

“putting down a riot.” Whatever the motive, this police lawlessness is evidently concerted. The Chicago police have engaged in it; so have those of San Francisco; a few days ago it was the police of New Haven, and now it is those of New York. Yet Emma Goldman has spoken in Cleveland, in Portland, and in many other cities, without leaving behind her the slightest evidence of unlawful utterance. Although she was arrested in San Francisco, she was acquitted upon jury trial; and in New York the District Attorney has warned the police that the utterances they have accused her of are quite within her rights. No pretense of unlawful speech is set up for dispersing her New York meeting. The police despotically dispersed it. If they are permitted to disperse her meetings with impunity they can disperse any others at their own will. Whether they are acting for some astute press agent to enhance Miss Goldman’s audience-drawing power in the early future, which is hardly conceivable, or are hounding her down in Russian style, they play a dangerous game—dangerous to all the people, whose rights of speech and assembly are menaced by this tendency to subject public meetings to police censorship. The practice should be peremptorily stopped. The right of free speech and free meeting is an American principle and not a police privilege.

+ +

Why Women Should Not Vote.

All the stock objections to woman suffrage have been ably condensed into one, by an English adversary no less distinguished than Lord Cromer. In an address to the L. O. W. S. (League to Oppose Woman Suffrage) in London on the 18th, Lord Cromer is reported to have said that the whole argument against enfranchising women could be summed up by saying “they are unfitted to vote because they are not men.” This is candor indeed. For it is quite true that all the arguments ever made in opposition to woman suffrage are part and parcel of this one; and could any argument be more catholic in possibilities of application, more strictly historical in connotations, or more frivolous in substance? See how comprehensive it is. Commoners are unfitted to vote because they are not lords, the poor are unfitted to vote because they are not rich, the illiterate are unfitted to vote because they are not academy bred. What a delightful specimen of begging the question Lord Cromer’s accurate summing up of the arguments against woman suffrage is, to be sure. And note how useful the principle might be made in other fields of controversy, as that black men are unfitted for freedom because they are

not white, or that workingmen are unfitted for wealth because they are not wealthy. Read it again. Women are “unfitted to vote because they are not men”! Might it not have been as well said in the days of Tom Jones that women were unfitted to read because they were not men? Or at this day, and conversely, that men are not fitted to cook because they are not women?

+ +

Bernard Shaw’s Censored Play.

The official suppression of Bernard Shaw’s new play because it makes effective dramatic use of a vital force which conquers the will of the human brutes who call it God and despise as sentimental weakness any expressions of respect for it, is not strange. Acknowledgments of the living God have always offended the worshipful servants of dead ones.

+ + +

LAND VALUES TAXATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

There seems now to be little doubt that the Lloyd-George budget (pp. 481, 487, 494, 510) is destined to insert the “thin end of the wedge” which, when driven home, will split British land monopoly wide open.

Whereas the Conservatives have all along been jeeringly calling upon the Liberal ministry to resign and bring on a general election immediately, they are now looking contentedly three years forward for the earliest probable general election date. This indicates that they are disposed to agree to the Lloyd-George budget, rather than meet its issue before the people; for in three years its basic principles will have been fixed in British policy. Their prudence does not desert them, bitter though their anger is and deep and loud their curses.

+

While the curses of the Conservatives are distributed with judicious impartiality over the entire budget, their anger really centers upon the land value items; and with much less intensity upon the trifling tax of a half penny in the pound on the capital value of vacant urban and suburban land, or upon the more stinging one of 20 per cent on future increments of value, or upon the moderate one on the value of unmined minerals, than upon the plans which these taxes necessitate for an Imperial valuation of all land—urban, suburban, agricultural and the rest. For it is only by such a valuation that the budgetary discriminations can be made. As this valua-

tion would not only expose the enormous existing values of British land, both that which is in use and that which is held out of use either arbitrarily or through exorbitant prices, but would also pave the way for successive increases and extensions of land value taxation until industry was emancipated and land capitalism alone bore the financial burdens of the social state that fosters land values, the landed interests of Great Britain, alert for the protection of their parasitical privileges, are angered to their very hearts' core.

Never since land capitalization has become a pronounced phenomenon of industry has there been a fiscal valuation of British land values. Not since the time of William and Mary has there been any attempt at such a valuation. With the growth of British industry, landlords and land capitalists have flourished parasitically upon "unearned increment" at the expense of the state, and prospered unjustly upon the earnings of large classes forced by a stunted land market to bid for wages in a glutted labor market. The indication, slight though it be, of a tendency to uproot this indefensible system by the automatic processes of land value taxation, seems to the land value parasites and industrial exploiters like a premonition of doom.

And that is indeed what it is. The valuation of all the land of Great Britain, for purposes of present and future taxation, and for the express reason that land capitalization constitutes a social and common, and not a private fund, can have but one outcome. And that outcome is land value socialization.

+

The strength which this movement has in Great Britain is evident from the inane, incoherent and hysterical protests it evokes from the privileged interests. They sense its progress much more keenly than do the interests whose working rights and incomes it would restore and conserve.

Some of them claim that land is not a monopoly. Isn't this farcical in a community where the land to be taxed runs up to enormous sums in capital value?

Others argue that land values are the same as other values. This is like arguing that land is the same as products produced by labor from and upon land, which is in turn the equivalent of an argument that the field and the crop or the site and the structure are identical.

Others whine that they must quit charity giving if the common social income they appropriate is taxed away from them. Of course they must; but what of that if the taxes take care

of charities? Shall we let private individuals keep the common income because they distribute some of it in charity? This harks back to the generosity of Dick Turpin. And though worst come to worst in that respect, isn't it quite conceivable that new charity dispensers might be had on better terms pro rata, if the function were offered to the lowest bidder—the least "unearned increment" for the highest annual charity dole?

Another set give warning that the small landowner and the tenant will have to bear the brunt. This is a sordid wish, but not a rational thought.

+

All the objections to the Lloyd-George land value tax simmer down to the test of a simple moral principle: By what conceivable moral right do the land owners of Great Britain retain the social values of British land?

Surely not by right of ownership of the land. They can show only a conventional title, and conventional titles must yield to moral rights. The land of England belongs of moral right to the living people of England. So with the land of Ireland and Scotland and Wales and the islands round about—it belongs in usufruct to the living people respectively of Ireland and Scotland and Wales and the neighboring islands.

Do the landlords and land capitalists of Great Britain then own by moral right the values of British land because they cause the values? They do not cause them. Those values are caused by British industry, by British growth, by those subtle influences which spring from social co-operation as distinguished from individual activity. We may assign the value of a product to its individual producers; but the values of the planet can be assigned only to social wholes.

Upon no moral plea whatever can the owners of British land claim exemption in any degree from taxation on its social value. The whole of this value belongs, by every sane moral test, to the whole community; and every penny the community leaves in the land owners' hands is a penny morally misplaced.

By their flimsy protests the landlords and land capitalists of Great Britain, and their hangers on in Parliament and in the press, make very great fools of themselves in stimulating discussion of their case in the forum of morals. They would be wiser to appeal, as heretofore, to the doctrine of might rather than to the doctrine of right.

+ + +

The first thing which the democracy will write upon the slate will be the nationalization of the land.
—Thomas Hughes.