

to their relieving themselves, which, after all, is the thing to be desired.

Mr. Herrick's twelfth objection to the single tax is that it "would not reach the so-called monopolistic class."

That depends upon what Mr. Herrick means by "so-called." But we need not concern ourselves about any "so-called monopolistic class" if we can reach the real monopolistic class.

What class is that?

Can any class be more fundamentally monopolistic than the class that owns all the most valuable sites for industrial activity which the earth affords? We should suppose not. And that class would be reached by the single tax.

We now come to the thirteenth and final objection which Mr. Herrick interposes to the single tax, and the one he places "above all" the others. The single tax, he says, "has been a disastrous failure in the only instances of experience."

It would be interesting to know to what "instances of experience" Mr. Herrick alludes. But he was reticent in his speech and we must glance over the entire field.

Down in Alabama, on Mobile Bay, there is a settlement called Fairhope. Its promoters declare that it is as faithful an experiment in the single tax as the existing laws of Alabama and the United States permit. Whether they are right makes no difference so far as the present point is concerned. The important thing is that if Fairhope is not a single tax experiment it does not come within Mr. Herrick's "instances of experience," and if it is a single tax experiment it is one that has not been "a disastrous failure" but is a very notable success.

Over the seas, in Australasia, there are some fiscal experiments that may be called single tax experiments in a very limited way. We refer to the communities, especially in New Zealand, that have adopted the single tax method of raising their own local revenues. All these experiments are successful. The people of the respective communities refuse to abolish them, and neighboring

communities are adopting them.

Beyond this we know of no single tax experiments, nor of anything that can with any approach to fairness be called a single tax experiment, with the possible exception of the German land system in China which is regarded as successful thus far.

Mr. Herrick would perform a public service by descending from elusive general assertions to tangible particulars and specifying—

(1) What "instance of experience" in the application of the single tax anywhere in the world, at any time in history, has been "a disastrous failure."

(2) Why he regards it as a single tax instance.

(3) Why, in his opinion, it has failed.

These explanations ought to be easy to furnish if Mr. Herrick's very general assertion has any basis in his own mind.

Mr. Herrick has apparently thrown together a collection of college boy objections to the single tax. This appearance, however, may be deceptive. Possibly he really understands the single tax and in his speech was laying down thirteen propositions against it which he is prepared to maintain. If that is the truth of the matter, he owes it to his reputation for personal intelligence and fair dealing to defend his position. As his statement stands it is erroneous in many of its assertions of fact and fallacious in most of its conclusions.

HENRY DEMAREST LLOYD.

Among the names that have come to be familiar in the English speaking world in connection with the industrial questions of recent years, is that of Henry Demarest Lloyd, who died suddenly of pneumonia on the 28th at Chicago. His fame was most general, perhaps, as the author of "Wealth Against Commonwealth," an exposure of the development of the Standard Oil trust, which, published many years ago, is still the standard work on that subject.

But Mr. Lloyd was not a man of one book nor of one act of public service. Among his other contributions to industrial literature

are two books on labor conditions in Australasia (vol. iii, p. 629)—"Newest England" and "A Country Without Strikes." They are pioneer books about the pioneer experiments in economics of a pioneer country; and with due regard for Mr. Lloyd's economic point of view, no one can seriously criticize them. Even his adversaries in economic and industrial controversy must appreciate their value and acknowledge the ability and fidelity of their author.

Mr. Lloyd distinguished himself in another way last Winter as the professional associate of Clarence S. Darrow in the legal work for the anthracite coal miners before the arbitration commission. With sometimes more distinction and sometimes less, he has frequently responded as writer and lawyer and speaker to the calls of labor organizations. Although a man of large means, his sympathies and service were at the command of the disinherited workers. It was not as a dole-out of charity, not as a sympathizer with individual suffering merely, that he approached the working classes; it was as a man who realized that men like himself are victims of industrial conditions which neither he nor they could control but against which it was the duty of both to fight.

It was in this spirit that Mr. Lloyd entered upon the struggle for municipal ownership of the Chicago street car systems, as the adviser and the leader in that connection of the Chicago Federation of Labor. This was the impulse that spurred him on in the work that cost his life at the very moment when his leadership seemed most to be needed.

The trend of Mr. Lloyd's economic philosophy was socialistic. That was the direction in which his democratic impulses carried him, although he was not especially identified with organizations or movements distinctively allied with or representing socialism. But in whatever light socialism may be regarded, no one could know Mr. Lloyd with any degree of intimacy without realizing that the goal he sought, whether or not the direction he took seemed to others mistaken, was a democratic state of society. He was one of those rare men who

follow their convictions rather than their interests. His integrity commanded respect while his enthusiasm inspired affection.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 1.

The Chicago traction question (p. 394) was the occasion of a mass meeting on the 27th in Handel Hall, at which the principal speakers were Mayor Jones, of Toledo, and Negley G. Cochran, editor of the Toledo News-Bee. William Prentiss presided. Among the local speakers was Charles L. Bonney, one of the legal experts in traction matters in Chicago. Mr. Bonney explained to the audience that if the Mueller act (p. 102) were accepted by the people of Chicago, so as to become law there, the city would have full legal power to enter at once upon the municipal ownership and operation of the street car system by condemning the existing systems to public use. In this connection he cited decisions of the Supreme Courts of the State and of the United States to show that if the jury in condemnation proceedings were to assess the value of the 99-years franchise (p. 195) at one dollar or one cent, such valuation would be conclusive.

On the following night, September 28th, representatives from the Handel Hall meeting and from the Federation of Labor, the Turnverein, and the Delegate Municipal Ownership convention were in attendance at the meeting of the city council with an immense popular petition favoring the postponement of all extensions of street car franchises until after the adoption of the Mueller act, and demanding the submission of that act to popular vote. The council-room gallery was crowded with a large and quiet audience drawn out by the call (p. 394) of the Federation of Labor.

No action was taken, however, either by the city council or the civic organizations in attendance upon it. The leader of the movement had been Henry D. Lloyd, and Mr. Lloyd was to have brought the petition to the attention of

the council. His death in the morning of the 28th necessitated delay. The probability is that Mr. Prentiss will be requested to act in Mr. Lloyd's place to promote the movement, and that some action will be taken in the matter at the council meeting of the 5th.

Henry Demarest Lloyd, whose death is mentioned above, was born at Belleville, N. J., near Newark, May 1, 1847. He acquired his education in New York city, where he was admitted to the bar in 1869. In the early '70's he was secretary of the American Free Trade League, a position which he resigned upon coming to Chicago in 1872. For several years thereafter Mr. Lloyd served on the staff of the Chicago Tribune in the positions successively of night city editor, financial editor and editorial writer. Subsequently he wrote "Wealth Against Commonwealth," intending it as a mine of facts relative to American monopolies, the truth of which could be absolutely relied upon because drawn from incontestable sources. His later books were "Newest England" and "A Country Without Strikes," both having to do with Australasia, where the author personally gathered his materials. Other books of his are "Labor Copartnership" and "A Strike of Millionaires Against Miners." As one of the attorneys for the striking anthracite miners Mr. Lloyd assisted Clarence S. Darrow before the arbitration commission (vol. v, p. 807) last Winter. An enthusiastic believer in municipal ownership, who feared that the Chicago movement in that direction would be diverted if the Mueller act of Illinois were not submitted to popular vote in Chicago, Mr. Lloyd left his summer residence in the East several weeks ago to devote his time and energies to the work of organizing an agitation in Chicago for the adoption of that act. It was while engaged in this work that he invited the illness of which he died. He addressed the Chicago Federation of Labor on the 20th, inducing that body to adopt the resolutions outlined in these columns at page 394, an effort that developed a cold into pneumonia, with which his frail physique could not cope. He died on the 28th. A memorial

meeting is in contemplation. Mr. Lloyd left in manuscript a discussion of the Chicago traction problem, to the preparation of which he had devoted several months with a view to publishing it as a book.

An amazing instance of contempt by the military for civil authority is reported from Colorado in connection with a miners' strike in Teller county. This strike began about the middle of last August. It was called by the Western Federation of Miners in support of the 8-hour day. The Mine Owners Association met the strike by applying to Gov. Peabody for troops, alleging that a large percentage of the men would work if protection were assured. The necessity for troops was denied by the sheriff of the county, who advised the Governor that the only violence reported had been an assault upon one non-union carpenter and a justice by unknown men. But Gov. Peabody acted upon the report of a committee he had sent to investigate. This committee reported as follows:

Having visited Cripple Creek and Victor, and after careful inquiry among representative citizens and property owners, including mayors of Cripple Creek and Victor, we are of the opinion that lives of citizens of the district are in imminent danger, and property and personal rights in jeopardy. Prompt action is imperatively demanded by the above people to protect the lives and property of the citizens. We find that a reign of terror exists in the district which should be relieved at once. We do not believe the civil authorities are able to cope with the situation.

Accordingly on the 4th the Governor ordered out the State troops, but not until the Mine Owners' Association had agreed to pay them.

Immediately upon arriving at the place of alleged disturbance the troops began acting as if martial law were in force and the habeas corpus suspended. They arrested several strikers without warrant, imprisoned them in a military guard house, refused to deliver them to the sheriff, and declined to give any reason for the arrests. Writs of habeas corpus were consequently applied for in behalf of the prisoners, who had by this time been in custody two weeks; and on the 24th the troops