

conservation agitation is to have the government own, and either operate or lease, not merely these resources which are unclaimed, but all of them;" and "all attempts to equalize taxation must ultimately result in the taxation of land values only, which will not only place the burden of all government expenses where it should be, but will, at the same time, make it unprofitable to hold land out of use for speculation." As the Boston Common pointedly said in its issue of August 20th, "voters who think as Mr. Meaker thinks, ought to work for his election; voters who may not accept all his ideas, but who are sick unto disgust of rubber-stamp representation in the interest of monopoly and high prices, could do worse than to elect him." We should add that they could do a great deal worse by re-electing Congressman Roberts, who is on record for pretty much every Congressional iniquity of Cannonism.

+ +

Newspaper War in Chicago.

A cut-rate war between the morning newspapers of Chicago is now "on for certain." The Tribune started it with a reduction from two cents to one; but the Record-Herald got wind of this in time to "follow suit" in the same day's issue; and then the Inter Ocean reluctantly but gamely "saw the drop" and "covered" it. Hearst's Examiner, having always been a penny paper, couldn't go a point better. So there the four are, selling their papers for much less than the cost of paper stock. They hope to "even up" with increased advertising patronage from increased circulation; but the news dealers must laboriously handle the papers at a lower profit for each delivery, and without any possibility of "evening up" except at the cost of greater work.

+

The mystery shrouding the Tribune (p. 914) continues. At any moment it may jump back into its old time plutocratic rut, and there is a holding of breath. To this mystery has now been added another. Has Victor Lawson's Evening News dropped its preparations for a penny morning paper and undertaken to back Kohlsaas's Record-Herald in the "penny-or-your-life" contest with the Tribune? or is Kohlsaas fighting in his own armor against all comers, and riding for another fall?

+ +

The "Hall-Mark" Not Enough.

Gifford Pinchot wisely warned his audience of the St. Andrew's Brotherhood at Nashville last

week, to beware of mere "hall-mark" Insurgency. His warning cannot be too often quoted:

In one way the Insurgent cause is threatened by its own success. Now that most open-minded men see the speedy triumph of the progressive policies, and because direct attacks upon them usually fail, the hope of the reactionaries is to join the movement and try from within to emasculate it or steer it to disaster. The soft pedal is still the most dangerous enemy of progress. Already there are signs in plenty that reactionaries are trying to dominate the progressive movement. Already the conversions without conviction have begun. Political deathbed conversions, performed in public by politicians whose leadership is dwindling, may fairly be regarded with suspicion. Like certain flowers, these gentlemen turn their faces to the rising sun, but their roots are held fast by the same soil as before. I would make it perfectly easy for all men to join the Progressive ranks. But I would keep the newly converted old-style leaders in the ranks and under observation till they had won a right to Progressive leadership by something more substantial than declamation alone.

+ +

Suspicious Insurgency.

By no means is it probable that Mr. Pinchot has President Taft personally in his thought when he speaks of "political deathbed conversions performed in public by politicians whose leadership is dwindling" as "fairly to be regarded with suspicion." But if Mr. Taft doesn't try on the cap to see if it fits, he is more obtuse than even his amiable whitewashing of Ballinger in his notorious condemnation of Glavis (pp. 460, 466, 817) would imply. For Mr. Taft, after fighting the Progressives of his own party with executive spoils until they had beaten him, whereupon he offered a fair divide in the future, has announced himself as a Progressive—and with the same wearisome cameratic smile.

+ +

Death of Dr. Beeler.

Among the earliest Ohio disciples of Henry George was Samuel L. Beeler, of Hamilton, whose death occurred on the 24th at the age of 68. Dr. Beeler was a volunteer soldier on the Union side in the Civil War. He enlisted while hardly more than a boy, at the very beginning of the war, and remained in the service until disabled with a shattered knee at the first battle of Winchester. Subsequently he became a physician, but passed most of the remainder of his life in business as a druggist. He got to be a convert to the doctrines of "Progress and Poverty" in the early '80's, and through the remaining quarter century or more of his life, with tireless persistence but quietly and with wise judgment he

spread among his neighbors the news of the light he had seen. Dr. Beeler's friends of Hamilton say of that city that it "probably has more Single Taxers than any other in Ohio, due largely to Dr. Beeler." The Democratic "Journal" says that "he observed the trend of events and human progress with a keenness and an accuracy of thought that was a delight to listen to," and "he always had a reason for his views;" while the Republican "News" describes him as a man "essentially modest," but "strong and positive," to whom "humanity was his first interest," who was "actively, sympathetically and intelligently interested" in social questions, and that in the discussions at his store during "all the years it was a favorite resort of his coterie of friends," there "was nothing superficial." If that could only be said of all such discussions!

+ +

Civic Engineering.

Professor Lewis J. Johnson, of the technical department of Harvard University, and a distinguished expert and leader in reinforced concrete construction since his designing of the stadium at Cambridge, has invented the new and good name of "civic engineering" for a new and good thing which he proposes—"constructive political science." The suggestion was made by Prof. Johnson in a letter to the Engineering News of August 25 last. Here is his interpretation of the first law of the constructive science of "civic engineering" as he sees it:

The people must rule—by indirect control so long as that suffices, and, that failing, by regular and orderly direct control to such extent and to such degree of detail as may be required for complete success.

+

Prof. Johnson's indefinite allusion to the Initiative, Referendum, Recall, and allied machinery for popular government, as an elementary law of Civic Engineering, is doubtless due in part to the habitual caution of a conscientious expert whose errors, if he makes any, may cause the collapse of a gigantic bridge or the crumbling of massive walls; but it is in greater part, probably, an indication of the good natured deference of an Eastern professor who knows the whole country, to the provincial prejudices that envelope the Atlantic intellect. In that part of his letter in which he gives testimony, Prof. Johnson unreservedly cites the experience of the commission-governed cities of the West and interior South, all the characteristics which, "from the Initiative, Referendum and Recall to systematic publicity and the small council, operate directly toward

popular supremacy in fact," discouraging "assaults upon the public welfare," and encouraging "loyal public service," and thereby tending "constantly to keep the public interest not only supreme but unassailed." He advises "any one wishing to study what is probably the most perfect piece of machinery to this end" to "turn to the charter under which Grand Junction, Col., is now living," one of the "distinctive features" of which "preferential voting—a workable scheme for dispensing with primaries and securing elections in the interest of the majority—has with little modification been embodied in the proposed new charter for Buffalo, already approved by popular vote in that city" (vol. xii, p. 1091). Proceeding with his primer lesson in Civic Engineering, Prof. Johnson says:

The Denver elections of last May show still further the value of means of popular control suited to the magnitude of the task. Denver, in that election, had the chance by direct popular vote to settle each of a series of twenty-one questions. The voters had the incentive of knowing that as they voted so it would be. Measures were for once disentangled from candidates, from parties, and from one another. Here was a chance for intelligent action. It was fully improved. Despite the lavish use of money and all else that great wealth and the united political machines could do to mislead—and they did much—the people adopted each of the six measures designed for their welfare, and rejected all of the fifteen which were not so designed. Much more to the same purport might be cited from American experience and on a State-wide scale, as in Oregon, not to mention the even better established Swiss results of direct popular control.

+ +

"Made in Germany."

The daily papers told of an incident last week of the deepest import to minds that are watching the evolution of democracy: "Scores injured by the Berlin police—'Bloodhounds!' shriek crowds as Von Jagow's men ride them down. In spite of the strictness with which the cordons were maintained, the strikers and their sympathizers held meetings at the street corners, which in several instances caused bloody fights." It is not much, the whole item; but let your mind wander over to England and look at that clock made in Germany. The words "Made in Germany" have a peculiar significance over there. To the less fortunate men, the words mean hatred, impotent rage; to the more fortunate—those who do not depend upon daily wages, and are trying to think out what it is that is wrong but do not think that the root of a thing is the place to hunt—those words have meant much: that Germany has discipline which England should copy; that