to oppose legislative reforms for removing congestion and promoting sanitation, when those reforms tend to lessen the power of their own monopolies—for instance, the Brooks-Sullivan bill in New York for the gradual reduction of taxes on buildings at the expense of land values. "It does not appear," he said, "that wealthy men who get their money out of the poor and who direct the policy of charities are desirous of removing the underlying causes of poverty when such action would tend to diminish their own incomes. The whole problem of bad housing cannot be bettered until we are willing to strike at the root of the evil by removing the tax on buildings and placing it upon land values." [See current volume, pages 583, 591.]



The same matter came into controversy in the

same Section on the 18th, upon motion to adopt a platform on social standards for industry, which had been prepared by the following committee:

Owen R. Lovejoy (chairman), Mrs. Raymond Robins (vice chairman), Dr. John B. Andrews, Julius Henry Cohen, Dr. Edward T. Devine, Dr. Lee K. Frankel, Hon. John Golden, Miss Pauline Goldmark, Dr. Alice Hamilton, Alexander Johnson, Mrs. Florence Kelley, Paul U. Kellogg, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, Hon. Julian W. Mack, V. Everitt Macy, Benjamin C. Marsh, Mrs. Dexter Otey, Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, Rev. John S. Ryan, Hon. A. T. Stovall, Harry Thomas and Hon. Wm. B. Wilson.

Inasmuch as the constitution of the Conference did not permit official adoption of such a report as this committee made, the session of the Section was suspended and action was taken by the audience simply as citizens. The report as thus adopted recommends:

I. (1) A living wage; (2) minimum wage commissions; (3) wage publicity.

II. (1) An eight-hour day; (2) a six-day week; (3) prohibition of night work for minors, an uninterrupted period of at least eight hours' rest for all women, and minimization of night work for men wherever possible.

III. (1) Investigation of all industries by the Federal government with a view to establishing standards of sanitation and safety and a basis for compensation for injury; (2) prohibition of manufacture or sale of poisons whenever harmless substitutes are possible; (3) regulation of employments according to the degree of hazard; (4) standardized inspection of work places.

IV. (1) Safe and sanitary homes at not more than 20 per cent of the family income. (2) "To protect wage earners from exorbitant rents and to secure for them that increased municipal service demanded by the massing together of people in thickly settled industrial communities, a greater share of taxes to be transferred from dwellings to land held for speculative purposes the value of which is enhanced by the very congestion of these industrial populations." (3) Factory work in factories and not in homes; (4) prohibition of manufacture of articles of commerce in tenement rooms occupied for dwelling purposes; (5) temporary labor colonies and camps to be standardized with reference to over-crowding, ventilation, water supply and sanitation.

V. (1) Prohibition of women's working in trades requiring them to stand constantly, and altogether for a period of at least eight weeks at time of child-birth; (3) intermittent employment to be considered abnormal and subjected to government investigation and regulation; (4) industrial training.

VI. (1) Compensation for accidents; (2) compensation for trade diseases; (3) service pensions or old age insurance; (4) insurance against unemployment.

A minority report on "untaxing buildings and taxing land values," submitted by Benjamin C. Marsh of the Congestion Commission of New York and Dr. Alice Hamilton of Hull House (Chicago), and voted down at the meeting which

adopted the foregoing report of the whole committee, was as follows:

With most of the planks in a living and industrial platform, we are in hearty accord. It may be questioned whether it is the function of this committee to suggest methods by which the high standards may be attained. We believe it to be. It is inevitable that in order to secure fair living and working conditions, unearned incomes or dividends must be reduced. Uniquely is this true of the incomes from land values. Nearly every improvement in living and working conditions tends, under the present system of taxing buildings and industry at the same rate as land values, to be shifted on to the users of buildings and the ultimate consumers of goods produced therein. The enactment of a better tenement house law tends to increase rents, but not the wages of the rent payers. The increase in wages to the Lawrence strikers was largely absorbed by the landlords. Practically the only municipal tax which cannot be shifted on to those unable to bear it, is the tax on land values, which are chiefly created, maintained and increased by community action. This is the just tax, and by stimulating the construction of building will reduce rents by the natural laws of competition. We, therefore, recommend the gradual untaxing of building and the laying of the tax burden upon the land values.



Frank Tucker, of the Provident Loan Association of New York, was on the 19th elected president of the Conference to succeed Judge Julian W. Mack, and thereupon the thirty-ninth Conference adjourned.



Tom L. Johnson Memorial.

At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of The Tom L. Johnson Memorial Association, it was decided to close subscriptions to the Memorial Fund on the 18th day of July, 1912, that day being the anniversary of the birth of Mr. Johnson, and to make the following public statement:

The fund now amounts to substantially \$10,000, contributed in sums for the most part small, and from a very large number of Mr. Johnson's friends and admirers. The feeling of the Committee is that if it could have consulted Mr. Johnson's wish he would have forbidden any active campaign for funds and would have preferred the expenditure of a small amount, voluntarily and spontaneously contributed, to any larger and more impressive sum secured by active solicitation and campaigning. This announcement is made in order to enable Mr. Johnson's friends who have delayed for any cause in sending in sums which they desire to send, to close the matter by sending checks or money to Mr. F. H. Goff, treasurer of the committee, at the Cleveland Trust Co., or to Mayor Newton D. Baker at the City Hall, on or before the 18th day of July next. After that day the Committee will meet and determine (in view of the amount on hand) what form the Memorial

shall take, and will immediately proceed to secure it.

[See current volume, pages 397, 400.]



Organized Real Estate Exchanges.

At its fifth annual convention, held at Louisville, Ky., from the 19th to the 21st inclusive, the National Association of Real Estate Exchanges altered its official title to The International Association of Real Estate Boards of America. The evening session of the convention on the 20th was largely devoted to a discussion of the Singletax, Louis F. Post of Chicago (editor of *The Public*) representing the affirmative, and William Scott of Winnipeg and A. G. Bowes of Denver the negative. A stenographic report of the discussion is to appear in the *National Real Estate Journal* for August, which is published by R. L. Polk & Co., of Chicago. Edward S. Judd of Chicago was elected president.



Financing the Republic of China.

The financing of the new Chinese Republic has been effected. The bankers representing the six great Powers—Great Britain, Germany, France, Japan, Russia and the United States—who have been having sessions in London and Paris during the past six weeks to consider a loan of \$300,000,000 requested by China, on the 20th reached an understanding and agreed to the loan. It is understood, say the dispatches, that Russia and Japan specifically reserve the right to withdraw from participation in the loan at any time should they decide that their special political interests in China have become jeopardized. Russia and Japan tried to force an agreement that the loan should not be applied in any way likely to compromise their interests. The four other Powers refused to agree to this, and it is understood that the final agreement was restricted to the financing of China, all political questions as such being left to the Powers. More important, probably, than the granting of the loan, was the first formal recognition by the Powers of the principle of the neutralization of China. According to the agreements, no individual Power may seek to exercise selfish rights of control in China. This is much the same as the neutrality policy of John Hay. [See current volume, pages 541, 584.]

NEWS NOTES

—The eight-hour law of Congress was signed by President Taft on the 19th.

—Bubonic plague is reported at Porto Rico. [See vol. xiv, page 784; current volume, page 227.]

—The judiciary committee of the lower house of Congress voted unanimously on the 21st to report

articles of impeachment against Judge Robert W. Archbald of the Commerce Court, who has been under investigation for alleged misbehavior in office in connection with a "culm bank" transaction with the Erie railroad.

—The amendment to the women's ten hour law enacted by the General Assembly of Illinois at the last session, making the statute apply to hotels, mercantile and mechanical establishments, factories and telephone and telegraph companies, was declared constitutional on the 21st by the Supreme Court of Illinois. [See vol. xiv, p. 492.]

—G. L. Berry, president of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, in convention at Hale Springs, Tennessee, was on the 19th sustained in his action in calling a sympathetic strike of pressmen throughout the country, following the Chicago strike, by a vote of 130 to 80. C. B. Crowley of Massachusetts, who led the fight against Berry, was unseated. [See current volume, pages 466, 582.]

—The Supreme Court of Illinois, decided on the 21st, in the case of Harry Kemp and others vs. Division No. 241 Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, that workmen may work for an employer or not as they see fit, and so long as they violate no contract obligations by leaving his employment they may strike at their own discretion. This decision, dissolving an injunction, sustains Judge Julian W. Mack's dissenting decision in the same case when it was before the Appellate Court at Chicago. [See vol. xiii, pp. 489, 519.]

—London dispatches of the 24th were to the effect that Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, sentenced on May 22 at the Old Bailey sessions to nine months' imprisonment on conviction of conspiracy and inciting malicious damage to property, was released on that day from Holloway Jail because her health was impaired by the hunger strike which she and her imprisoned followers recently began. Miss Annie Kenney, who has been directing the Women's Social and Political Union during the imprisonment of the suffragette leaders, announces that Mrs. Pankhurst was released because she was found the night before to be at the point of death, all attempts to feed her by force having failed. Reginald McKenna, home secretary, admits that Mrs. Pankhurst's heart was too weak to permit of forced feeding. [See current volume, page 514.]

PRESS OPINIONS

Officer-Seeking.

The Mirror (Wm. Marion Reedy) June 20.—What's all this world of noise? It is nothing but "the office seeking the man" in the good old fashion.



The Parker Episode.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.) June 22.—Alton B. Parker may be the best presiding officer in America; may be a man without blemish, personal or political, but he should not have been selected even tentatively for chairman of the Baltimore convention. For Mr. Parker could not do otherwise

than stir up contention. His most ardent admirer must have known that his selection would be the signal for an outbreak.



Progress of the Singletax.

(Chicago) Real Estate News (real estate), April.—The strongholds of tradition are being fast invaded by the land tax, and as its inroads increase, the reputation of the old methods of merely theoretical equality suffers diminution. The uncollectible personal property tax, that incomparable school of perjury and evasion, becomes day by day a fouler stench in the nostrils of the people; indeed, it is defended now by none save those indoctrinated zealots who set some idol of mere abstract justice or equality above the fortunes and souls of the people, and who raise the insensate cry of "tax-dodging," as if that abuse were not, under the system they support, as inevitable as the precession of the equinoxes. On the other hand, the land tax is insinuating itself by imperceptible degrees into the body politic, whether by discrimination between land values and improvements, or by direct agitation for the Singletax or for appropriation of the unearned increment. The progress of this crusade is seen more in the measures which are being agitated than in those which have already prevailed; but there is no doubt whatever of the eventual adoption in many quarters of methods of taxation largely modified by these theories. The destruction of speculative land value is written in the book of projects of progressive democracy, and it will come to pass in substantial degree whether you and I like it or not. Part of the unearned increment will eventually be taken over for public use, and the value of unoccupied land for purposes of private ownership will be seriously impaired. Besides, as between man and man, who could possibly approach this subject with a fresh and unbiased mind and doubt that the ownership of land for any other purpose than personal or productive use is little less egregious than the ownership of human beings?



"What started th' fight? 'Twas th' same as at the Republican convention. 'Twas about th' timpry chairman. Ye see, Willum Jennings Bryan says there's a man in New York with a fine old Irish name who provides timpry chairmen f'r all convintions iv ivry party. Willum Jennings says he supplied th' very fin' lookin' timpry chairman f'r th' Republican convintion. He's in th' business on a big scale. 'If ye want a timpry or permanent chairman f'r ye'r convintion, Republican, Dimmycrat, Prohibitionist, or Progressive, call on Mither Ryan. Chairmen supplied on short notice f'r anny pollytickal or social gatherin'. Frock coats go with each other. A large stock in speakers iv legislachures always on hand. Our platform department makes a specyality iv th' cillybrated adjustable platform with patent removable planks. Skilled mechanics will be sint to convintions to assimble these to suit th' taste. No trouble to show goods.'"—Mr. Dooley on the Democratic Convention, in the Chicago Tribune of June 25.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

BRYAN! BRYAN!!

The Cry of a Nation.

For The Public.

Say, Billie Bryan, you know how
Old Cincinnatus quit his plow,
And left behind the joys of home,
To save the destinies of Rome.

Well, Bill, old boy, they've grown in tricks
Since that great fight in Ninety-six;
Their swaddling-clothes they have outgrown;
The parasites infest the throne;
They've hogged each thing in mortal ken,
They've subsidized most every pen;
They have "the Smokes," the Oil, the Steel,
The Iron now is on their heel;
They have the Coal within the Mine;
The thrall is now on mine and thine;
They have the Courts—they read the Laws—
Suspended is "effect and cause";
They've checked the law of gravity;
The will of man no more is free.
Their King is, lo, "A Man of Straw!"
It's just the very thing you saw
In those old days of "Cross of Gold,"
When we in superstition sold
Our kith and kin, our birthright fair,
For noxious G. O. P. hot-air.

Say, Billie Bryan, you know how
Old Cincinnatus quit his plow,
And left behind the joys of home,
To save the destinies of Rome.

ROYD EASTWOOD MORRISON.



FOUND SOMETHING GOING ON.

Ed Howe in the American Magazine for February, 1912.

So little that is really exciting or worth while has happened in my life that I am greatly interested in Jim and Dan Ayers, who run a restaurant in the town where I live. Something really happened to them once upon a time, and when I go to their restaurant I enjoy hearing them tell about it.

When they were boys, they lived on a farm in Virginia; I have heard them say their postoffice was Sudley Springs. One Sunday morning, their father started them to Sunday school, and after they had loitered along the way a mile or two Jim Ayers remarked a commotion over beyond what they called the Big Woods.

"What's that?" Jim asked, stopping.

It was getting late by this time, and Dan replied:

"I don't know, but we'd better hurry up and get to Sunday school, or we'll get a whipping."

Then they hurried on, but the commotion over beyond the Big Woods broke out again, faintly, but it was very unusual, and Jim stopped and listened. He had never heard anything like it before, although he was a big boy twelve years old, and, after listening a while, he said:

"I'm going over there."

"Better not," Dan said. "You know father whips hard."

But the strange commotion continued, so Jim said he was going, whipping or no whipping. Dan followed, but kept saying they would catch it when they returned home.

They walked and walked and walked; all the time the commotion over beyond the Big Woods became more pronounced, but they couldn't tell what it was. They forded streams, and were chased by strange dogs, but kept on from ten o'clock in the morning until three o'clock in the afternoon. They had nothing to eat, and they didn't know that they could ever find their way back, because they were in a country strange to them. But they kept on, and a little after three o'clock, as a reward for their perseverance, they walked into the battle of Bull Run. I never before heard of boys going anywhere and finding anything as great as they expected.



LAND VALUES TAXATION IN THE CITY.

From "The City As a Socializing Agency," by Fred-eric C. Howe in The American Journal of Sociology, of March, 1912.

The cities' economic foundations control the distribution of wealth. Poverty is largely a social rather than a personal thing. The city creates the pauper as well as the millionaire. There is a single family in New York whose fortune has grown from \$20,000 to \$450,000,000 by the growth of land values in that city. The total value of the land in New York city is \$4,500,000,000. This is almost exactly \$1,000 per capita.

In four years' time speculative land values in New York have increased by \$1,000,000,000 or at the rate of \$250,000,000 a year. These are the official figures of the Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments. In Cleveland, Ohio, land values increased \$177,000,000 in ten years' time. The population during the same period increased by 172,000. Here too, land values are at the rate of \$1,000 per capita. In almost every city where land values are accurately valued they aggregate from \$800 to \$1,000 per capita. Every babe that is born, even the ignorant immigrant coming to the city, adds this value to the land and to the land alone. He produces wealth by his coming,

and then is charged an annual rent for that which he himself has produced. This is one of the paradoxes of society. The wealth the worker creates is given to another who in turn levies tribute in the form of land rent from him who produces it.

Is it not clear that the city is a wealth producer on a colossal scale? Is it not obvious that here is a source of revenue far in excess of the needs of any city? Is it not equally obvious that the city levies tribute on its people and passes it on to a few who have done nothing to create it? City ground rent increases the cost of city living. It is the heaviest burden on city life. In New York City ground rent amounts to an average of \$250 per family. The ground rent alone of a miserable two-room tenement on Grand street amounts to \$90 per year, almost as much as the rent of a comfortable cottage in a small town. This is a social burden imposed on people by the failure of the city to control its economic foundations in the interests of the people. It is one of the principal causes of poverty.

The private monopolies which supply transportation, light, heat, and power are another cause of poverty. They collect such tribute as a corrupt alliance with the city sanctions. The city of Cleveland reduced the burden of car riders by \$2,000,000 a year when it cut the rate of fare from five cents to three cents. It saved its people this substantial sum. But this is the least of the costs which the private ownership of the public utility corporation involves. They are operated for monopoly profits. They should be operated as a public service, for the relief of housing, for the promotion of decent living conditions, for the health, for cheap rent, for cleanliness and comfort. Our failure to recognize the plumbing of the city as a public rather than a private function is another of our costliest errors.

Poverty could be reduced to the vanishing point if the city thought in public rather than in private, in social rather than in personal terms. If the city took in land taxes, what the city itself creates, it could abandon all other taxes; it could supply many services at no cost whatever, that are now privately exploited. With this abundant revenue the city could acquire public utilities, could widen education, could build slaughter houses, markets, and cold storage plants; it could furnish many kinds of recreation and amusement, now denied to people.

But more important by far than the fiscal gain, the taxation of these increasing land values would relieve the housing problem, it would reduce rents and distribute people far out in the country. For the taxation of vacant land compels owners to use it, to build upon it, to cultivate it, and that is the great gain from this reform. With a heavier tax on land values, opportunity would call men to work, to build, to cultivate. Then speculators would be punished for their idleness rather than

rewarded for it. Then too, new wealth would be created, prices would come to a competitive basis and those monopolies identified with the land would be destroyed. For the taxation of land values would open up nature to use by man, it would offer him a place in which to live, and to labor. It would create new opportunities. It would relieve poverty by the creation of more jobs. It would lead to a more equitable distribution of wealth.



TAXING LAND VALUES—CAN THE TAX BE PASSED ON?

By Henry George.

. . . That taxes levied upon Land Values, or, to use the politico-economic term, taxes levied upon rent, do not fall upon the user of land, and cannot be transferred by the landlord to the tenant, is conceded by all economists of reputation. However much they may dispute as to other things, there is no dispute upon this point. Whatever flimsy reasons any of them may have deemed it expedient to give why the tax on rent should not be more resorted to, they all admit that the taxation of rent merely diminishes the profits of the landowner, cannot be shifted on the user of land, cannot add to prices, or check production.

Not to multiply authorities, it will be sufficient to quote John Stuart Mill. He says (section 2, chapter 3, book 5, "Principles of Political Economy") :—"A tax on rent falls wholly on the landlord. There are no means by which he can shift the burden upon anyone else. It does not affect the value or price of agricultural produce, for this is determined by the cost of production in the most unfavorable circumstances, and in those circumstances, as we have so often demonstrated, no rent is paid. A tax on rent, therefore, has no effect other than its obvious one. It merely takes so much from the landlord and transfers it to the State."

The reason of this will be clear to everyone who has grasped the accepted theory of rent—that theory to which the name of Ricardo has been given, and which, as John Stuart Mill says, has but to be understood to be proved. And it will be clear to everyone who will consider a moment, even if he has never before thought of the cause and nature of rent. The rent of land represents a return to ownership over and above the return which is sufficient to induce use—it is a premium paid for permission to use. To take, in taxation, a part or the whole of this premium, in no way affects the incentive to use or the return to use; in no way diminishes the amount of land there is to use, or makes it more difficult to obtain it for use. Thus there is no way in which a tax upon rent or Land Values can be transferred to the user. Whatever

the State may demand of this premium simply diminishes the net amount which ownership can get for the use of land or the price it can demand as purchase money, which is, of course, rent or the expectation of rent, capitalized.

Here, for instance, is a piece of land that has a value—let it be where it may. Its rent, or value, is the highest price that any one will give for it—, it is a bonus which the man who wants to use the land must pay to the man who owns the land for permission to use it. Now, if a tax be levied on that rent or value, this in no wise adds to the willingness of anyone to pay more for the land than before; nor does it any way add to the ability of the owner to demand more. To suppose, in fact, that such a tax could be thrown by landowners upon tenants, is to suppose that the owners of land do not now get for their land all it will bring; is to suppose that whenever they want to, they can put up prices as they please.

This is, of course, absurd. There could be no limit whatever to prices, did the fixing of them rest entirely with the seller. To the price which will be given and received for anything, two wants or wills must concur—the want or the will of the buyer, and the want or will of the seller. The one wants to give as little as he can, the other to get as much as he can, and the point at which the exchange will take place is the point where these two desires come to a balance or effect a compromise. In other words, price is determined by the equation of supply and demand. And, evidently, taxation cannot affect price unless it affects the relative power of one or the other of the elements of this equation. The mere wish of the seller to get more, the mere wish of the buyer to pay less, can neither raise or lower prices. Nothing will raise prices unless it either decreases supply or increases demand. Nothing will lower prices unless it either increases supply or decreases demand. Now, the Taxation of Land Values, which is simply the taking by the State of a part of the premium which the landowner can get for the permission to use land neither increases the demand for land nor decreases the supply of land, and therefore cannot increase the price that the landowner can get from the user. Thus it is impossible for landowners to throw such taxation on land users by raising rents. Other things being unaltered, rents would be no higher than before, while the selling price of land, which is determined by net rent, would be much diminished. Whoever purchased land outright would have to pay less to the seller, because he would thereafter be called on to pay more to the State.

But while the taxation of Land Values cannot raise rents, it would especially in a country like this where there is so much valuable land unused, tend strongly to lower them. In all our cities, and through all the country, there is much land which is not used, or not put to its best use, be-

cause it is held at high prices by men who do not want to or who cannot use it themselves, but who are holding it in expectation of profiting by the increased value which the growth of population will give to it in the future. Now, the effect of the Taxation of Land Values would be to compel these men to seek tenants or purchasers. Land upon which there is no taxation even a poor man can easily hold for higher prices, for land eats nothing. But put heavy taxation upon it, and even a rich man will be driven to seek purchasers or tenants, and to get them he will have to put down the price he asks, instead of putting it up; for it is by asking less, not by asking more, that those who have anything they are forced to dispose of must seek customers. Rather than continue to pay heavy taxes upon land yielding him nothing, and from the future increase in value of which he could have no expectation of profit, since increase in value would mean increased taxes, he would be glad to give it away or let it revert to the State. Thus the dogs in the manger, who all over the country are withholding land that they cannot use themselves from men who would be glad to use it, would be forced to let go their grasp. To tax Land Values up to anything like their full amount would be to utterly destroy speculative values, and to diminish all rents into which this speculative element enters. And, how groundless it is to think that landlords who have tenants could shift a tax on Land Values upon their tenants can be readily seen from the effect upon landlords who have no tenants. It is when tenants seek for land, not when landlords seek for tenants, that rent goes up.

To put the matter in a form in which it can be easily understood, let us take two cases. The one, a country where the available land is all in use, and the competition of tenants has carried rents to a point at which the tenant pays the landlord all he can possibly earn save just enough to barely live. The other, a country where all the available land is not in use and the rent that the landlord can get from the tenant is limited by the terms on which the tenant can get access to unused land. How, in either case, if the tax were imposed upon Land Values (or rent) could the landlord compel the tenant to pay it?

It may be well to call attention to the fact that a tax on Land Values is not a tax on land. They are very different things, and the difference should be noted, because a confusion of thought as to them may lead to the assumption that a tax on Land Values would fall on the user. Barring such effect it might have on speculation, a tax on land—that is to say, a tax of so much per acre or so much per foot on all land—would fall on the user. For such a tax, falling equally on all land—on the poorest and least advantageously situated as fully as on the richest and best situated land—would become a condition imposed on the

use of any land, from which there could be no escape, and thus the owners of rentable land could add it to their rent. Its operation would be analogous to that of a tax on a producible commodity, and it would in effect reduce the supply of land sufficient to pay the tax. But a tax on economic rent or Land Values would not fall on all land. It would fall only on valuable land, and on that in proportion to its value. It would not have to be paid upon the poorest land in use (which always determines rent) and so would not become a condition of use, or restrict the amount of land that could be profitably used. Thus the landowners on whom it fell could not shift it on the users of land. This distinction, as to nature and effects, between a tax on land and a tax on Land Values, it is necessary to bear in mind.

It is also necessary to bear in mind that the value of land is something totally distinct from the value of improvements. It is a value which arises not from the exertion of any particular individual, but from the growth and progress of the community. A tax on Land Values, therefore, never lessens the reward of exertion or accumulation. It simply takes for the whole community that value which the whole community creates.

While it is not true that a tax on Land Values or rent falls on the user, and thus distributes itself through increased prices, it is true that the greater number of taxes by which our public revenues are raised do. Thus, speaking generally, taxes upon capital fall, not upon the owners of capital, but upon the users of capital, and are by them transferred to the consumers of whatever the capital is used to produce; taxes upon buildings or building materials must ultimately be paid in increased building rents or prices by the occupiers of buildings; imposts upon production or duties upon imports must finally fall upon the consumers of the commodities. This fact is far from being popularly appreciated, for, if it were, the masses would never consent to the system by which the greater part of our revenues are raised. But, nevertheless, it is the vague apprehension of this that leads by confusion of ideas to the notion that a tax on Land Values must add to rents.

The general principle which determines the incidence of taxation is this: A tax upon anything or upon the methods or means of production of anything, the price of which is kept down by the ability to produce increased supplies, will, by increasing the cost of production, check supply, and thus add to the price of that thing, and ultimately fall on the consumer. But a tax upon anything of which the supply is fixed or monopolized and of which the cost of production is not therefore a determining element, since it has no effect in checking supply, does not increase prices, and falls entirely on the owner.

In view of the efforts that are made to befog the popular mind on this point, I have deemed it

worth while to show why taxes on Land Values cannot be shifted by landlords upon their tenants. But the fact that such a tax cannot be so shifted is realized well enough by landowners. Else why the opposition to the Single Tax, and why the cry of "confiscation"? Our national experience, like the experience of every other country, proves that those who are called on to pay a tax that can be shifted on others seldom or never oppose it, but frequently favor it, and that when once imposed they generally resist its abolition. But did anyone ever hear of landlords welcoming a tax on Land Values, or opposing the abolition of such a tax?



ENTER, BABE OF NATIONS!

For The Public.

Enter, Babe of Nations, into world of struggling fate;
Take thy choice of stations, future heir to large estate;

Choose, before eternity
Brings a new posterity,
Shedding blood for charity,
Crying out for liberty.

Enter, Babe of Nations, into world of struggling fate;
Take thy choice of stations, future heir to large estate.

Thou shalt rule tomorrow, and succeed despotic kings;

Wilt thou outcast sorrow, and root out oppressive things?

"Free and equal," is it true?
Laborers, and Wall street crew—
Mills Hotel, Fifth Avenue—
Tenements and mansions, too?

Thou shalt rule tomorrow, and succeed despotic kings;

Wilt thou outcast sorrow, and root out oppressive things?

Hast thou any fairing, such as hope of equal men?
Will thy sons be daring in the quest of nobler ken?

Love become thy destiny;
Faith be found, or jealousy;
Peace enthroned, or enmity;
Death triumph, or liberty?

Hast thou any fairing, such as hope of equal men?
Will thy sons be daring in the quest of nobler ken?

Enter, Babe of Nations, into world of struggling fate;
Take thy choice of stations, future heir to large estate;

Hasten, thou, the golden age
Here, where all the world's a stage;
Learn, for all the past's a gage,
Pledge of vengeance, wrath and wage.

Enter, Babe of Nations, into world of struggling fate;
Take thy choice of stations, future heir to large estate.

PAUL MAY.



If you do not wish for His kingdom, don't pray for it. But if you do, you must do more than pray for it; you must work for it.—John Ruskin.

POVERTY AND THE SINGLETAX.

Second Part of Address of Louis F. Post, Editor of
The Public, Before the Thirty-ninth National
Conference of Charities and Correction of
the United States, at Cleveland, Ohio,
June 17, 1912, on "Distribution of
Industry in Relation to Con-
gestion, Rent, Taxes."*

In considering the question of continual monopolization of the mechanism of modern industry, our greatest difficulty comes from assumptions that this universal and unified mechanism is artificial. But wholly artificial it in fact is not. This universal and indispensable subsistence factory of the civilized world is not wholly produced nor wholly repaired nor wholly renewed by workers, either in the sense of a personal class or of economic interests. Nor yet by its owners. Its roof to the zenith, its foundations to the center of the planet, and all the forces of nature that play between, are supplied continually from sources independent of human initiative and energy. This is no news of course; but I am not trying to bring you news. I am here to urge reflection upon familiar facts. If the workers of the world have to bid for a place in the world's workshop, bid in cut-throat competition against one another, because monopoly interests control it and workers must get access to it or become objects of charity—if that be true, then the primary reason must be not that its *artificial* equipment is monopolized, but that the *natural* foundation and walls of the workshop itself, and its equipment of *natural* forces, are monopolized and monopolized continuously. The master key to present problems of industrial distribution is recognition of the supreme industrial power of planet monopoly.

It does not follow, though, that charity organizations should enter upon a crusade for the abolition of land titles. They will have done their share in that respect if they subject the land monopolization principle to systematic and intelligent scrutiny; and then, if they find it operating unrighteously in the distribution of industry, by candidly saying so. Could less be asked of any organization of self-respecting citizens?

As to the rest, it is all a matter of method—of righteous expediency with reference to time, place and circumstances. Those for whom I may speak with some measure of authority believe that there is a righteous and practicable and peaceable way of abolishing monopoly of the planet with reasonable rapidity. They believe it can be done without substantial injury to anyone. They believe it can be done without prejudice to any conventional right that is not a continuing and blighting wrong. They believe

it can be done without attempting the hazardous experiment or arbitrarily readjusting intricate industrial relationships. They believe it can be done in strict conformity to the historical trend of social evolution. In the way they propose, they believe that the interlaced industrial mechanism of the world would progressively and speedily become a closed shop against monopoly and for industry an open and fair one—and this altogether without class conflicts either political or "direct," but through normal development of enlightened self-interest and the expansion of higher ideals of industrial life.

If that method were tried and should realize those expectations, there would no longer be an overplus of labor, reducing wages to the subsistence minimum and driving workers into unnecessarily hazardous service. The charity problem in all its aspects would consequently solve itself. Nor would the efficacy of the method be completely suspended pending its complete application. Its results would be realized progressively in a degree corresponding to that in which the method itself was allowed to progress. Nor yet is the method at all arbitrary or in any wise divorced from the facts of the situation. It takes into account still another of the large and plainly observable facts of modern life, and adapting to it a further fact, brings the two to bear co-operatively upon the purpose to be achieved.

Of this order of large and obvious facts, I have already marshalled four. First we had the fact that poverty is especially characteristic of the working class. Next we had the correlative and explanatory fact that abundance of the products of work is especially characteristic of aristocratic leisure. Our third was the world's monopolized subsistence machinery. The fourth accounted for that monopolization by monopoly of the planet and its surrounding space. If, now, we consider this basic monopoly commercially, in a civilization wherein feudal status with reference to planetary proprietorships has given way to capitalistic contract—landlordism to land-capitalism—we shall observe a fifth great fact.

Differential advantages of location possess in the market differential commercial values. They vary from zero where work is hard and its results scanty, to high figures where the results relatively to the work are abundant. In New York City, for instance, the aggregate of planetary location-values is twice the aggregate of the value of all the buildings. Translated into terms of area, the location-values of that city would be equivalent to a path of \$100-an-acre farming land more than two miles wide around the globe at the equator, through all the continents and across all the seas. And these commercial values of location, already enormous, as that single example suggests, rise as improvements enhance the productivity of work and the possible comforts of life. Not uncom-

*The first part of this address was published in The Public of June 21, at page 591, under the title of "Poverty and Organized Charity."

monly they rise in mere expectation of improvement. If I do not make this clear, any real estate dealer will, if you put the point to him as a question of investment. Have you never heard of confidence in the future of this or that locality, as an inducement to invest? Invest in what? Not in the artificial mechanism of the industrial system, nor in any of its products, but in a foothold on its natural foundations in that locality—in a title, that is, to some share of planet monopoly.

Differential commercial values of planetary locations is the fact alluded to by the word "rent", in the title of this discussion. Not house rent, for houses being products of work there is necessarily a categorical difference between what is paid for them and what is paid for the use of the planet. Planet rent includes rent for the site of an office building, for instance; royalties on mineral deposits; excessive rates for monopolized transportation; premiums for location on the earth, in the earth, or over the earth. In Cleveland a few years ago a large sum of money was paid by the city for mere permission to swing a viaduct draw over low land in the Cuyahoga Valley, through some man's air. That was "rent," planetary rent. "Rent" does not mean periodical payments alone. It means also the selling price of land, of air, of space, of location—which is potential ground rent capitalized. Every form of income that is for the monopoly in any degree of natural resources, and every capitalization of such income (be the income actual or potential), is "rent"—no matter what its other name may be. Incomes from railway stocks are seldom thought of as planetary "rent," yet that is what for the most part they really are. The fact that they are represented on the market by stock certificates instead of title deeds makes no difference. Think you that any part of the anthracite coal deposit of Pennsylvania loses its character as land, because the planetary titles to 60 per cent of it are represented by Reading railway stock? When you use the term in the discriminative economic sense, "rent" refers to one of the large and highly significant facts of modern industry. Its function in industrial distribution is to distinguish the social surplus from the shares of individuals for their work. In the world's workshop industry proceeds under varying advantages of planetary opportunity socialized. The differential values of those opportunities constitute a social surplus. This surplus—though it be called "rent," or whatever other name it may take—represents the advantages of social opportunities for industry in contradistinction to individual services in industry. Though every worker got his full proportion of all he individually helps to produce, this perennial surplus of production would exist, because differences of desirability in working opportunities exist.

But the social surplus is not now distributed socially. It is distributed among monopolists of

the world's workshop in proportion to the industrial desirability and scarcity of their respective monopoly holdings. In other words, it goes as planetary rent to planet owners.

Another important consideration is that rent, this social surplus of industry, increases with industrial improvement and in expectation of industrial improvement. That statement needs no other proof than any one can give from his own experience or observation. If any of you had a "sure tip" that a vast improvement was about to begin at your home town, one that would increase the local population in a year by those "leaps and bounds" by which we describe progress when other expressions fail us, wouldn't you wish to invest? But invest in what? In the improvements? You wouldn't have money enough left for that after you had cornered all the local building lots you could. This planetary investment tendency is everywhere. With frequent fluctuations as to time and place, but on the whole constant, investment flows heavily toward monopoly of location, and thereby the industrial future is mortgaged. Not only are needed localities monopolized as needed, but they are monopolized in advance and held out of use for exorbitant prices. Nearly a third of the site of crowded Chicago, for instance, is vacant; and a good deal of the rest isn't much better.

Such a tendency can have but one effect on the working classes of the world—its working interests, if you prefer "interests" to "classes" as I do. It is a tendency that must make access to the world's workshop increasingly difficult, that must make the volume of disemployed labor increasingly great, and that must therefore make underbidding for work increasingly keen, and the necessity for charitable relief more and ever more pressing.

Incidentally, the same investment tendency causes those harrowing congestions of population which, like the poverty and the crime that fester there, are characteristic of working life. We cannot have wholesome distributions of population any more than we can have righteous distributions of industry and its products, so long as the natural foundations and the natural equipment of the world's intricate mechanism of labor and life are monopolized.

All this would be obvious enough if a non-working class held the planet under feudal custom. But methods make no difference. The principle and its effects upon industry are precisely the same when non-working economic interests exploit industry by contract with reference to planetary rent, as they would be if a feudal class did it under the power of status.

Shall we try, then, to abolish planetary rent? It were better, I reckon, to practice first on something easy—abolition, for instance, of gravitation. But if we could, why should we? Normally, planetary rent operates in behalf of equal pay for equal work, regardless of the differential advantages of

working opportunity where the work is done. Normally it turns the differential rents of different working opportunities into a social rent fund. Rent is not an evil to be abolished, but our social misuse of it is an evil. We distribute this common fund unfairly, and so as to encourage monopolization of the planet and gambling in its social values. Thus we feed that "parasite of normal industrial interests become abnormal which take without giving," thus we breed poverty and all its concomitants. Reverse that process. Recognize the rent fund as the social surplus it is, and use it accordingly for social purposes, leaving the work fund to workers as they earn it and free of all exactions. Do that, and instead of starving industry as we do now, we shall starve our industrial parasite.

To begin doing this involves no difficulties whatever, except such as the righteous but slow of thought and the unrighteous but alert, may thrust in the way. In itself it is a simple matter. We have only to continue levying taxes as now on land according to its commercial value (regardless of whether used or not, and regardless of how well or how poorly used), but at the same time to begin a policy of exempting all industry from taxation. The governmental machinery for this exists now and is in operation everywhere. Nothing is necessary but to begin exempting what ought not to be taxed. The rest will then be automatic—a mere matter of keeping on.

While taxation has at first the sound of a far cry, it is in fact related closely to our whole subject. Taxation should not be a levying of private contributions for public use. It should be a public taking over of common funds. No better brief statement of the matter could be asked for than one by Joseph Fels in the Daily Herald (the Labor daily of London) in its issue of May 10, 1912. "In the last analysis," says Mr. Fels, "we must either tax Labor values or Monopoly values. That is the question we have got to face, and I suggest that such taxes should be levied on Monopoly values." Mr. Fels continues:

Wealth goes down through two main channels, wages to Labor and rent to the owners of Land. We must either take our taxes out of the one or the other. The taxation of land values will put a period to land speculation; make it easy for industry to have access to its natural reservoir; create a demand for Labor and raise wages naturally. This to my mind is the genuine direction to go for the solution of the poverty problem.

Mr. Fels implies that we need not adopt this method all at once. Personally, I would adopt it all at once if I could, and I am sure that he would. But if there were no other reasons against this, the fact that the opposition is as yet too strong would be reason enough. The time is ripening, however, for advances in the direction of lifting the burdens of taxation from industrial pro-

cesses and placing them on planet values; and one of the advantages of the method he and I advocate, along with rapidly growing groups and a still more rapidly growing general sentiment in every community, is that every advance in that method is a distinct improvement, not only in the readjustment of the distributions of industry but also in taxation simply as taxation.

For that assertion we have the testimony of experience. Beginning in New Zealand some 20 years ago, and taken up soon afterward in crude fashion by the Germans in China, experiments in various forms—some not so good as others and none of them far enough advanced to emphasize their efficiency in readjusting industrial distribution, except suggestively—have been made or officially set on foot in many countries. Nearly 100 taxing localities in New Zealand are operating now under this method of taxation. Several of the States of Australia have adopted it. Its vital principle has crept into the fiscal plans of hundreds of cities in Germany and even into the budget of the Empire. Great Britain introduced it for Imperial purposes through the Lloyd George budget of 1909, and is now on the point of allowing it for rating purposes, that is, for local taxation. Vancouver was probably the first to adopt it in purest form; and all the other important cities of British Columbia have followed Vancouver's example, as it is now understood that British Columbia as a Province will do at the next session of the legislature. Coming eastward through Canada, the movement for this method of taxation has reached the Atlantic coast, affecting many localities on the way but principally those of the Canadian middle west. Although not yet adopted anywhere in the United States, its agitation here meets with favorable and growing responses in many places. In its most radical form it polled in Seattle 13,000 votes out of 40,000 this year, though Seattle is a city that worships at the shrine of land speculation and all the land speculators were against it. In Missouri and in Oregon, with the support of public-spirited citizens there who are impressed with its value simply as a method of abolishing the exasperating policies of taxation that now prevail, Constitutional amendments providing for it are to be voted on next fall. Whether these experiments and proposals, or any like them yet to come, shall go further in the direction of abrogating planet monopoly and its concomitant industrial evils, will depend no doubt upon whether they commend themselves in practice to public approval. That they have done this so far is the testimony in every place where they have been tried. In New Zealand the experiment has not been abandoned except in two or three instances, and in those only for peculiar local reasons. In Vancouver and the other cities of British Columbia it has proved to be so successful and consequently popular that although the experi-

ments there are among the most advanced, the adversaries of this policy elsewhere are forced to pretend that those experiments are "not the real thing."

It has been objected that this method of taxation is an entering wedge for the abolition of planet monopoly. But the objection confesses its value as an entering wedge for that purpose. And isn't that purpose desirable? Planet monopoly ought to be abolished. To what good end or by what moral right shall monopoly of the planet be perpetuated? Nobody can defend it without moral stultification. To defend planet monopoly is to align oneself with those historical enemies of orderly society of which some of the Dukes of Great Britain are survivals and to whom Thorold Rogers alluded when he wrote of liberty and property, that these "two conditions of social order have been invoked as names by those who know nothing of any liberty but their own privilege to do wrong, and no property but that which custom has allowed them to appropriate and fence."

If in the milder applications of the principle of exempting industry and taxing land values alone, its feasibility for starving the industrial cancer of planet monopoly should be indicated, who will oppose expanding the experiment? Shall any one complain because he or his, forsooth, may therefore lose an unearned income? It would be an insult to any man's honesty as well as his civic intelligence to assume that he could wish to have the continuous stream of industrial products divided otherwise than in proportion to earnings—to earnings adjusted under full freedom of every one to do work and to make working contracts in an unglutted labor market. I assume that nobody here would tolerate in his conscience the notion that a system of privileges, however ancient in its origin, should be permitted to take from the producers of today any part of their fair share in the production of today, in order to give to privileged ones shares they do not earn or shares that are larger than they earn.

Of course it is not for me to say whether the views I offer should be adopted. You may think them faulty. If you do, it is your duty no less than your right to look for something better. I ask nothing of you except that you yield to your own best impulses under the counsel of your own best thought. My appeal is not to any one's self interest, but to every one's chivalry, to their citizenship, to their sense of brotherhood, to their honesty, to their passion for the right, to their moral courage if courage be needed. Let me ask your special heed, however, to these words from Henry George, of whose teachings this address throughout has been but an echo. Referring to the central truth of his philosophy as expounded in "Progress and Poverty," he writes: "It shows that the evils arising from the unjust and unequal distribution of wealth, which are becoming

more and more apparent as modern civilization goes on, are not incidents of progress, but tendencies which must bring progress to a halt; that they will not cure themselves, but, on the contrary, must, unless their cause is removed, grow greater and greater, until they sweep us back into barbarism by the road every previous civilization has trod." "But it also shows," Henry George continues, "that these evils are not imposed by natural laws; that they spring solely from social maladjustments which ignore natural laws, and that in removing their cause we shall be giving an enormous impetus to progress. The poverty which in the midst of abundance pinches and imbrutes men, and all the manifold evils which flow from it, spring from a denial of justice. In permitting the monopolization of the opportunities which nature freely offers to all, we have ignored the fundamental law."

Speaking for yourselves and to yourselves, my fellow citizens of this fair but monopolized land, of this wealth-producing but poverty-breeding world, what say *you*? Shall you keep on ignoring that fundamental law?

BOOKS

OUR STORE HOUSE.

Memory; How to Develop, Train and Use It. By William Walker Atkinson. L. N. Fowler & Company, London. The Elizabeth Towne Co., Holyoke, Mass. Price, \$1.00.

Among the many memory culture systems there appears to be nothing more simple and practical than Mr. Atkinson's recent addition to the list. While it embraces the vital points of other systems they are applied in a practical common-sense way which appeals at once to the understanding of the student who sees a reason in what he has hitherto regarded as arbitrary laws.

Mr. Atkinson's theory is that the subconscious region of the mind records all impressions made upon it and will yield up its classified facts on demand when we have learned the scientific method of producing and recollecting the stored up knowledge which is never lost to us. "The memory region may be thought of as a great record file with a system of indexes and office boys whose business it is to file away the records, to index them and to find them when wanted."

It appears to be our own fault if the office boys of memory fail to respond with alacrity to our call for needed facts, since we must have failed to impress them with the vital duty of attention to the data committed to their charge for instant reference and service.

Interest—attention—practice and review are the important points which our memory teacher

proves to be essential to the art of recalling any so-styled forgotten fact in our experience. Mr. Atkinson devotes a chapter to the training of each faculty of mind and body and lays down the psychologic laws that govern the recollection of particular events, places, faces, names, numbers, book, anecdotes, or whatever is needed for instant and rapid use.

His system is so simple, natural and readily adaptable that it may be cordially recommended to take the place of more complicated and cumbersome methods of memory.

A. L. M.



AN ECCLESIASTICAL NAZARENE.

The Cardinal Democrat: Henry Edward Manning. By I. A. Taylor, author of "Queen Henrietta Maria," "Queen Hortense and Her Friends," etc. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., Dryden House, Gerhard St., W. St. Louis: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway.

Fortunate is the great man whose memory calls out the best efforts of a biographer so impartial as well as appreciative; and fortunate the religious organization with a representative in the forum of the common people such as Manning was. This is not a biography, though full of biographical incident; it is an appreciation in the best sense of that word. Cardinal Manning was imperfect in his democracy, and this is not concealed by Mr. Taylor; but all his impulses were genuinely democratic, and Mr. Taylor gives full and fair play to every expression of them. In the best light of his time and with all the devotion of a great mind and great human sympathy, Cardinal Manning became a Nazarene pioneer into those hinterlands of democracy, its industrial phases, which ecclesiastics are so prone to ignore except as moral policemen for plutocratic privilege.

Flying Time.



J. W. Donahey in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 2, 1912. Reproduced in The Public by courteous permission of the Editor of the Plain Dealer.

A writer in the New York Globe tells of a young woman who, he believes, is not inferior to any man in the management of the affairs of life. She bought a small farm, and was busy overseeing the work on it.

The other day she ordered a telephone installed, and the company's workmen started in. Presently the "boss" called her out to the lawn.

"We can't run the wire in without damaging that

THE CHICAGO SINGLETAX CLUB

Meets every Friday at 8:00 p. m., at 508 Schiller Building

June 28, JAMES B. ELLERY, "Are Large Units of Production Economical?"

All are welcome. Ladies invited. Discussion. Literature for sale.

IMMORTALITY CERTAIN

Swedenborg's great work on the life after death, 400 pages, 15 cents, postpaid. Stamps taken.

PASTOR LANDENBERGER, Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

"THE ART OF LIVING LONG"
Guide to a Long and Healthy Life.

From the Italian of Lodovico Cornaro's "Trattato della Vita Sobrio." Completed at the age of 95.

The most eminently commended work on the attainment and preservation of perfect health ever published. \$1.50 postpaid.

For free booklet of commendations, address the translator and publisher, WILLIAM F. BUTLER, 51 Loan & Trust Building, Milwaukee, Wis.

FREE LITERATURE ON FREE ECONOMIC SUBJECTS FREE

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, 538 S. Dearborn St., Chicago

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

tree," he said, pointing to a fine old elm near the piazza. "It can't be done."

"Very well," replied the young woman, smiling, "then you needn't put in the phone"; and she re-entered the house.

"Did the electricians go away?" asked the correspondent, who assuredly believes that a man should think twice before insisting upon his boasted mental superiority to the other sex.

"No, sir. They put in the phone—and without harming the tree."

"A man, now," he concludes, "would have argued a half hour over the matter."



This story comes from Australia, where all conversation turns eventually to matters educational, because every parent is painfully anxious that his

IDEAL STOCK AND FRUIT FARMS

In Tancy 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.

Bankrupt Standard Sets Sale of Editions at a Books Fraction of Former Prices

Special

The Bahama Islands, Pub. at \$10. Net, for. \$2.10
Letters of Mrs. J. G. Blaine, Published at \$4.
Net, for 65c
Roger Williams, Life of, Pub. at \$2. Net, for 65c
Hitchcock, Maj. E. A., Fifty Years in Camp
and Field, 1814-67, Pub. at \$4. Net, for 1.50
Kieffer, Slavery and 4 Years of War, \$6.
Net, for 2.25
Tarbell, Life of Lincoln, 4 Vols., \$15. Net,
for 5.25
Pierce, Studies in Constitutional History,
\$1.50. For 40c
Historic Churches of America 1.50
Schroeder-Lossing, Life of Washington, 4
Vols. Bx'd, \$8.00. Net, for 2.25

Send for List

Stock Limited.—All Fresh New Books. Send check with order and give shipping directions. Money back in a minute if books are not as represented and entirely satisfactory.

H. H. TIMBY, Box 227 Ashtabula, Ohio

sons shall pass the standard which will free them from certain years of military service. A visitor was conversing with his host's small son, and opened, as a matter of course, with the words, "Do you go to school now?"

"Yes."

"And what do you learn? Reading, writing, sums?"

"Oh, yes, and I learn religion, too."

"Religion?"

"Yes. I learn the little religion, which teaches

Human Interest Books

Related to the Democratic Factors of Life

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 \$1.25

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 \$1.00

The Confessions of a Monopoli

By Frederic C. Howe, Ph. D. A simple, enormously true story that "puts you on" to Monopoly's game all the way to the last play.

In green cloth, postpaid 65

Garrison the Non-Resistant

By Ernest Crosby. The story of the great Abolitionist from a new point of view.

In blue cloth, with portrait of Garrison, postpaid .50
In grey paper, postpaid 25

Labor and Neighbor

By Ernest Crosby. An appeal to first principles for the working out of the Labor question in a human way.

In grey paper, postpaid 25

The Hungry Forties: Life Under the Bread Tax

"Here is England as Carlyle saw it when he prophesied the working out of the same laws, eternal, adamant, which had made the great revolutions in Europe—*London Daily News*.

In orange paper, postpaid 20

A Great Iniquity

By Leo Tolstoy. The famous letter to the *London Times* on the iniquity of private property in land.

In red paper, with notable illustrations, postpaid . 10

Franklin and Freedom

By Joseph Fels. Our old wise printer friend, Benjamin Franklin, on the land question.

In buff paper, with portrait of Franklin, postpaid . 05

Thomas Jefferson

By Sterling E. Edmunds. What Jefferson's pen did and attempted in vain to do, in the formation of our Constitution.

In grey paper postpaid 05

How to Get Rich Without Working

By Edward Homer Bailey. A gay little story, well told.

White paper leaflet, postpaid 05

The Public, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago

that we all come from Adam. But my elder brother is in a higher class; he learns the big religion, and that teaches that we all come from monkeys."—Manchester Guardian.



"Let me write the nation's songs and I care not who makes the laws."

"But what if they should get to working the Recall on the poets?"—Chicago Record-Herald.

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 Copies08
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.

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

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

Social Service

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

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

In blue paper, postpaid..... 40

The Taxation of Land Values

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


In stiff red paper covers; charts printed in colors; postpaid... 30

The Open and the Closed Shop

By Louis F. Post.

In grey paper covers, postpaid.. 05

THE PUBLIC'S BOOK DEPARTMENT
Ellsworth Bldg. Chicago



The Franklin Society

Here are some facts to which we respectfully invite your attention:—

- 1—The Franklin Society has a long and honorable business record, this being its 23rd year.
- 2—The society is by law subject to the strict supervision of the State Superintendent of Banks. Its books and securities are examined in detail at least once a year, by a Public Examiner.
- 3—Its funds are invested in the very best securities—first mortgages on small dwellings in a vicinity where the demand for homes is greater than elsewhere in the world.
- 4—You can open a savings account with one dollar or more.

Send us a remittance today and get one of our mailing size pass books.

THE FRANKLIN SOCIETY
FOR HOME-BUILDING AND SAVINGS
148 Nassau St., New York City

4 1/2 PER CENT

Advertisers like to know where you saw their advertisement. And we like them to know.