

a tacit avowal on the part of the United States of its intention to annex the island instead of securing its independence; and so significant is it regarded by the Spanish that they are freely predicting an early union of the Cuban forces with their own to expel the American invaders. Of course their prediction is baseless. It is what the Spanish would like rather than what they expect, and is important only because it goes to show the impression which the conduct of this government toward the Cuban republic makes upon its enemies as well as its friends. But the Cubans are too level-headed to carry even just resentment so far. They know, too, that the administration is not the American people; and that however persistently the administration, backed by imperialistic and plutocratic sympathizers with the Havana autonomists, may try to repudiate with an appearance of honor, the pledge this country has given to Cuba, the people of the United States will see to it that that pledge is redeemed.

As late as the 20th, the war department had not received a complete report of the casualties at the battle of Santiago, fought three weeks before, and none was given out until the 26th. This is evidence of extreme incapacity or inexcusable neglect, and there is little difficulty in placing the responsibility where it belongs. It is inconceivable that the military officers at Santiago who hold their places legitimately should have been so grossly negligent. With a roll call every day, it is not probable that they omitted promptly to report the names of the killed, wounded and missing. But somewhere among the incompetent civilians whom the McKinley administration has been thrusting into places of military responsibility, these reports caught fast. It was all of a piece with the incompetency that characterized the shipment of arms and supplies to Santiago, for which shoulder-strapped white house favorites

were responsible. Nor was the delay of reports of casualties a minor matter. More than three score men of the American army had been reported as missing since the battle of Santiago, and as their names were not given, every family in the States which was represented by a father, son or brother at the front, from whom nothing had been heard since the battle, was kept in suspense lest he might be one of the missing. And this suspense continued for nearly a month. The neglect to publish the names of all the injured long before they were published was a piece of unpardonable cruelty, for which McKinley's partiality for senators' sons was doubtless accountable.

"Freedom of the port" is a device for enabling the rich to escape custom house snares which they lay for the poor. In plain English it is a license to smuggle, which is issued by the administration to wealthy friends thereof. When working men complained that under McKinleyism poor men were taxed for clothes which they might send for from abroad, while rich men who could afford to go to Europe were allowed to bring in all the clothes they wanted without paying a penny of duty, the complaint was silenced with a provision in the Dingley law forbidding the importation by travelers of more than \$100 worth of personal effects. This clause, it appears, was for the benefit of workingmen—to hoodwink them; for now it comes out that the administration assumes to exempt rich friends from having their baggage examined upon arriving from a foreign country. This exemption is called "the freedom of the port."

Not long ago, it seems, the "freedom of the port" of New York was extended to W. D. Sloane and his party, upon their return from a Vanderbilt wedding abroad. They offered to pay \$600 duties upon their baggage, but that was not satisfactory to the agents of the board of trade,

who, acting under special authority to search baggage, and arbitrarily disregarding the privileges of "freedom of the port" which the Sloane-Vanderbilt party had received, examined their baggage mercilessly. As a result, it appeared that the baggage, instead of being covered by \$600 duties, was lawfully subject to \$2,500. It will be seen, therefore, that the "freedom of the port," if frequently extended, would be well worth an occasional campaign contribution.

Landlords are pretty much the same everywhere. Living as they do upon the labor of other people, they can never quite bring themselves to feel that they ought to pay anything for the pecuniary benefits the public confers upon them. Their disposition thus to shirk just obligations is most frequently manifested in connection with street improvements. The number of instances in which landlords have tried to shift the expenses of street improvements from themselves, who are enriched by the improvements, to the masses of the community, whom the improvements do not enrich a penny's worth, since all their advantages are offset by the higher rent they pay to landlords, would fill a doomsday book. And the success of landlords in this is astonishing.

London landlords are no exception. For years the people of London have been agitating for a wide street from the Strand to Holborn. Justly enough, the London county council proposed that the expense be born by the landlords whom the great improvement would enrich. But characteristically, the landlords opposed that proposition with all their might. They wanted the thoroughfare. They knew it would enable them to charge higher ground rents. They were not at all ignorant of the fact that it would pour gold into their pockets from the pockets of other people, without their having done a thing to earn it. But all the same, they wanted other people to pay the expense. And,

as usual, the landlords have won. The great thoroughfare is to be built; it will increase ground rents throughout the neighborhood; the landlords are to pocket the increased ground rents; and the people who bear the burden of the taxes—the poorer people bear most of it—are to foot the bills. Then, at the end, the London landlords will be still further confirmed in their notion that they are the upper classes and that the London landless, who bear the burdens of making them rich, are men of inferior clay. Perhaps they are right. Men of better clay wouldn't tolerate the arrogance of these parasites.

There is no difference between the hunger of London landlords for "unearned increment" and that of Irish landlords. After 20 years of passionate opposition an Irish local government bill has passed the British house of commons without an angry word, as smooth as the flight of a gull. That miracle of legislative miracles was accomplished by the shrewd device of tax exemptions for the benefit of Irish landlords and sub-landlords. Landlords are to pay no local rates, and the county councils cannot tax them. For all local improvements tenants and laborers must foot the bill, while landlords pocket the benefits. Without this concession the landlord interest in parliament would have defeated the bill; with it the people of Ireland are no better off than before. They will continue to work for the landlord.

The London Spectator thinks it odd that Gladstone did not perceive that Irishmen are free. So do we. And we think it would be rather difficult for anyone who disputes it, to answer the Spectator when it asks: "In what are Irishmen not as free, in any true sense of freedom, as Tories are, indeed, as free as the English, as free as the Scotch, as free as Americans. Yet it does not follow that Irishmen are really free. Only some Englishmen, only some Scotchmen,

only some Americans are free. The great masses everywhere, no matter how free their form of government, are subject to monopolies which serve the ends, in this politically freer era, which autocratic government served in an earlier era. The real explanation of Irish discontent is not that Irishmen are less free than the masses of English, Scotch and Americans, but that oppressive economic institutions to which these have grown accustomed make the Irish sore. They themselves suppose they are restive under English political institutions, which bear upon them with peculiar severity. But what they are really restive under, as the "no rent" agitation went to show, is the economic institution of landlordism, which bears upon them in the same way and with the same severity as upon their brethren across the channel and their cousins over the Atlantic. The reason they feel this as English tyranny, instead of recognizing it as an evil under which the landless everywhere are suffering, is because their landlords are mostly Englishmen or absentee descendants of English land grabbers.

Were it not for being accused of punning, we should be tempted to say of that really useful magazine, *Self-Culture*, that it sometimes needs a little. So does its critic who reviews Henry George's theory in the July number. Thoughtful readers of George's works will be interested to learn, upon the authority of this critic, that George has utterly failed to show definitely how land as raw material, and made or improved land, "can be separately treated so as to do justice to the individual's right to enjoy the results of his own labor." If the author of *Progress and Poverty* made anything clearer than anything else, it was this. He showed that economic rent is the measure of the value of land as raw material, and that by taking economic rent for common use, while exempting land improvements along with all other product values, "the individual's right to enjoy the re-

sults of his own labor" would be secure.

In another place in his *Self-Culture* article, George's critic quotes a Cornell professor. George had said that social progress increases land values by increasing the demand for land; to which the professor replies, "as to agricultural lands," that improvements bring in better grades, thus throwing poorer grades out of use and decreasing rents. If this means anything, it means that improvements in transportation, etc., have brought into use distant lands of higher fertility and put out of use the nearby lands, thus reducing the rents of the latter. But what about the rents of the former which before the improvements were at zero? Henry George never said that social progress might not reduce the rents of particular lands. What he maintained was that it tends to increase rent as a whole. Moreover, Henry George was dealing with land, all land, not agricultural land alone. To segregate agricultural land from other land, therefore, in order to reply to him at this point, is either stupid or dishonest. Even if agricultural rent as a whole were to diminish under the influence of improvement—in fact it has not diminished—yet that would be no refutation of George's position, if at the same time the rent or value of other than agricultural lands, urban lands and mines, for example, had increased.

To the mind of *Self-Culture's* critic, the strongest argument in favor of the single tax, upon his own confession, is that in regard to "the unearned increment." Here he shows how much superior his own mind is in economics to the second hand mind with which universities equip their economic students. But the second hand mind obtrudes, nevertheless. For he declares that even the unearned increment "is not without its counterbalance." Behold now the counterbalance. We state it in his own language: "If we admit the injustice of permitting the individual