

when the votes are counted in November. An aroused public opinion will carefully note every act on the part of those in power. It will be the Democratic party's last opportunity. It cannot be found wanting, else it must follow in the wake of its old time opponent.



#### A Sensible Word in Good Time.

The (Omaha, Neb.) Chancellor (Ind.), August 22.—The Chancellor doesn't wish to be pessimistic, but it recognizes the fact that the people of the United States are only nominal rulers, and that those who determine elections are seldom seen or heard. They are generally most active in directors' rooms in Wall Street behind closed doors. As usual these men are very quiet. It is probable that the inner ring is composed of less than a score of men, but these men are in a position to stop every wheel in the United States. For we have but a nominal republic. It is not that Woodrow Wilson, so very seriously threatens the power of these men, but they know that he "betrayed" them when he was elected Governor of New Jersey. For that reason, undoubtedly, they would prefer Roosevelt or Taft. Between these, they would probably prefer Taft, not that he would favor them any better than would Roosevelt, but because they recognize in him a more judicious, discrete and sane man. Should they choose to elect Roosevelt, they will do so only because they believe his election would be easier. Opposed to the machinations of these astute dictators of America, stand Wilson, Debs, Chafin, and, in deference to a common supposition, we might include Roosevelt, but he is opposed to them only in the public imagination. He has advanced a platform to clinch that imagination, at that. He knows, and these dictators know, it could not be carried out. Now, what if this division of the people among all these candidates would but pave the way for the reelection of Taft? Don't forget, it is the Electoral and not the popular vote that counts.



#### Land Value Taxation in Great Britain.

The (London) Daily News and Leader (radical Liberal), August 2.—A very useful purpose was served by the meeting of the Parliamentary Land Values Group which reaffirmed in almost identical terms its adherence to the land taxation memorial presented to the Prime Minister in May. A glance at almost any Unionist paper since Mr. Lloyd George spoke at Kensington the other day will show the need for this step. Since July 15 we have had almost daily tirades against the "Singletax," and should that legend prove to have been killed by Mr. Asquith's blunt denial on Tuesday that it will be adopted by the Government, no doubt it will speedily be replaced by some other invention equally alarming and equally baseless. So strong is the feeling in the country on the subject that the only hope for the Tories of campaigning successfully against land reform is first to misrepresent it; and in order that its advocates may avoid the necessity of repeatedly explaining what it is not, it is extremely desirable that they should explain, with the authority attaching to its recognized spokesmen in the

Liberal party, exactly what it is. There is nothing startling or rhetorical about the terms they have employed. The taxation of land values is not a new departure, but a consistent sequel to the policy of the 1909 Budget, without which the provisions embodied in it for the valuation of land would be almost meaningless. It is a development which is not only logical but necessary. The system under which land escapes, as it has long escaped, its due share of taxation is an injustice to the rest of the community, which has to make good the deficiency, as well as a handicap to the industrialism it penalizes. Everyone but the landowner has to contribute in rates or taxes towards the balance, and it is at the cost of his neighbors in shops, factories, cottages, or tenements, who are made liable on the very values they have created for him by their efforts and on the improvements they carry out, that he evades his proper burden. In the interest of all—and we do not exclude the landlord—a readjustment equitable for all must be undertaken. There is no doubt that the country is ripe for it, and that, wherever it gets the same chance as at Hanley, it will return the same verdict. Provided the issue is kept clearly before it, its justice can hardly be disputed; and every possible effort to free the problem and the main lines of approach to it from obscurity or ambiguity is well worth the making.



#### Eugenics.

Newspaper Enterprise Association (Chicago), July 31.—Eugenics is the science of breeding better men and better women. . . . Burbank breeds cactuses without thorns, and persimmons without pucker, and why can't we breed people without diseases or bad breath or criminal tendencies? The answer is plain. It is too bad to damp the ardor of the eugenists, who, on the whole, are doing some good, but the fact is that people can't be bred as plants and animals are. We get better breeds by saving only the best, and killing off the ordinary and imperfect. To ordinary and imperfect people this seems an objection to the application of the principles of scientific breeding to us! We don't like to be killed off, or sterilized merely because we are ordinary or imperfect. . . . The result would be that the strong, the wealthy and the powerful would get hold of the bureau of eugenics and insist on perpetuating their own lines—which are just as ordinary as ours. . . . There is only one way to make the race better. That way lies through better conditions for everybody. . . . Abolish poverty, brethren, and the better race will come. Educate, and the mating business will take care of itself. . . . The breeding of a uniformly better race must be sought through political economy, not eugenics.



#### Chesterton on Eugenics.

G. K. Chesterton in the (London) Daily News and Leader (radical Lib.), July 6. Somebody puts shortly and strongly what the Eugenists put lengthily and feebly; the Eugenists are shocked at the short words (as if they were swear words) and say they never meant anything like that; the other man is left wondering what they did mean. For eugenics

is not a science; eugenics is a euphemism; and without euphemisms it cannot endure the day. For example, I once said that some people wanted marriages controlled forcibly by the police. Whereupon some very serious Eugenists actually rose and assured the public that no such strenuous bridal scenes were really in preparation. . . . I know quite well that if I had said precisely the same thing elaborately instead of compactly, no Eugenists would probably have denied it, or even noticed it. Suppose instead of saying "marriages managed forcibly by police" I had said, "The modern state must broaden its functions and so far from abandoning its existing powers should rather employ them positively to the creation of healthy marriages than merely to assault abuses in the existing marriages." Most Eugenists would swallow that like so much milk; so far from thinking it an attack on their idea, they would think it a very temperate plea for it. Yet my longer sentence means the same as my shorter sentence, as inevitably as the longer formula of two plus two plus two means the same as the shorter formula six. It was the mere word "police" that startled these poor people. I mean no harsh insinuation by this phrase. An almost exactly similar case occurred in this paper some days ago. When Mr. Oliver W. F. Lodge wrote his admirable letter about that ridiculous rag, the Feeble-minded Bill, he used, as I did, a phrase that shortened and sharpened the matter, and in that sense, of course, exaggerated it. He said that some people wanted human beings bred "on the principles of the stud farm." Once more a solemn disciple wrote explaining that no responsible Eugenist wanted human beings bred on the principles of the stud farm. Once more, I quite accept the assurance; and once more it does not reassure. Here again all that one really feels is that Eugenists have never pictured men as actually living in stables and being scrubbed down by ostlers. And here again one has this unsatisfying impression for the same reason. Because if Mr. Lodge had put the same thing in long sympathetic words instead of short fighting words, Eugenists would have let them pass. Suppose Mr. Lodge had said, "It will probably be advisable to evolve a higher democracy by a supervision somewhat similar to that which was largely present in the deliberate evolution of the higher aristocracies, which could not however make their schemes of sexual selection so wide and scientific as our own; this principle must not be identified merely with the survival of the fittest as it is in nature, but finds a better analogy in that human selection which has been so successful with the race-culture of the higher animals." That sentence consists of eighty-nine words; and its meaning consists of two words, "stud farm." But if Mr. Lodge said that sentence to a thousand Eugenists towards the end of a Eugenist congress, not one of them would stir in his sleep.



G. K. Chesterton in *The (London) Nation*, June 15.—Eugenics! That we should actually be talking eugenics? Have we no spiritual noses? Are we unaware of such a thing as a spiritual stink? Into what tale have we wandered, and in what sort of nightmare cities do we walk, where secret powers

are given to janissaries for the manufacture of eunuchs? Imagine some man who lived on liberty, Jefferson or Charles Fox, walking suddenly into such a world!

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### LOSS AND GAIN.

For The Public.

He lost—and what did he lose?

All that he hoped to gain.

But the query is, Did he wisely choose?

Was the thing that he lost of a higher use  
Than the great things that remain?

The other won—but what did he win?

How can we count the cost

Of all the gains that he gathered in?

Or know if he fain would his life begin

To retain the things he lost?

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.



## THE COWARDS OF PEACE.

For The Public.

*Patriot*: "How many of your boys, Mr. College President, would enlist in the Army if we got into a war with Germany about the Monroe Doctrine?"

*College President*: "About 80 per cent. of them."

*Patriot*: "Would they be willing to do that if they knew that it really meant some sacrifice? Suppose they knew that they were all going to give up two years of their time, and that one-fifth of them would never get home again. Do you think they would go just the same?"

*College President*: "I am sure they would. Our young men in college and out of it are fine fellows, a brave and patriotic lot, and you will find them ready to make sacrifices for their country in time of need."

*Patriot*: "Now, Mr. President, you know much of history. Tell me, what is it that has most often caused the downfall of nations. Is it foreign armies pounding at their boundaries, or is it graft, injustice, greed and oppression within?"

*College President*: "Much reading of history has convinced me that a nation sound within is in about as much danger from foreign enemies as a healthy man is from the microbes that meet him every hour. Undermine the man's health, and he catches every disease that comes. Fix a nation within so that the plain two-handed man has not a fair show, and you pave the way for the conqueror from without. It is not bayonets that overthrow nations, but graft, injustice, greed and oppression—inequality of opportunity among the people."

*Patriot*: "Will your young men sacrifice as much to drive out inequality of opportunity which