

anyone's sympathies regarding the circumstances out of which his indictment came. Criminal proceedings prosecuted with less public spirit than those in which he was entangled, it would be difficult to recall. The McNamara crime was indefensible and horrible, but methods used in prosecuting it and in disposing of it were better calculated to make crime than to discourage crime. Though Darrow had been found guilty in this aftermath of the McNamara case, and even if he had been guilty, it is by no means certain that persons interested in prosecuting him would not have deserved conviction more than he.



A Gruesome Warning to Young Girls—Especially Black Ones.

By operation of Virginia law, the action of a Virginia jury, and the non-action of the Governor of Virginia, a human life was taken last week in Richmond officially, and of course deliberately. It was the life of a woman—a mere girl, hardly more than a child. Her life was taken because she had killed her mistress, though not deliberately. Doubtless everyone would like to believe—but isn't it somewhat difficult?—that the official killing of this girl of less than seventeen was not because she happened to be of the servant class and black, and the person she killed of the mistress class and white, but for some reason more consistent with even-handed justice. Would a white girl of seventeen or less and not of the servant class be officially killed anywhere for any crime?



Farmers and Taxation.

Reasons have for sometime been cropping up to indicate that the traditional hostility of farmers to the Singletax is not in all instances attributable to misapprehension. Some farmers have seemed to understand quite clearly that the Singletax, while a good thing for the farming business, would be a bad thing for speculation in farming land. Such of these as either make money, or hope to make money, not out of farming but out of higher prices per acre for farms, have reason to be averse to the Singletax. But that such farmers are not farmers was pretty clearly shown in a recent issue of Carlson's Breeders' Review.



It seems that Carlson's Review—we are quoting from the editorial page of the Chicago Record-Herald of July 11, 1912,—was not satisfied with the higher credit ratings that farmers have been getting. So it set on foot an investigation which showed that this agricultural prosperity is due,

not to profits from farming, but to profits resulting from speculation in land. As the Breeders' Review is a Nebraska publication, it confined its specific inquiries to Nebraska, but it declared that the same conditions prevail in the United States as a whole. "If from the total farm production of the United States we deduct the cost of labor, farm management and interest on the investment," says the Breeders' Review, "we will find the balance on the wrong side of the account. It will not be necessary to charge the crop with the upkeep of the farm, seed grain, feed for work-animals, breaking of tools and machinery, labor of the family, insurance and a score of other necessary costs, in order to show a loss." Prosperity among farmers is then traced to men who are "good judges of property values," and to their speculative, not their farming, abilities. The value of farming land has increased enormously, the Review explains, adding, what is doubtless true, that farm land "is already too high in price from the standpoint of what it is now producing."



It is not from production but from land speculation that farmers get rich. But when they get rich in that way they usually retire to town or city, leaving tenants or "hands" to do the producing, while they themselves take ground rents in higher rent from tenants, or lower wages to "hands," or through some subtle process of "higher cost of living" for both, and then make the welkin ring with outcries against the Singletax because "it will hurt the farmer." Some farmers can prosper in this way; but as landlords and not as farmers. The Singletax would surely weed them out. But they are few at best. Their interest is not the tenant farmer's interest. Their interest is not the farm "hand's" interest. Their interest is not the interest of farmers who own and work their farms, and make their money, if they make any, by being good producers of food stuffs instead of "good judges of property values." It is "a long shot" for working farmers to get money out of increase in the value of their acreage. "Farmers" who succeed at that game are not of the working kind, as a rule, except as they "work" others.



Further in the course of its investigation mentioned above, Carlson's Breeders' Review says of Nebraska that "it would not be a difficult matter to double the per acre yield throughout the State," by "better seed, better tillage of the soil, better cultivation, more fertility, less waste from insects and the present system of marketing, and more

and better live stock." No doubt this is approximately as true anywhere as in Nebraska. But suppose it were done. How much better off would farm "hands" be? How much better off would farm tenants be after their leases expired? And farm owners, what about them? Would they be better off or worse off if they paid increased taxes on all their larger product, as tax laws now require, or only on the raw land value of their farms as the Singletax would require? As the Breeders' Review says, "farming in the United States will never be generally profitable until" farmers "know the difference between profits resulting from actual production and the margins of a speculation." But when farmers know this difference, no farmer who farms a farm will be averse to the Singletax. Every working farmer then will know that taxation of land values means taxation of land monopoly, and that exemption from taxes on production means exemption of farming from all taxation.



LAISSEZ-FAIRE.

In considering concrete applications of abstract principles, one is sometimes tempted to doubt the principle because of failures in the application. Still, George's answer to Garrison, when the latter questioned the efficacy of the Singletax as a panacea for all social ills, "Nor do I believe it a panacea, but freedom is," should lend us heart.

A particular application of liberty may be followed by bad results. A particular denial of liberty may be followed by good results. But if a full and careful analysis be made, it will still be found that the good results were due somehow to liberty, and the bad to tyranny.



When the principle of laissez-faire was propounded, a wave of enthusiasm swept over the world. Many thought the economic problem had been solved. But somehow it would not stay solved.

England established free trade; but poverty persisted, and business depression followed prosperity.

And then, as though that were not enough to give the lie to liberty, Germany began her tariff orgy. She protected everybody, by turns. She taxed farmers for the benefit of manufacturers, then manufacturers for the benefit of farmers, and then both for the benefit of sailors. And strange to say, her restrictive legislation was followed by as remarkable results as was England's policy of freedom.

What was the reason?

Was the principle of laissez-faire wrong? Or had there been a mistake in the application?



The laissez-faire doctrine, liberally interpreted, embraces two points:

- (1) Clear the way.
- (2) Let alone.

The Manchester school succeeded in getting the government to let trade alone, but it would not clear the way.

By removing restraints upon trade, the wealth of England was increased to a marvelous degree; but that wealth, instead of going to the people in general, went to the particular persons who owned the land upon which Englishmen worked, and out of which they got their materials. Wages increased but little; but incomes from land—whether from factory sites, city lots, or mining rights—increased beyond all precedent.

In Germany, the reverse was true. That is, the restrictions placed upon trade were followed by an increase of business, an advance in wages, and a raising of the standard of living.

Does this mean that freedom has been found wanting? that the following after liberty is a vain pursuit?

By no means. A careful analysis of German conditions will make the reason of their apparent success as plain as the failure in England.



Germany was peculiarly conditioned. The youngest of western nations, and the least influenced by Roman thought and customs, her people had retained in largest degree their primitive individuality, and their inherent virility.

This tremendous latent force was quickened into life by the scourgings of commercial restrictions; just as the same force in England was quickened by freedom.

Bounties wrung from farmers will stimulate manufactures; and manufacturers in their turn can contribute to the prosperity of farmers; while both together may aid the shipping. But let no one suppose for a moment that this process can be carried on indefinitely.

Just as the dishonest bookkeeper who covers a shortage in one account by borrowing from another, and balances the second shortage by still further borrowing, must fail in the end, so must the nation fail that seeks prosperity by taxing one industry to stimulate another.



Lest apparent facts lead us to doubt a cherished principle, let the real facts be borne in mind.