

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy, and
a Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

Vol. XVII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1914.

No. 824.

EDITORS, 1898-1913: LOUIS F. POST AND ALICE TEACHER POST

SAMUEL DANZIGER, MANAGING EDITOR.
STOUGHTON COOLEY, } ASSOCIATE EDITORS.
ANGELINE L. GRAVES, }
STANLEY BOWMAR, BUSINESS MANAGER.

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
HENRY F. RING, Texas
HERBERT S. BIRLOW, Ohio
HERBERT QUICK, West Virginia
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPROX, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio
JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
LEWELLYN JONES, Illinois
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Calif.
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
S. A. STROCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
LINCOLN STRAPPERS, New York
HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
FREDERIC C. HOWE, New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
GRACE ISABEL COLBORN, New York
W. G. EGGLESTON, California
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon
R. F. FETTINGREW, South Dakota
LEWIS H. BERRNS, England
J. W. S. OALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, England
ERNEST BRAY, Australia
GEORGE FOWLES, New Zealand

Published by STANLEY BOWMAR, Manager
Eliaworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents Yearly Subscription, One Dollar
Canadian and Foreign, \$1.50

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago,
Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

War and Human Fellowship—S. C.	49
Barbarity of Militarism—S. D.	49
Where the Blame Belongs—S. D.	49
Better Than a Lord Bountiful—S. D.	50
Regulating Competition—S. C.	50
Not Equal Before the Law—S. D.	51
Taxation and Suffrage—S. D.	52
Unearned Increment—S. C.	52
Tuberculosis a Product of Monopoly—F. W. Gar- rison	54
High Prices and the Land—William E. McKenna	54

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

The Farmer's Welfare—C. M. Koedt	56
----------------------------------	----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

Volcanic Disaster in Japan	57
Rural Credits Bill	57
Supreme Court Upsets Franchise Contracts	57
Chicago School Questions	58
Rangel-Cline Defense	58
Mexico and the United States	58
Germany and Its Army	59
Chinese Affairs	59
South African Labor Trouble	59
The Labor War	59
News Notes	62
Press Opinions	63

RELATED THINGS:

Ave!—Charles Johnson Post	64
Some Friends of Ours, II—Charles Howard Shinn	64
A Wonderful Old Lady—Harry W. Olney	65
On the Deck of the World—Henry D. Thoreau	65

BOOKS:

To Abolish State Boundaries	66
Jesus and His Teachings	66
Periodicals	67

EDITORIAL

War and Human Fellowship.

What a spectacle was that of the wounded Fed-
erals and Constitutionals alike crawling to the
boundary line, after a week's fighting at Ojinaga,
to receive succor from the surgeons of the Ameri-
can Army!

S. C.

Barbarity of Militarism.

Associated Press reports from Presidio, Texas,
show plainly how militarism creates barbarians.
American army officers stationed there sent back
into Mexico refugees from the federal army flee-
ing from bloodthirsty enemies at Ojinaga. They
were sent back to practically certain death. The
reason was that the officers had orders to do this,
or believed that they had, and military education
makes unquestioning obedience more sacred than
the claims of humanity. It actually required an
order from the Secretary of War to put an end
to this merciless barbarity. Had these soldiers
been men of true courage such an order would
not have been necessary. They would have chosen
to incur the risk of punishment for disobeying
orders rather than become guilty of such actions.
But craven fear of one's superior officers is an
essential characteristic of a good soldier. S. D.

Where the Blame Belongs.

Michigan mine owners refuse to come to terms
with striking employees. Why should they? Do
they not control the opportunities bestowed by na-
ture? Has not the State of Michigan conferred
on them power to say whether or not labor may
use these opportunities? If there is no immedi-
ate prospect of legislation that will penalize with-
holding of natural opportunities from use, then
they can safely keep on withholding until the
strikers are starved into submission or enough
strikebreakers secured to take their places. In the
meantime the state of war will continue. Who

is to blame? The mine owners or the voters who uphold Land Monopoly?

S. D.

Better Than a Lord Bountiful.

Public attention has been called to the action of Henry Ford, the automobile manufacturer, in voluntarily establishing a minimum wage of \$5.00 a day in his factory, making eight hours a day's work, and instituting other profit-sharing arrangements. Most of the comment made seems based on the opinion that Mr. Ford's action is a one-sided affair in which he generously gives profits to his employees without any expectation of return. Such an opinion robs Mr. Ford of credit that is due him. It places him in the position of Lord Bountiful, a position assumed only by those whose judgment is not as good as their intentions. It places his employees in the humiliating position of recipients of Lord Bountiful's charity, a position repugnant to self-respecting persons. Mr. Ford has displayed the possession of a broad mind and of the knowledge needed to realize that it pays an employer fully as much to have the good will of his employees as for an employee to have the good will of his employer. The policy he has instituted can only prove a public benefit if it encourages other employers to follow his example. It can hardly do this if it fails to benefit him financially. So those who hail him as Lord Bountiful are casting doubt and discredit in advance on a policy which other employers might adopt from purely selfish motives could they be sure that no feature of something for nothing is involved therein.

A policy similar to that instituted by Mr. Ford has proved a financial success in the case of some other employers. Tom L. Johnson at Johnstown found that it paid to pay higher wages than his neighbor, The Cambrian Iron Co. It gave him the pick of the labor market. The same is probably true of others who have adopted a similar policy, among whom may be mentioned, "Golden Rule" Jones of Toledo and Fels & Co. of Philadelphia.

Under existing conditions it is not possible for Mr. Ford's policy to be universally adopted with success. It can be applied where the employer has a monopoly, or where his trade mark on an article alone suffices to give it an advantage in the open market. But to urge employers generally to do so is as impracticable as is the advice so frequently given indiscriminately to employees, to voluntarily work longer than the hours required of them. An

occasional employee who does this may be favored by his employer. But if all do so the advantage will be lost and the final result will be more work for all without increase of wages. It must be the same way with employers. The occasional one who pays more than he must can get the most efficient labor in the market. But if all employers do so, no particular one will have any superior attractions.

Even if all employers were to voluntarily pay more than the market rate the employees would not long derive much profit from it, under conditions as they are today. A general increase in wages would be followed by a proportionate increase in land values, and in the end land owners would absorb in rent all that workers would gain in increased wages. As long as land values remain subject to private appropriation, the individuals who own the land will be able to get the lion's share of all public benefits. The labor problem can not be solved through unanimous following by employers of Mr. Ford's example, even if such action were possible, although the value of such an effort, as a lesson in political economy, would be great.

S. D.

Regulating Competition.

The idea of commercial regulation through industrial commissions has had considerable vogue of late among persons who lack the courage to stand boldly for principle, or who will not take the trouble to examine into the problem they seek to solve. The holders of privilege would, to be sure, prefer to be let alone; but if that cannot be, if the public is determined to do something, they would much rather have their privileges regulated than to have them abolished. The good-intentioned reformers who advocate regulating-commissions are, like the Socialists, victims of the deadly analogy. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been a useful instrument of government. It has brought some order out of the transportation confusion, and its usefulness has increased as its powers have been extended. Therefore, the commission advocates argue, we should have industrial commissions to regulate the general business of the country.

The fallacy of this logic lies in the confusion of facts, and the treatment of things as analogous that are in fact wholly different. A part of the business of the country is based upon natural privilege, confirmed by law; another part is naturally

competitive, but has been endowed by the state with legal privilege; the remainder is actually competitive, and is victimized by the other two. A natural monopoly, such as the carriage of freight and passenger on an exclusive highway, has been beneficially controlled by a government commission. But it does not necessarily follow that a government commission could, or would, control the legal-privileged business, or the purely competitive business. Such an undertaking would be nothing less than a form of Socialism, and would be of such vast dimensions that it would break down of its own weight. To attempt the regulation of all the business of the country would be as impossible as to consciously control the beating of the heart. Were such regulation the condition upon which society exists, it would speedily pass away.



Consideration of the industries of a primitive community will make clear the essential factors in the problem. The shoemaker and the farmer deal fairly with each other when exchanging shoes and potatoes; and each deals fairly with the tailor when exchanging shoes or potatoes for a coat. Should any one of them attempt to exact an unreasonable amount other men would enter his line of business. The invention of a sewing machine would make coats cheaper for the whole community; for, should the tailor attempt to charge as much for the machine-sewn coat as for the hand-sewn coat, others would make use of the machines, till the price reached normal level. The same would be true of the use of better fertilizer on the farm, or of a better yielding potato. This is a natural law; and, so long as it is not interfered with, it will work in a large or a small community, and for any length of time, measuring in just proportions the product of every laborer.



But suppose privilege to be introduced. If the sewing-machine be patented, its owner can exact an arbitrary price during the life of the patent. If the farmer be allowed to retain the value that attaches to land through the growth of the community, he will receive an ever-increasing share of the community's labor product. If the highway over which the shoemaker, the tailor, and the farmer must pass be given into the exclusive control of the road-builder, he can charge more than a just share for its use. Under such conditions it is conceivable that the machine owner, the land owner, and the highway owner might be able to sub-let to others their privileges, and so have their

own living without working at all. The painters or blacksmiths, the grocery men or butchers might enter into agreements with each other, but their combination would work no hardship to the community; for the moment they attempted to charge more than their work was worth, others would enter their calling to share in its greater profits.



It will be apparent that the government has a right to regulate the charge of the highway-builder, either by means of a commission or otherwise, because he enjoys a government-created privilege. The highway could not exist except by the consent of the people, or the government's fiat; and the government has the right to control its creature, even to the extent, if necessary, of direct operation. It is not only the right of the government, but its duty, to control the monopolies that it creates. It should control and regulate the use of patents, so long as they are issued; and it should distribute the economic rent, or land value, among the people who create it. This done, the commercial functions of the government cease. No competitive business needs to be, nor can be, regulated by government. When a business is not competitive, the government should make it competitive by withdrawing its privileges. Competitive business is natural business. It is self-regulating until interfered with by privilege. The duty of government, therefore, is not to try to regulate competition, but to suppress privilege.

S. C.



Not Equal Before the Law.

At least six possibly innocent men were subjected to the risk of serving a full penitentiary sentence when the federal judge at Indianapolis refused, on January 1, 1913, to grant a stay of execution to the convicted structural iron workers. These six men, with about twenty-seven others, were convicted of conspiracy. They appealed to the Circuit Court, but pending hearing of appeal no stay was granted nor bail allowed by the lower court, and they were promptly sent to the Leavenworth penitentiary to begin serving their sentences. In the meantime, however, the Circuit Court allowed release on bail, fixing it at \$10,000 for each man for each year of service. In allowing bail the Circuit Court said: "There is a possibility of substantial error—error so great that a conviction could not be sustained." Now, fully a year later, this court finds in the case of six of the prisoners who had been compelled to begin serving sentence that the conviction can actual-

ly not be sustained and orders a new trial. Had the views of the lower court prevailed, four of these men whose sentences were but for one year each would have served their full time before the higher court had found that on account of substantial error the conviction could not be sustained.

Even with the order of the Circuit Court allowing release on bail, there was danger of such injustice. Bail in the cases of these six men was fixed at \$10,000 for those sentenced to one year and \$60,000 for one sentenced to six years. But for the fact that friends were found able to furnish this heavy security, they would have been left to serve as convicts with the question of their guilt or innocence still in doubt. However innocent they may have been, however strong the grounds on which a new trial might be demanded, lack of money or of friends with money would nevertheless have surely forced them to undergo the penalty of guilt. However one may view this case the fact cannot be hidden that a poor man subjected to prosecution in our courts is in greater danger of suffering injustice than a wealthier one.

S. D.

Taxation and Suffrage.

Dr. Anna Shaw urges women to refuse to make income tax returns on the ground of "no taxation without representation." This has been compared with Mrs. Pankhurst's militant policy, but the comparison is unfair. Mrs. Pankhurst's militant acts have injured not only the participants, but others—even some friends of the suffrage movement. Dr. Shaw's proposed action can injure only those who willingly follow her advice, and these, one may safely assume, will act with full knowledge of possible consequences. But if "no taxation without representation" is a valid reason for opposing a tax, it applies to many legal voters as well as to disfranchised women. Present methods of choosing representatives, and lack of control over them after election, make so many votes ineffective as to deprive large bodies of voters of representation. Election of single representatives from districts deprives of representation all whose views on public questions are not held by the successful candidate. In a district electing a Democrat all Republicans, Progressives, Socialists and members of other parties or groups fail to secure representation—to say nothing of Democrats of a different brand than the party candidate. The same is true in a district electing a Republican, Progressive or Socialist. Until proportional representation will be secured ensuring to each party

or group representation in proportion to its numbers there will be almost as much taxation without representation after equal suffrage has been secured as before. All women and men are not only entitled to a vote but to an opportunity to vote effectively.

The phrase "no taxation without representation" owes its popularity to its supposed connection with the resistance of American colonists to the Stamp Act. One must hold a poor opinion of the revolutionary fathers to imagine that they would have tamely submitted to an unjust tax if they had had representation in the Parliament that imposed it. If Benjamin Franklin, who addressed Parliament in opposition to the measure, had been allowed a vote and had cast it against the tax as he certainly would have done—what difference would it have made? The tax would have been robbery just the same. The colonists would certainly not have been deluded into submission. It is not believable that they would have solemnly proclaimed, "We will submit to robbery provided it be done by act of a parliament in which a few members will represent us."

In view of the fact that there are better methods available for gaining representation, Dr. Shaw's advice ought to be rejected on grounds of expediency. Whether it may be ethically justified depends entirely on the government's moral right to levy the tax. If the principle is correct that every one should pay in proportion to his or her ability for services rendered by government, then the income tax is honestly due, vote or no vote, and resistance, for any reason, would be wrong. If the principle quoted is incorrect, if a person's right to all that he honestly earns is such that it is robbery even for the government to forcibly take any, then the tax is wrong even when imposed by vote of one's own representatives. In that event every tax levied on labor and its products is robbery. In that case no other moral objection can be urged against Dr. Shaw's advice than the one that it may be wrong to endanger a just cause through arousal of prejudice against it. Such prejudice may result from unwise insistence on a moral right. Her advice may be "magnificent but it is not war."

S. D.

Unearned Increment.

That the land question lies close to the heart of British politics is evident from the continued comment of the English press on the recent sale

of nineteen acres of land in the heart of London. It was the magnitude of the transaction that first attracted attention; but later the enormous increase in the value of the land while in the possession of the Bedfords has called for comment, and it is this phase that is likely to make the more lasting impression. The price announced at the time of the deal was \$50,000,000; but subsequently it was given as \$13,750,000. Even the amended sum is sufficient, when taken in connection with the sentimental interest attaching to the historic buildings, to serve as an object lesson.



The land in question was given to the first Earl of Bedford by Edward VI in 1552, when Covent Garden, one of its valuable features, brought in a yearly rental of \$30.84; now the Market brings in \$121,750. That this piece of land, nineteen acres in extent, presented by a king to a courtier who had ingratiated himself, should have supported that courtier's descendents for 361 years, not only without wearing out—as a tool, building, or other labor product would have done—but instead, should have increased in value nearly four thousand fold, makes the reader pause. Few of the buildings that were on the land in the time of Edward VI are there today; and had any lingered that long they would now be of no small value. Nor was it the practice of the first Duke, nor the last, nor any of the intervening Dukes during the three and a half centuries, to do much on the way of improvements. The same obliging Englishmen who raised the value of that nineteen acres of land from a few hundreds of dollars to as many millions, also put up the buildings. They constructed the buildings at their own expense, paid a snug rental for the use of the land, bore the expense of government, and at the end of a term of years presented the building to the Duke.



But the Dukes of Bedford have been good landlords, as landlords go. They furnished as good land as is to be found, being full measure superficially, and extending full depth to the center of the earth. Nor did they permit any encroachment from above. Though this pyramid of land was balanced on its apex, it was so carefully and so completely surrounded by similar pyramids that it has never, so far as the records go, shown the slightest inclination to topple over. It is, indeed, generally conceded that the Dukes of Bedford have furnished good, honest earth to support the buildings made by their fellow Englishmen. That the buildings have not increased in

value along with the Duke's land is doubtless due to the fact that other Englishmen also put up buildings. In this the Dukes had the advantage; for no one made any more land. As people continued to pour into London, labor and capital brought in materials and put up buildings for their use. There was plenty of labor, plenty of capital, and plenty of materials, so there were always plenty of buildings; but the land grew scarcer and scarcer as the people became thicker and thicker, until today nineteen acres of land in the heart of London sells for thirteen and three-quarters million dollars.



What superlative regard Edward VI must have had for the first Earl! And what remarkable forethought he exercised in showing his favor. Had he given houses and goods to his favorite, they would long since have fallen into decay. Had he made his political job hereditary the English Revolution would have interrupted it, or subsequent administrations might have thrown him out. But by giving to him and his heirs forever a piece of the earth, upon which all must live who exist at all, the king conferred a boon upon his favorite that must continue to grow in value as long as society grows. Truly a magnificent prince!



But after all, does the action of King Edward VI. differ from that of our own democracy? Many tracts of land might be named in this country that came into the possession of the ancestors of the present owners for less service than was rendered by the first Earl of Bedford, and that show greater increase in less time. Land used as cabbage gardens in New York City a hundred years ago is now worth far more than the English estate that is attracting so much attention, and the owners have done about as much as the English Duke to create that value. The people of England are coming slowly but surely to the conclusion that the value of the great London estate—indeed, the value of all landed estates—is the creation of the public as a whole, and should be taken by means of annual tax to defray the cost of government. Does not the same logic apply to the lands of this country? Does it make any difference whether the grantor be a king or a Congress? Does it matter whether the grantee be a lord or a commoner? The law of rent is no more a respecter of persons than is the law of gravity. Should England push her land tax to its logical conclusion she will gain an advantage in the mar-

kets of the world greater, far greater, than when she adopted free trade. To take taxes off of trade was well; to abolish taxes on production is better. Neither England's trade, nor the trade of any other country, will ever be really free until all taxes are removed from both production and exchange, and laid upon land values.

S. C.

TUBERCULOSIS A PRODUCT OF MONOPOLY.

In an eloquent letter published in the New York Evening Post of December 26, Dr. John B. Huber rightly attributes the cause of tuberculosis to bad economic conditions. "It is neither a hereditary nor a family disease," he declares, "but a house disease, contracted chiefly in unhealthful tenements and workshops. . . It is a disease of the poor, of the submerged; a disease developed in sunlessness, cold, starvation, misery; in the overworked, exhausted, anxious body; in the body devitalized by previous diseases, of which alcoholism is preëminent." And he urges "the rest of civilization" to assist the doctors in making the cure possible.

What are the obstacles in the way, he asks, and points to the tariff which has made a few millionaires while reducing the masses to a poverty which cannot hope for pure food as a bulwark against disease, the overworking of women and children in factories and sweat shops, the employment of men in dangerous trades under intolerable conditions which give to some industries a consumptive death-rate above 80%. He condemns also the faith healers and purveyors of patent medicine, and sees a "ghastly inhumanity" in gauging human labor by a law of supply and demand. He does not perceive that the law of supply and demand is as much a dispensation of Providence as the circulation of the blood and that the evil resides not in the natural law, but in the ignorance of those who attempt to thwart it. He fails to see that land monopoly acts on the body politic as a clot of blood in the arterial system; and so, while condemning private charity and philanthropy and admitting that the model tenement is beyond the reach of the very poor, he can foresee a solution of the problem only through the public charity of government action in reconstructing the slums and providing sanatoria.

It is encouraging to find a doctor who appreciates the significance of tariff monopoly, and we may believe that it will not be long before he sees monopoly in its most sinister form in laws which support the claim of landlords to private owner-

ship of natural opportunities and transform the right to work into a privilege graciously accorded by some men to their fellows.

F. W. GARRISON.

HIGH PRICES AND THE LAND.

An editorial in The New York Evening Post suggested that the present high prices of farm products make this an unusually favorable time for a movement to encourage immigrants to take up farming in this country. Mr. Raymond V. Ingersoll replied to the effect that the trouble was that farm land prices have gone up faster than farm product prices; that this "effectively checked what would otherwise be a normal redistribution of population." This brought from The Post an editorial in which it took issue with Mr. Ingersoll, but not violently. "Except for the question of degree," said The Post, "Mr. Ingersoll's point is perfectly well taken. A great rise in the value of farm lands . . . has been amply verified by statistics."

How much of the increase in the farmer's profits has been absorbed by the increase in land values appears to The Post "an extremely interesting question upon which we would not venture a judgment, but that a large part is left over by way of encouragement to the user of the soil, we feel very sure."

The editorial goes on to point out the increasing attractiveness of city life as a reason for the drift from the country. Next comes a paragraph from which the following extract is taken:

"There is a vast amount of land that can be bought or rented at low prices in such States as New York or Pennsylvania or Massachusetts which could be used for truck farming, raising chickens, and so forth, and evidently of the great advance in the price of eggs, poultry and garden truck only a small portion can be taken up by the cost of the land. Further the census figures which show that average values per acre for farm lands in such States as Illinois and Iowa rose between 1900 and 1910 more than one hundred per cent also show that in New York the rise was only 32 per cent, in Massachusetts only 33 per cent, and in Pennsylvania 14 per cent."

But The Post admits that a rise in land values has been caused by a rise in farm-product prices; points out that Henry George never imagined that his system would destroy economic rent; admits that his system would have some influence in lowering agricultural rents by forcing lands now unused into use; thinks that the effect would not be

great in such States as New York and Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, and that it would be "more than balanced by the destruction or impairment of the sense of ownership which is so great a factor in the farmer's life."

Result of the editorial, at least four letters, three from Singletaxers, one from an "anti." Result of the letters, another editorial in which The Post says:

"The Singletax idea is one that is not for a moment to be classed with greenbackism or with any other popular delusion. It has a solid foundation in economic theory and it is neither to be waved aside as a fallacy nor dismissed as a thing of no importance. The element of soundness that there is in it we have more than once taken occasion to recognize."

What Singletaxer, even though he be also a greenbacker, will be in a frame of mind to quarrel with The Post after that? even though it does say in the next sentence:

"On the other hand, we have insisted that as usually advocated, it is open to fatal objection from the standpoint of ethics and we have also pointed out that many of the economic claims made for it are extravagant and some of them fantastic."

The Post goes on to repeat its criticism of Mr. Ingersoll's views; to point out to Mr. F. W. Garrison that "under the full fledged Singletax. . . any rise in farm products would be absorbed by the rise of land values as completely as under the present system" and there would not be then, as now, "millions of farmers who benefit by the advance as land owners; points out to another correspondent that the Singletax plan applies to urban as well as farm land, and if, as Singletaxers claim, the scheme would improve the lot of the city dweller—"and so far as we can judge," says The Post, "his gain would be greater than that of the country dweller—what becomes of the Singletax as a sovereign remedy for the drift from the country to the city?"

Aside from the question of ethics, which ought to be the supreme consideration, the points of agreement between The Post and the Singletaxers are more important than the points of difference, and more important than the particular question under discussion, whether the Singletax would or would not check or reverse the drift from the country to the city.

Some of the special points which The Post makes can be admitted without damage to the Singletax theory. One is that under present con-

ditions there is an attraction in city life for the rural population. Also that if we improve rural conditions but improve urban conditions still more, the relative attraction of city life will be greater than it is now. But the more closely you examine this proposition the less discouraging it will look.

Another point is that a prospective advance in land values is an attraction to a prospective farmer. True. If a man can buy a farm for \$2,000 and thinks it will be worth \$5,000 in ten years so that he can get not only the results of his labor but \$3,000 profit he will be more likely to buy that farm on account of the expected profit. But he cannot get that advantage except by selling or renting and letting somebody else do the farming. The man who has the farm now has his own ideas about what it will be worth later on and that makes it harder for the man who wants to farm to get a chance at it now. It is the farmer whom we need to encourage, not the man who is about ready to drift to the city if he can sell out at a satisfactory figure. Quite recently The Post had some figures regarding the increase of farm tenancy. Probably the tenants would like to buy farms but the present system is not helping them to do so.



As to the relation between high prices for food and high prices for land, it is probable that the data available do not justify any positive conclusions. The people who buy food know that they have to pay high prices, but how much of what they pay does the farmer get?

Mr. Stewart Browne, the "anti" who writes to The Post, has something to say about this and he is merely repeating a complaint that comes from many quarters.

"Although the prices to the consumer of farm products have in twenty years doubled or, in some cases, trebled, most of the increase is eaten up by increased cost of production, transportation and distribution, not forgetting cold storage."

Assuming, however, that the farmer gets more money for what he sells than he did formerly, it must be remembered that he pays more for everything he buys. What is the net result to him of his work, not in money but in the things he needs? Is he drifting to the city in spite of unprecedented prosperity and comfort on the farm? Are we quite sure that we know the necessary facts?

Another point that merits some consideration is that low and even declining prices for commodities may accompany advancing land values. Indeed, up to the era of trusts and combinations,

or of the increase of the gold supply if you hold that responsible for the present troubles, the tendency seemed to be in the direction of a cheapening of production in nearly all lines, and land values were not declining. In those days even freight rates were going down—any railroad authority will give you convincing ton-mile, carload-mile and locomotive-mile figures—and yet railroad values were going up, sometimes getting within a stone's throw of the capitalization.

Even the figures of advances in land values should not lead us into hasty conclusions. If an owner of Pennsylvania land, for instance, can get only 14 per cent more than he could ten years ago he may be worse and not better situated than he was then; that is to say, he may be able to get less of the things he wants to buy with his money, as prices in general have advanced more than 14 per cent in ten years. But the Iowa and Illinois figures cannot be explained away in any such fashion, and the opinion that there has been, on the whole, an actual and a marked increase in land values is probably no delusion.



There is no such general agreement as to the prosperity of the farmers. The whole rural credit agitation, with the statements of fact on which it is based, especially so far as they relate to the need for short term loans and the explanations of the present high rates of interest paid for such accommodation, suggest conditions approaching distress. The figures as to increased farm tenancy do not indicate prosperity although they do indicate advancing farm values. The report of the New York State Food Investigating Commission (1912) has some passages which may help to explain the drift to the city:

"The methods of fixing prices to the producer need as careful thought as those of distribution. The producer seems to be receiving about 40 per cent of the retail price. Under the system of private treaty and commission sales still principally in use, the producers are growing restive and indignant and nearby sources of food supply are drying up."

And we are told of dairy farmers, going out of business in a period of advancing prices for dairy products.

But whatever may be the present situation, it seems clear enough what the effect of land value taxation would be. It would give to the farmer, as farmer, more of the results of his work and to the farmer, as landowner, a smaller income than he has now. It would encourage agricultural production and if applied to urban land, would, in

a similar way, lessen the income of the landlord and leave to the worker more of the results of his work and so encourage urban production. The relative advantages of rural and urban life would be weighed as they are now by those to whom both alternatives are open, but the advantages of either would be greater than they are now. Production in all lines would be encouraged and there would be a greater product to be exchanged between producers. The farmer might require a greater inducement to stay on the farm, but he would have a greater inducement in the greater proportion of his product he would be allowed to retain, and the increased urban production would give the farmer more satisfaction as the result of exchanges.



There remains the question of ethics. The Post does not go into particulars, but from experience in cases of conscience we may suppose that it is the vested rights question that is bothering it.

There is nothing new to be said on that point. We think that the present system takes from the producer and gives to the non-producer, and we think that is wrong. We do not see how you can compensate the people who benefit by the present system without taking the compensation out of the pockets of the others, and we think that would be wrong. If the New York Legislature had granted to Robert Fulton and his heirs and assigns forever the exclusive right to sail steamboats on the Hudson River, and if the mistake were only just being discovered, the vested interest would have some value. Nevertheless we believe that such a privilege could not justly be left to Fulton's heirs; nor could they be compensated except at the expense of those who have suffered by the mistake, which does not seem logical. And we think that the time to correct such mistakes is when they are discovered. Perhaps there are Singletaxers who will not agree to this; who think the remedy should be gradually applied. If so, they will have their way; there is no danger that anything that is right will be done in too much of a hurry.

WILLIAM E. MCKENNA.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE FARMER'S WELFARE.

Chicago, January 2.

The following query is one that the universally talked-of small-farmers of Denmark have proposed to themselves, and solved to their own entire satisfaction.

A farmer with wife and four children owns a farm

valued at \$6,000, and which yields an annual "net" income of \$1,000. The land is worth \$4,000, unimproved, the improvements are valued at \$2,000. Now arises this question: Upon the death of the parents, is it best for the children that the bare-land value has increased, or decreased, even to no selling value at all?

During the farmer's life, it is obvious that his income would remain about the same with the same application of labor, whether the value of the land rose or declined, since he would harvest no more grain, the cows give no more milk, the pigs no more hams and bacon, the chickens lay no more eggs, and the horses do no more work. Now, if upon the death of the parents the value of the farm still remained \$6,000, each child naturally would inherit \$1,500, and to have as good a farm as the father's, each of them would be obliged to borrow \$4,500.

If, however, the bare-land value rose to \$8,000, and the improvements remained \$2,000, each child would inherit \$2,500, but must borrow \$7,500, while the income would remain about the same as before. And if the bare-land value declined to \$2,000, plus the \$2,000 for improvements, each child would inherit only \$1,000, but need borrow only \$3,000, income remaining about the same, \$1,000. And lastly, if the bare-land value disappeared altogether, each child would inherit only \$500, but need borrow no more than \$1,500, to obtain as good a farm as the father left, while with the same application of labor, the "net" income would remain \$1,000, as before.

The farmer, of course, has to contribute to the expenses of government and this can be done in two ways. Either as now, by direct and indirect taxes, or by the surrender to society of the annual bare-land rental value. As a question of taxation it is evident the present direct taxes, except what land-tax there now is—as well as the indirect taxes, like the tariff, increase snowball fashion and the consumer finally pays all. The absorption by society of the annual rental value of urban as well as rural land in the unimproved state, would cut out this snowball feature, since rental value taxes, or ground-opportunity-dues, if the term is preferred, cannot be shifted to the consumer; a point on which all economists agree.

Small farming is, nationally viewed, the most desirable form of agriculture, because it produces more wealth than farming on a large scale, in well-settled communities, and it would naturally profit by the surrender of the bare-land rental value in lieu of all the present taxes. However, this taxing matter, though pertinent to the initial question, is left out of it, since the "net" income as stated is \$1,000, and the query thus remains: What is best for the farmer's children, an increasing or decreasing bare-land value, even to the extinction of all the bare-land value?

C. M. KOEDT.



"The Declaration of Independence states that all men are born free and equal, I believe?"

"Something of the sort."

"Then why do you hold yourself so aloof?"

"My dear man, I'm descended from one of its Signers."—Washington Herald.

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, January 13, 1914.

Volcanic Disaster in Japan.

Sakura-Jima, a volcano on a small island in the Gulf of Kagoshima in the extreme south of Japan, began without warning on the 11th to pour out smoke and flame, and to throw fiery rocks and ash far and wide. Simultaneously other volcanoes of the range became threateningly active and numerous earthquakes shook the whole region. How many of the 15,000 inhabitants of the island escaped in the boats that went to their rescue is not yet known. Kagoshima, a city of 60,000, three miles away on the west side of the gulf, is evacuated and six inches of ashes cover the nearby seaport city of Miyazaki.



Rural Credits Bill.

The bill prepared by the Federal Commission on Agricultural Credits headed by Senator Fletcher, was reported on January 8 to have been submitted to President Wilson and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. It may be changed before being introduced. In its present form it provides for the creation of farm land banks under the supervision of a commissioner of farm land banks—an office created by the bill. These banks will have Federal charters, and will issue debentures and lend the proceeds on first mortgages to farmers at higher rates of interest than will be paid to purchasers of debentures. The banks may be formed either by individual capitalists or by co-operative associations. Loans are to be repaid in small fixed annual installments. [See vol. xvi, pp. 777, 1161, 1177, 1182.]



Supreme Court Upsets Franchise Contracts.

That a State Public Utilities Commission may fix absolutely without regard to franchises or contracts the rates which public service corporations may charge, was decided on January 5 by the Supreme Court at Washington. The specific case involved was one involving the right of the State Public Utilities Commission of Kansas to regulate the rates of the Wyandot County Gas Company. The decision apparently effects every public utility franchise in the country and may enable Chicago and other cities to secure better terms from local corporations hitherto considered securely entrenched in power through franchise grants.

Chicago School Questions.

The Chicago Board of Education by a vote of 13 to 8 on January 7 discontinued the "personal purity" lectures which were begun in the high schools last October. This action was taken without debate, after caucus consideration. Much opposition from many sources had developed during the autumn, and press reports indicated that, considering the critical questions now at stake in the Chicago school system, those in favor of this instruction did not consider the matter of importance enough to make a stand upon at present. [See vol. xvi, pp. 708, 1116.]

At this same meeting of the Board, Peter Reinberg was re-elected president and John W. Eckhart, a new appointee, was chosen vice-president. Mrs. McMahan, a champion of Mrs. Young during the recent controversy, was appointed by President Reinberg chairman of the School Management Committee to succeed Dean Sumner, also a staunch champion of Mrs. Young. Charles S. Peterson was made chairman of the Finance Committee in place of Mr. Rothmann, whose opposition to Mrs. Young, along with that of Mr. Sonstebly, was plainly in evidence at this meeting, as at those preceding the December school crisis. [See current volume, page 10.]

The Chicago Tribune of January 11 made sensational and specific charges of graft in the purchase, during Mr. Lipsky's chairmanship of the Sites Committee, of public school sites on the part of certain West Side real estate dealers and certain relatives or friends of Congressman A. J. Sabath. The charge was that these persons bought up land just before its selection for school purposes and sold to the Board of Education at a large profit. Two investigations into this affair were provided for on the 12th. The City Council ordered its Committee on Schools to inquire and report; and the Board of Education, after an executive session, appointed a special committee of investigation consisting of eight men—five Board members, two real estate board officials, and a building construction employers' official.

Rangel-Cline Defense.

A committee has been formed at Los Angeles to raise funds for the defense of fourteen men in jail on a murder charge at San Antonio, Texas. The appeal for funds makes the following statement:

Fourteen men have been thrown into jail in Texas, one of them having been given already a life sentence and another one of twenty-five years. Eleven are still awaiting trial at San Antonio, and their lawyers assure us that six are in serious danger of

being sent to the gallows. These cases have their origin in the regulations forbidding men from entering Mexico with arms, and are, therefore, of exceptional interest just now. The prisoners were trying to cross the international frontier and were attacked without warning by Texas officials, who killed one of their party. In a subsequent encounter they lost two more men and two were wounded. They themselves killed a deputy sheriff, for which the murder charge has been brought against them.

The letter is signed Rangel-Cline Defense Fund per Victor Cravello, P. O. Box 1891, Los Angeles, California. The correspondence committee consists of M. Lissner, Jaime Vidal, M. Fasano and William C. Owen.

Mexico and the United States.

The capture of Ojinaga is the most striking feature of the week's news, marking, as it does, the end of Huerta's authority in the north. General Villa with an army of 6,000 men led the attack on the village the afternoon of the 10th, and by 10 o'clock the federal army of 4,000 was in flight, a few men and officers escaping by way of the river banks to the mountains, but the mass wading across the Rio Grande to surrender to the American troops guarding the frontier. Nearly all the civilians in Ojinaga accompanied the federals in their flight. Men and women waded breast deep through the water, carrying children, and such meager belongings as they could. The refugees were taken in charge by the American troops, the soldiers disarmed, the wounded cared for, and all given such aid as was possible. Secretary Garrison has ordered the Mexican officers and men, about 3,000 in number, transferred to Fort Bliss, where they will be interned indefinitely. The 1,500 civilians who are still at Presidio, will be allowed to remain in the United States, subject only to the restrictions of the immigration laws. [See current volume, page 33.]

No marked change is apparent in the situation at Mexico City. The financial phase is uppermost. Not only is Huerta short of money for his government, but business shows the lack of circulation. With a view to relieving the stress Huerta has undertaken to coin 200,000 silver half pesos—equal to 25 cents in American money—a week. He is also forcing the issue of State bank notes. Much depends upon the reception of this paper issue.

General Zapata is reported to be operating close to Mexico City on the south. His successes with his small army of bushwhackers—or brigands, as many call them—taken with General Villa's triumph in the north and the financial situation confronting Huerta, lend color to the report that

the American Government is massing men and ships near Vera Cruz and other ports leading to the interior with a view to preserving order when the government falls.



Germany and Its Army.

The courtmartial that considered the charges against the commanding officers in the Zabern garrison has returned a verdict of acquittal. Charges of arbitrary subversion of civil authority and of individual brutality were substantiated by good witnesses, and were tactily admitted by the judge-advocate, when he sought to mitigate the court's rigor by asking a sentence of seven days' imprisonment for Colonel von Reuter, and three days' imprisonment for Lieutenant Schad. But the court, recurring to the almost forgotten decree of 1820, which authorized the military commander to assume control whenever in his judgment it was necessary, approved the very acts that the Imperial Chancellor, Von Bethmann-Hollweg, in December declared to be unquestionably illegal. [See vol. xvi, p. 1212; current volume, page 1.]



This is a triumph for the army, but it is likely to end in arousing the people. The parties that put through the vote of nonconfidence in the Reichstag at the time of the trouble in Alsace between the garrison and the citizens are lining up in defense of constitutional principles. Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg is again defiant of his liberal critics, which means a further tightening of the lines between the people and the military.



Chinese Affairs.

Parliament was formally dissolved on the 11th by proclamation of President Yuan Shi Kai. This is the end of a Parliament that from lack of capable leaders and a coherent policy has been impotent from the beginning. The supreme control now rests in the hands of the President and the administrative council. The council was established by Yuan, November 12, and consists of 71 members made up from governors of provinces, military men, and members of the cabinet. President Yuan's latest proclamation says that Parliament will be reconvened in due course of time. [See vol. xvi, p. 1114, current volume, page 37.]



Z. F. How, founder and managing director of the Commercial Press, Shanghai, is reported assassinated on the 11th. He was an active, aggressive man who from a small printing office is said to have built up the finest printing house in Asia. Many educational works have been issued from this house, which have contributed toward the enlightenment of the people.

South African Labor Trouble.

Scarcely was the conflict between the whites and Hindus of Natal brought within bounds, with a prospect of peaceful solution, than the embers of discord in the Johannesburg mining region were fanned into flame, and the strike extended into the other mining camps, with a general strike imminent. The trouble already includes the railway employes; and the other unions are balloting on the question of a general sympathetic strike. Not only the miners of the Johannesburg district, but the various trades in the city have voted to go out. The strike of the Johannesburg branch of the typographical union is taken to mean the people of Johannesburg will have no newspapers. The grievance of the railway men is due to the policy of retrenchment of the South African railway company, which has led to the discharge of men. The men claim this is a move to reduce wages. [See vol. xvi, pp. 661, 1164.]



The government has ordered a general mobilization of troops, and it is estimated there are now 20,000 armed men on the Rand, many of whom saw service in the Boer War. Attempts to dynamite railroad bridges and other railroad property have been followed by orders to the guards to shoot to kill.



Coincident with the general unrest is the outbreak of 900 natives who escaped from the compound of the diamond mines at Jagersfontein on the 9th, when fifty negroes and two whites were killed. A second outbreak occurred on the 10th, resulting in the killing of seven and the wounding of thirty-six natives. This uprising is independent of the trouble at Johannesburg, and is said to be due to the killing of a Basuto by a white overseer.



The Labor War.

Governor Ferris of Michigan began on January 6 his investigation of conditions in the copper mine strike district. He first called on Sheriff Cruse of Houghton County for information. Sheriff Cruse reported that he had at the time 220 paid deputies throughout the county and between 1,500 and 1,600 others, who were employed and paid by the mining companies, but had been appointed by him. Only four of whole number, he said, were gunmen, furnished by the Waddell-Mahon strike-breaking agency. Some of the deputies were members of the State militia. Sheriff Hepting of Keeweenaw County reported that he had about seventy deputies, some of whom were employed by the mining companies and included in these were nineteen gunmen. Prosecutor Lucas of Houghton County told the Governor that the Waddell-Mahon strike breakers had mis-

treated prisoners until he had threatened them with prosecution. [See current volume, page 35.]



On January 7 Governor Ferris called on miners' union officials for information. The union officials said that the Western Federation of Miners was not responsible for the strike. It had been called by a vote of the miners contrary to the advice and wishes of the federation's officials. The vote was 7,680 for the strike to 125 against. The whole number entitled to vote at the time was about 9,000. The books of the union secretaries showed that 7,715 men were out on strike. The union representatives also told the Governor that they would stand on the proposals made by federal mediator John B. Densmore. These were an eight-hour day, as had already been instituted on December 1, wages as fixed on December 1, amounting to \$3.00 a day minimum for miners, and return to work of strikers without discrimination. They all expressed themselves willing and anxious to adjust difficulties.



On January 8 the Governor met the mine managers. Mr. Allan F. Rees, attorney for the Calumet and Hecla, said that when the Western Federation of Miners claimed to represent the men, an investigation was made which showed that less than twenty-five per cent of the miners in Houghton and Keeweenaw counties were members. In one mine, he said, 171 men admitted membership and 2,300 denied it. For this reason the companies had refused to recognize or treat with it, and all proposals for arbitration had been rejected because they carried with them recognition of the Western Federation. He said, further, that 9,368 men were at work in the mines as against 13,514 before the strike. The Governor questioned Mr. Rees concerning the attitude of the managers toward organized labor generally. Answering for himself only Mr. Rees said he favored unions, but "objected to the socialistic, anarchistic unions." F. W. Denton, manager of the Copper Range Consolidated, evaded a direct reply. The Governor declared that Labor has a right to organize and that there should be co-operation between Labor and Capital. He then asked whether the managers had any solution or plan of arbitration to offer. Mr. Rees, apparently speaking for all, answered that the companies were willing to conciliate grievances of employees and would correct abuses, but could make no specific offer.



Later in the day a committee of the Socialist party conferred with the Governor. The committee consisted of ex-Congressman Victor L. Berger, Charles Edward Russell and Seymour Stedman. They urged the Governor to use his power and

influence with the mining companies to force recognition of the Western Federation. This he refused to do. All efforts to bring about conciliation having failed the Governor left the copper district on the same day, summing up the result of his investigation as follows:

I think this is an inopportune time for executive action. The judicial machinery of the state is in full swing, and as governor I don't want to do or say things that might be constructed by any interest as an attempt to influence the course of justice. I got what I came here for. The strike cannot be settled in a week or a fortnight. I think if it were left to the miners and their employers it could be settled very quickly. It is the advice of the outsider—and this is a venturesome statement to make—that is likely to do more than anything else to prolong the strike.



Charles H. Moyer, president of the Western Federation of Miners, returned on January 7 to Hancock, Michigan, from which place he had been previously deported by a mob. He was accompanied by Charles Tanner, who had been deported with him, and by two detectives sent by the Governor to protect him. He gave out for publication a number of affidavits made by men who had been sent into the strike region by strike-breaking agencies. These affidavits told of the orderly behavior of strikers, of instructions given to assault peaceable men, of men forcibly detained at work in the mines against their will, and of other unlawful methods pursued. Both Mr. Moyer and Mr. Tanner went before the grand jury to testify. Moyer left Hancock on January 10 for Washington to attend a meeting of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor. The militia left the strike region on January 12.



An attempt by the Quincy Mining Company in the copper mine district to evict striking employees from the company's houses was prevented by an order of Circuit Judge P. H. O'Brien, setting aside or a ruling of the Circuit Court Commissioners of Houghton County ordering the eviction. The company appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court for a writ of mandamus to compel Judge O'Brien to vacate his order. On January 8 the Supreme Court passed on the question, refusing to issue the writ.



Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, made public on January 10 a report on the Michigan strike situation made by Walter B. Palmer, an investigator of the department. The report having been made prior to December 7 contained no reference to the Parnesdale shooting, the Christmas eve disaster or the deportation of Moyer. The report says that the strike was called on July

22 and began on the following day. The demands were recognition of the union, an eight-hour day and a \$3.00 minimum wage for all underground workers. Men to displace the strikers were brought into the district from Chicago and New York, having been secured by agencies which withheld the information from them that a strike was in progress. Affidavits made by some of these men showed that they had been forced into peonage. The report showed that before the strike underground hours of labor were from ten to eleven per day. In some mines the miners were paid as low as \$2.85 per shift and trammers as low as \$2.00. Miners employed by the Calumet-Hecla company earned during the six months ending June 30, 1913, an average of \$3.28 per shift. Other companies paid an average of \$2.74 per shift. The average of all was \$2.98. The average of trammers' earnings was \$2.75 per shift with the Calumet-Hecla and \$2.40 with other companies. Some of the smaller companies have operated at a loss, but the Calumet-Hecla, employing more than half of the total workers of the region, has made enormous profits. It was organized in 1871. The actual cash capital paid in was \$1,200,000. Dividends paid since amount to \$121,050,000, besides investments of \$75,000,000 made out of earnings.

The Chicago Tribune on January 12 published some features of Investigator Palmer's report which were not contained in Secretary Wilson's original statement. This told of drunkenness among militiamen who were allowed to wander around armed in this condition, of violence resulting in fatalities provoked by imported deputies, of lack of provisions for safety and sanitation in the mines, of work imposed on trammers in the mines which soon permanently disables them, and of the fact that houses have been sold to employes by the Calumet and Hecla built on leased ground, one condition of the lease being that if the lessor "should cease to be an employe of the company by discharge or otherwise" he may be dispossessed and the company take possession of house and land. A resolution to investigate the situation was introduced immediately on the reassembling of Congress on January 12 by Senator Ashurst of Arizona, and referred to the contingent expense committee. It provoked criticism from Senators Townsend of Michigan and Lodge of Massachusetts.

A committee of five appointed on November 17 by labor leaders on the suggestion of Governor Ammons of Colorado to investigate conditions in the Trinidad district reported on January 6. Their report was in the form of a telegram to all Colorado Congressmen declaring that the militia "has grossly violated the constitutional

rights of the strikers," that the deportation of "Mother" Jones was "a high-handed affair," and asked that a congressional investigation be ordered immediately. Congressman Edward Keating answered promptly that he would do all in his power to obtain an investigation. On January 12, "Mother" Jones returned to Trinidad, was arrested by militiamen immediately upon arrival and ordered by General Chase to be held in prison "incommunicado." A protest was telegraphed by President John P. White against her arrest to President Wilson, Secretary of Labor Wilson, and Governor Ammons.

The appeal for a new trial of the officers and members of the Structural Iron Workers' Union, convicted of conspiracy to dynamite at Indianapolis in December, 1912, was passed upon by the United States Circuit Court at Chicago on January 6. In the cases of twenty-four of the men the conviction was upheld. In the case of six new trials were granted. The twenty-four convictions sustained were of Frank M. Ryan, Eugene Clancy, Michael J. Young, Frank C. Webb, Charles W. Beum, Henry W. Legleitner, Ernest G. W. Bases, Philip A. Cooley, John T. Butler, John H. Berry, J. E. Munsey, Peter J. Smith, Paul T. Morrin, William E. Reddin, Michael J. Hannon, Murray L. Pennell, W. Bert Brown, George Anderson, Frank J. Higgins, Frank H. Painter, Edward Smythe, Fred J. Mooney, William Shupe and Michael J. Cunnane. An application in their behalf for a rehearing has been made and a stay of thirty days allowed. Should the rehearing be refused an appeal to the Supreme Court will be taken. Those granted a new trial are Olaf A. Tveitmoe, William McCain, James E. Ray, Richard H. Houlihan, Fred Sherman and William Bernhardt. [See vol xvi, p. 1165.]

Final arguments in the appeal of Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and Frank Morrison, from conviction of contempt by Judge Wright of the District of Columbia, were made before the Supreme Court on January 8.

The Supreme Court of Massachusetts on January 10 upheld the constitutionality of the statute which compels employers advertising for help during labor troubles to state that a strike exists.

The Ford Motor Company, of Detroit, instituted on January 5 a profit-sharing plan with its employes by which a minimum wage of \$5 a day is established in its factories. As explained by Mr. Henry Ford, the plan is as follows:

Every man in our employ over the age of 22 years,

who is not working on a salary, will share in the distribution of profits. The man of a minimum wage of \$2.34 will receive an additional \$2.66 per day, semi-monthly, and all the men who do the actual work will receive the same increase. Foremen and superintendents and all other salaried men will continue to share as usual in the distribution by bonus at the close of the year, based solely on merit. They are passed on by the management. Last year we distributed in bonuses from \$200,000 to \$300,000 in this way with about 200 men receiving an average of \$1,000 each.

NEWS NOTES

—The record of German municipal activities was set by the town of Briessen, Saxony, which made a municipal grant of \$12.50 to its chief mail wagon conductor in recognition of the birth of his thirtieth child.

—Nine million Japanese are reported as starving because of the crop failures in Hokkaido and other northeastern districts. The scale of living is so meager that a crop failure leaves the natives nothing to fall back upon but charity.

—The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the engineering departments of Harvard University are hereafter to be united, the combined classes being conducted in the new buildings of the Institute in Cambridge under the instruction of the faculties of both institutions.

—Increased representation for Ulster in the Irish Parliament is one of the suggestions of the Unionist Protestants to solve the trouble between Catholic and Protestant Ireland under home rule. Little progress, however, is visible in the negotiations for a settlement. [See current volume, page 10.]

—Negotiations between the United States and Colombia for the settlement of the matters of dispute arising from the Panama rebellion are said to be progressing satisfactorily at Bogota. It is expected that the issues will be adjusted within a few weeks. [See vol. xvi, pp. 970, 989.]

—John Skelton Williams of Virginia, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, was nominated on the 13th as Comptroller of the Currency by President Wilson. Great importance is added to this office by the provision of the Currency Bill which makes the Comptroller of the Currency a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

—Since the launching of the first Dreadnought 101 of these war monsters have been added to the world's fighting fleets. Of these, England has built 34, Germany 22, United States 10, France 7, Italy 6, Russia 5, Japan 5, Austria and Brazil 3 each, Spain and Argentina 2 each, and Turkey and Chile 1 each. In 1911 Great Britain possessed 24 of the world's 63 dreadnoughts; now she has 34 of the 101.

—In answer to an open letter from Upton Sinclair urging him to become a Socialist, Vincent Astor replied on January 11 declining to do so. Mr. Astor's reasons were that leading officials of the American Federation of Labor with whom he is associated in various organizations, do not accept the socialist

philosophy. He further stated that he believes "that the condition of the laboring people has greatly improved during the last few generations."

—By a vote of four to one, the city commission of Springfield, Illinois, ordered a special election on January 27 at which a popular vote will be taken on an ordinance prepared by Commissioner Spaulding, to combine the municipally owned water and light plants. An initiative petition for the submission of this question had been filed December 31 signed by 5,641 voters, but the mayor had questioned its legality and called on the Attorney General of the state for a ruling. Although the ruling upheld the validity of the action, the mayor still opposed the action of the commission in calling an election, but his was the only vote cast against Commissioner Spaulding's motion ordering the action taken. [See vol. xvi, p. 1189.]

—With the aid of six Progressive party members the candidate of the Republican reactionaries for Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives was elected on January 8. The new speaker is Grafton D. Cushing. He received 123 votes. His principal opponent, George P. Webster, Progressive, received 109 votes. Peter F. Tague, Democrat, received five votes and Charles H. Morrill, Socialist, one. Through the efforts of Reverend Roland D. Sawyer, former Socialist candidate for Governor, now a Democratic legislator, a union of Democrats and Progressives had been arranged to elect Webster. This arrangement was defeated through the treachery of the following six Progressives: James M. Lyle of Gloucester, Cleveland A. Chandler of East Bridgewater, Alfred N. Fessenden of Townsend, Charles H. Webster of Northfield, Fred W. Cross of Royston and George E. Briggs of Lexington. [See vol. xvi, p. 1090.]

—Judge Smith McPherson of the United States District Court at Kansas City, Missouri, declined on January 10 to dismiss an injunction he had issued nearly seven years ago, although this refusal seems a failure to comply with a mandate of the Supreme Court. The injunction forbid the State of Missouri from enforcing against the railroads of the State two-cent passenger fare and maximum freight rate laws. A bond of \$10,000 was put up by each one of the railroads at the time, and they have since charged and collected the old rates. Six months ago the Missouri law was upheld by the Supreme Court, and the attorney general of the State, John T. Barker, entered suit against the roads for \$24,000,000 excess in passenger and freight rates paid them since enactment. Finding Judge McPherson's old injunction still in the way, he asked that it be dismissed. On December 20, 1913, Judge McPherson was about to dismiss the injunction when the attorney for the railroads asked him to retain jurisdiction so that he might limit their liability to the \$10,000 bond put up. This the Judge did and the attorney general's suits have since been held up. Refusal to dismiss the injunction on January 10 led to a scene in court when Attorney General Barker used this plain language to the Judge: "Your honor can't police this state to protect railroads." He announced his intention to take the matter to the Supreme Court in the following words: "If you don't issue a decree as the higher court ordered, I'll see if that court will not make

you." Judge McPherson did not resent the openly expressed contempt. [See vol. xvi, p. 586.]

PRESS OPINIONS

Lawless Enforcement of Law.

New York World, January 6.—"Mother" Jones has been driven out of Colorado by State troops for the crime of appearing in the State while a strike was in progress. In Oregon the Governor has taken military possession of a town because two saloons were open. In Alabama the Mayor of Florence has refused to recognize a pardon granted by the Governor to a woman sentenced to work 200 days on the road for a violation of the Prohibition law. In West Virginia, as a member of a Senate investigating committee, Senator Borah of Idaho reports that citizens have been arrested, tried, convicted and imprisoned by the military authority contrary to the Constitution and laws, and that these military trials took place while the civil courts were open and unobstructed. The Assistant Attorney-General for the Post Office Department complains that "criminal proceedings are necessarily slow," and therefore the department is justified in using summary measures in dealing with offenses against the postal laws. The American people are raising up a curious crew of petty despots who will cause them a great deal of trouble some day unless they are soon suppressed. Government by law cannot be trampled underfoot indefinitely, even by obscure office-holders, without serious consequences.



Legalized Murder Fails to Stop Crime.

Cleveland (Ohio) Press, December 19.—The State executed a man for murder a week ago. Since that day thugs have killed one man and fatally wounded another at Bowling Green, murdered and robbed a theater manager in Cleveland, wounded a youth who interfered with them at London, Ohio, shot and wounded a grocer near Akron, and have used violence in robbery in scores of instances throughout the State. In theory, the extreme vengeance of the law is supposed to prevent crime by scaring malefactors. In practice, it does nothing of the kind. If Frank Kinney's sentence of death had been commuted to life imprisonment, many very excellent people would have said that the governor's mercy was responsible for the wave of crime that has swept the State in the last five or six days. The governor did not commute Kinney's sentence, however, and Kinney died in the electric chair. Crime has not been checked.



How to Get Rich Without Working.

Jackson (Mich.) Patriot, November 14.—John D. Rockefeller recently told a friend in Cleveland, Ohio, how to get rich without wickedness. "See that tract of land there!" he said, pointing to a part of his Forest Hill estate. "All I did was to buy that for \$5,000 seven years ago, and now it is worth \$70,000." Mr. Rockefeller had done nothing to aid

this increase—not a thing. In fact he had been a non-resident most all the time. What he said emphasizes the point which Lloyd George is making in England and which Henry George made in America. It is this: Men put money into land and do nothing to improve it; their neighbors improve surrounding property; the city grows; society increases its value and they are made richer. This was the foundation of the Astor fortunes. Perhaps, some of these days, society will assert its inherent and legal rights to a portion at least of this unearned increment, by taxing the bare land value more and the improvements less, as a simple act of justice.



The Sherman Law Menaces Labor.

American Federationist, January.—Only a few months ago the officials of the United Mine Workers were indicted under the Sherman Anti-trust law because they helped the miners of West Virginia to break the shackles by which the mining companies held them helpless objects of exploitation. The mine operators forced the constituted authorities of the state to do their bidding. The miners could appeal to no one for justice. Their only defense lay in their ability to enforce their rights through their united organized power. To strip them of that defense is the purpose of the litigation begun by the indictment charging that organization with restraint of trade. . . . The right to organize is a sham, a trick, a deceit, unless it carries with it the right to organize effectively and the right to use that organized power to further the interests of the workers. This implied right must be assured. . . . The indictments by the federal grand jury were accompanied by a report, a portion of which criticised the miners—this was given wide publicity by the daily press; another portion criticised in more moderate terms the mine operators—this was not given equal publicity. . . . Despite the statements of law-breaking no indictments were returned against the coal operators. Why? Why is it that our laws may be perverted and interpreted to prevent those who toil from doing things necessary for their protection and betterment? Why is it that men of wealth may with impunity break laws whose meaning is plain and unmistakable? . . . That law which was intended to benefit human beings, to prevent or check monopoly and absolute control over the products of labor and of the soil, to assure to the people the necessities of life at reasonable prices, has proved useless in establishing control or regulation over the trusts and monopolies. In a spirit of ironic glee these same monopolies, trusts, and corporations, unharmed by the law which was to have regulated them, now turn this law against the human beings who were to have been protected.



It has been pointed out that "potato" cood, cwiet consistentli with valyuz atatch to leterz in uthur wurdz, be speld "gheaphtheightteough". Heer iz the unraveling: "gh" in "hiccough", "eau" in "beau", "phth" in "phtthisis", "eigh" in "weight", "tte" in "gazette", and "ough" in "though". The seed ov a nyu form ov speling bee iz heer.—The Pioneer.

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

AVE!

For The Public.

Lean and weazened and ancient, aged in ways of guile,
A heart throb of synchronized profits, the flaccid and unctuous smile,
Full seventy years in the making this famine grey
thing of greed
That has lusted and wormed and taken to fatten its sordid need;



And faded and spent is a lifetime bent aye to a tireless clutch
While the dreams that the angels gave him crumbled to gold at his touch,
Gold that is hot with passions and gold that is cruel as ice—
The cheapest gifts on the footstool for those who will pay the price—
Grim and gaunt in the gaining in this strife for an ashen toll
He prayed for the gift of Midas nor weighed him the barren soul.
Mammon and Croesus and Midas, immortalized symbols of pelf
From the fabled days of Creation, all lost in the love of Self.
And lo, this web that lured him thrilled in his eager hands

And a master bent lowly and servile caressing the golden strands,
And ever in eager serfdom, spinning aye through cold and heat,
Shriving and spinning and shriving, and shunning the public street.

Now the blood runs cool in its courses and cool is a human soul
That lived for an aimless passion and strove for a visionless goal.
Measure for measure was given heaped high with his treasured world—
Yet an eye for an eye is a measure—now a blinded life is unfurled
That looms like a spectral warning through the mists of the shrouded years,
Like a lonely spar on a bleak, bleak coast that curbs with its proven fears,
Or a reef or a beacons headland—ho, you seaman or city dweller—
Shrivelled and shunning and naked, what would you, a Rockefeller?

CHARLES JOHNSON POST.



SOME FRIENDS OF OURS.

No. 2. The Wood-Chopper's Lie.

For The Public.

There was once a man whom I knew very well. He was growing old, after a long and adventurous life. Born with the traditional "silver spoon in his mouth," he had received a college education, had become quite a noted railroad man, had lost his money, then drifted around the world, a seemingly worthless tramp and hard-drinker at last. Finally he had thought it out deliberately, at the age of fifty, and had somehow "found his soul," relating himself once more to the earth and the heavens.

This man went up into the mountains, and became a wood-chopper, and soon a contractor in a small way, for he had brains, system, and the most striking integrity in little things, as well as in large ones. In ten years he had a couple of thousand dollars in the bank; he expected to retire to some little old cabin when he had five thousand, smoke his daily pipe, cultivate his garden, cook his dinner, read his books, study in his own line (for he loved higher mathematics).

He had many relatives, cousins, nephews, nieces, scattered over the world. Some of these he had offended in his brusque career, and they always poked fun at him. Also, as it happened, there was one relative who never tired of alluding to him as "Our rich Californian lumberman uncle, who is rolling in money, and yet is too mean to help any of us." The tradition grew in family circles; he was really thought to be a capitalist—this old fellow who worked at the head of his crew, swinging an axe with the best of them, and

who saved every cent so as to keep out of the poor-house!

A letter came to him from the Philippines one day; it was from his favorite niece; he had told her stories when she was a little girl, when he was a money-making railroad man. She told him her sad life, with entire truth and simplicity; she was now a penniless widow with four children, but she knew of an opening in San Francisco. If her dear uncle, her rich lumberman uncle in California, could only lend her five thousand dollars, first looking up the references and details which she gave, she could support herself and her children.

It took the old wood-chopper about five minutes to make up his mind on this matter. And this is the letter he wrote:

"Dear Mary: I have been prospered beyond my expectations, and yet this year is one in which all business enterprises find ready money scarce. I am sending you my check for two thousand dollars, which you are to consider a gift to the children, and I hope you will prosper greatly. My business plans are such that I cannot do more than this in justice to others. This little item is just between ourselves, and for my dear niece, who was such a nice little girl in old Vermont, awhile back."

The wood-chopper read the letter over before he sealed it, and laughed gloriously as he sat in his one-room cabin on an old coal-oil case. "Is it a lie, or is it not a lie?" he said. "But I couldn't get her to take a cent if she knew the absurd facts. She will call me a mean old sinner for not sending all she asked for. Poor little Mary; four children! Of course her rich uncle will remember her in his will! Now I'll buckle down to hard work; this is my very last spree!"

The wood-chopper sealed the letter, and took it out to the road and put it on a stump, with a rock on top. The first person who passed would mail it. But a cattleman came along that minute—

"Say, Fred, have you registered for the election?"

"I haven't, Billy Dane."

"That's all wrong. Here's your papers to sign; new county register."

"All right, Billy." He filled the blanks, struck out "wood-chopper" under "occupation," filled it bravely: "Frederick Joseph Watson, Retired Capitalist, age sixty-three."

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.



A WONDERFUL OLD LADY.

For The Public.

Yesterday I saw her again. A dear old lady in shabby black clothes, plodding along the muddy street, carrying her heavy basket. Tired, worn

old face? Not on your tintype. Strong, quiet, gentle, cheerful. Last week her daughter was taken with a severe case of blood-poisoning in one arm (they mend sacks for a grist-mill, and the filth had gotten into an open sore), and it is nip and tuck whether the girl's life will be saved.

The "old man" has a "pension." That is, when he got too old to work in the warehouse ten hours a day, bucking sacks, they gave him a job as general roustabout, twelve or thirteen hours a day, at twenty a month. He is at work before six in the morning, "getting ready for the men," and for the rest of the day he does—well, if it isn't men's work I don't know. Oh, he doesn't work like that every day—a good part of the time he is laid up at home with "lumbago."

"He worries too much," the old lady confided to me. "I tell him if he would only stop his worrying he would fat up and git well."

Religion? She denies it. Says she has "no time for this here Church business." She has a wonderful religion, nevertheless. I have seen it in her face—strong, quiet, gentle, cheerful.

HARRY W. OLNEY.



ON THE DECK OF THE WORLD.

From "Walden" by Henry David Thoreau.

I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to front the only essential facts of life, and see if I could not learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived. I did not wish to live what was not life, living is so dear; nor did I wish to practice resignation, unless it was quite necessary. I wanted to live deep and suck out all the marrow of life, to live so sturdily and Spartan-like as to put to rout all that was not life, to cut a broad swath and shave close, to drive life into a corner, and reduce it to its lowest terms, and, if it proved to be mean, why then to get the whole and genuine meanness of it, and publish its meanness to the world; or if it were sublime, to know it by experience, and be able to give a true account of it in my next excursion. . . .

I left the woods for as good a reason as I went there. Perhaps it seemed to me that I had several more lives to live, and could not spare more time for that one. It is remarkable how easily and insensibly we fall into a particular route, and make a beaten track for ourselves. I had not lived there a week before my feet wore a path from my door to the pond-side; and though it is five or six years since I trod it, it is still quite distinct. It is true, I fear, that others may have fallen into it, and so helped to keep it open. The surface of the earth is soft and impressible by the feet of men; and so with the paths which the mind travels. How worn and dusty, then, must be the highways of the world—how deep the ruts of tradition and

conformity! I do not wish to take a cabin passage, but rather to go before the mast and on the deck of the world, for there I could best see the moonlight amid the mountains. I do not wish to go below now.

I learned this, at least, by my experiment: that if one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and endeavors to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with a success unexpected in common hours. He will put some things behind, will pass an invisible boundary; universal, and more liberal laws will begin to establish themselves around and within him; or the old laws be expanded, and interpreted in his favor in a more liberal sense, and he will live with the freedom of a higher order of beings. In proportion as he simplifies his life, the laws of the universe will appear less complex, and solitude will not be solitude, nor poverty poverty, nor weakness weakness. If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put foundations under them.

BOOKS

TO ABOLISH STATE BOUNDARIES.

The States-Rights Fetish: A Plea for Real Nationalism. By Henry Leffmann. Published by the Author, 1817 N. 17th St., Philadelphia. 1913. Price, 50 cents.

This as a 63-page argument favoring the abolition of State governments. Under the caption "Baleful Effects of Jeffersonian Theories" is contained a review of the events leading up to what the author terms the "War between the States." He not only charges this war up to the doctrine of States rights, but he shows that it could never have gained such rapid headway in the absence of State governments. "Before Lincoln's administration was six months old," he says, "a new compact had been formed and the nation was ablaze with war. Nothing is more certain than that the extent and rapidity of secession were promoted by the existence of separate States with all the attributes of sovereignty."

The strongest claim made for State sovereignty is that decentralization of power is necessary to liberty. Yet the first eight Amendments to the United States Constitution, "containing probably the most concise and comprehensive code of personal liberty ever given to the world" are thru "the blighting hand of State sovereignty" no protection against encroachments on the citizen's liberty by the States, for any State can "deprive its citizens and the citizens of all other States that may be within its borders, of all rights vouchsafed by the Amendments." These Amendments have "been held by a long line of authorities" to apply only

where the Federal government seeks to invade the rights of the citizen.

The States can and have abridged the freedom guaranteed under the so-called Bill of Rights contained in these eight Amendments. "In the early days of the Union" in some States even "the right to vote and hold office was given only to those professing Christianity; indeed, in some," the particular brand of Christianity was designated. Jews were under civil disabilities in Maryland as late as 1825.

The waste and unnecessary expenditure involved in the duplication of State and Federal activities are not to be overlooked. The pure food acts are good illustrations of these evils. The national pure food law reversed the rule laid down in the Mosaic law: "Ye shall not eat of any thing that dieth of itself: thou mayest sell it unto an alien." Deut. 14;21. The reversal of this scriptural rule resulted in dumping all the inferior and adulterated food products on the consumers of the State in which they were manufactured, forcing the States to enact their own health laws and to provide food commissions, inspectors and health officers. Other expensive State commissions of almost endless variety have also been provided. The burden of taxes imposed by reason of more than a score of such commissions in every State is becoming an intolerable burden on the taxpayers. These functions could all be much better performed by the Federal government with practically none of the cost entailed by State administration.

The author concludes the book with an outline of his methods for national administration. He would divide the country somewhat on the plan devised for the regional banks, providing, however, for the maintenance of the present corporate existence of cities. He would "increase the function of local self-government, relegating to the individual communities many powers and duties belonging to State governments and often very badly administered by these." If municipal home rule can only be obtained by the sacrifice of State governments—it may well be said "it's worth the price."

E. J. BATTEN.



JESUS AND HIS TEACHINGS.

Out of the Muck. By Lincoln Steffens. Published by Hillacre Bookhouse, Riverside, Conn., 1913. Price, 25 cents.

There was printed in Everybody's Magazine* in December, 1911, what Mr. Ridgeway called "the most remarkable Christmas contribution I have ever read." It was a letter from Lincoln Steffens written in defense of his challenged statement—made in the course of an editorial discussion on censorship—that Jesus was "against the use of

*See The Public, vol. xiv, p. 1249; vol. xv, p. 42.

force altogether." Many readers will remember the author's surprisingly human interpretation of Jesus' treatment of the money-changers in the temple, and will be interested to learn that the epistle has been republished in the form of a booklet fashioned simply and beautifully to frame the rare sincerity within.

A. L. G.

PERIODICALS

Songs of Brotherhood.

The Survey of January 3 is a "Social Hymn Number." Twelve jurors have counseled with Mabel Hay Barrows Mussey for months in her task of selecting one hundred new and old hymns "of Brotherhood and Social Aspiration." "We tried," writes Mrs. Mussey, "to choose hymns which Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, might sing with equal fervor. To this common store were added a few which voiced the special messages of each of many groups. . . . We have drawn the line to include hymns of cheer, courage and inspiration, leaving to the church hymnals the other phases of religious life." A tune has been selected for each hymn, and in a number of instances,—where not a well-known favorite—printed along with the words. There are besides these hundred hymns, several excellent articles on social songs: one by Mary E. McDowell, embracing translations of Polish, Lithuanian and Bohemian patriotic songs; and another, entitled "Songs for Labor," in which Elizabeth Balch offers examples of English labor-class songs, from the time of the peasants' rising in the 14th century and the Chartist movement of the 19th, through the whole American labor movement down to the present.

A. L. G.



"Everyone has some secret sorrow," says a philosophising friend. "Even the fattest and jolliest of us has a skeleton in his midst."—Plain Dealer.



"Waiter," asked the impatient customer, "do you call this an oyster-stew?"

"Yessuh," replied Erastus Pinkley.

"Why, the oyster in this stew isn't big enough to flavor it."

"He wasn't put in to flavor it, suh. He's jes' supposed to christen it."—Washington Star.

R. B. BRINSMADE, E. M., Consulting Engineer
Expert Investigation of Mexican Mines, Lands or Enterprises.
"ABC" Code—1a Pasaador Mex. No. 3, Puebla, Poo., Mexico

THE CHICAGO SINGLETAX CLUB

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

Jan. 16, EDWARD GATES, "Capital Defined."

Jan. 23, GEORGE J. KNAPP, of Pueblo, Colo.,

"Singletax and Lower Taxes."

Otto Cullman, Pres.

Milton D. Bryce, Sec.

"Why don't you work in your garden and get an appetite?"

"The appearance of the vegetables in my garden," replied Mr. Crosslots, "discourages an appetite."—Washington Star.

"Trusts Good and Bad"

By LOUIS F. POST

We have had reprinted in a handsome 64-page booklet, with a portrait of Mr. Post, Part IV of "The Ethics of Democracy", which explains the fundamentals of the trust question.

Trusts are now "before the house". Anti-Trust Legislation is pending and it is important that the source of whatever malign power the trusts have, should be thoroughly understood.

Single Copies 15c. 10 Copies \$1.00

THE CHAPTER HEADS ARE:

"Department Stores," "General Business Concentration," "The Rage for Trusts," "The Trend of the Trust," "Trust Evolution," "The Trust and Socialism," "The Trust and Singletax."

Get a supply for distribution amongst the thinking public men and women in your town and state. Single copies 15c. Ten copies only \$1.

THE PUBLIC

ELLSWORTH BLDG., CHICAGO

Anything that

protects the wife and mother
protects the whole family.
There's nobody of more account in the world.

Many a woman would be better, stronger and happier if her work was easier. Fels-Naptha Soap makes all kinds of work easy, takes half the time, and saves women's strength. It does the best work in cool or lukewarm water.