"union-made" goods to "scab-made goods"; the manufacturer has no property right in secrecy as to that fact. Unless persons who abhor the death dealing child-labor of our factories; those who shudder at the oppressive conditions which employers' unions, taking advantage of unfair social institutions, are forcing upon working people; those who believe in encouraging labor organizations—unless these may unite to divert their custom from the establishments that turn human blood into dividends, both their personal freedom and their property rights are destroyed. For it is everybody's personal right and his property right to trade with whom he pleases.

✣ ✣

Disemployment and the Land.

We are accustomed to speaking of the workless as "the unemployed," but the San Francisco Star long ago brought into use a truer word—"disemployed." For the merely unemployed, we need have no especial sympathy if they are poor, nor any extraordinary respect if they are rich; for "unemployment" means no more than idleness. But "disemployment" connotes all the agony of the worker in a period of hard times, when he can find no work to do. And as this condition comes from social maladjustment, the resulting lack of employment is best expressed as *dis*employment. It is enforced unemployment.

✣

But those who speak of unemployment in such circumstances really mean disemployment; and that is what the meeting set for the 15th at Glasgow, Scotland, implies. It is for the discussion of "The Land Question and Unemployment," and the principal address is to be delivered by Alexander Ure, solicitor general for Scotland in the Asquith ministry. In Scotland and England as well as here, there is a great and growing army of disemployed. Its membership is drafted, not recruited, through monopoly of the planet. The planet, both here and there, is made a "closed shop," and industry consequently lanquishes—suffers continually and collapses in periodical spasms. One of these spasms is now on, and Mr. Ure's address will be looked forward to with the utmost interest. He knows the sinister relationship of disemployment to land monopoly. It is to be hoped he will make its meaning clear.

✣ ✣

Advance of the Asquith Ministry.

From the London dailies it is evident that the Asquith ministry are expected to move upon the fortifications of privilege, by means of land value taxation. Mr. Asquith's recent speech has at least given the reactionists a scare. Hardly an edition of the Tory papers appears without an outcry against the proposed land value tax of a penny in the pound as "unjust" and "impracticable." Appeals are made to the small merchants, who are begged to remember that their prosperity depends upon the patronage of the landlord class, and that a land value tax would diminish the purchasing power of that class. In almost the same breath, and with delicious inconsistency, the same defenders of privilege turn to the tenant class with assurances that the landlords would shift the tax over upon them in higher rents! What these pleaders advise, to avoid land value taxation, is an increase of the income tax and the re-establishment of protective tariffs. Anything to save the institution of land monopoly, which is the key to the fortress of privilege. But the Tories are growing hopeless. Their newspapers practically admit that a land value tax will go into the budget and that the House of Lords will be powerless to avert this entrance of the people into their citadel. This would mean inevitable defeat for the Tories at the next elections. It begins to look as if the Asquith ministry, lately regarded as doomed, were turning the tables upon their adversaries.

✣ ✣

Disaster and Benevolence.

When a great catastrophe occurs, like the earthquake upheaval in Italy, there is something elemental in the world-wide benevolence it inspires. This is not charity in any conventional sense. It is the spontaneous fraternal response on a great scale which may be observed on a small scale in little neighborhoods when a building burns or a neighbor is disabled by sickness or accident. With one accord, therefore, we may all put our hands into our pockets, for a dime or a dollar, or a hundred or more, according to our means, and feel that we are one of a spontaneously organized party of rescue.

✣

But conventional charity is another matter. Not that it is unnecessary. It is necessary, as things go. But this kind of charity is for those who would rather relieve suffering at the expense of an easy gift than prevent it at the expense of an unearned income. The point is well illustrated by a bit of correspondence now lying before us. A charity solicitor of a town where many charitable people live in comfort off the sweat of disinherited brethren, had called the attention of a friend to

Digitized by Google