

is used for business purposes and homes is made to bear enormous burdens of taxation, which increase rents and so bear heavily upon industry and upon the people, especially the rent payer. That which most retards the development of New York, city and causes crowding and congestion is the holding of unimproved property for increases in market value, and it is the system of valuation for purposes of taxation that enables owners to keep their valuable city lots cumbered with little dilapidated buildings, while the enterprise of others is augmenting the value of these holdings. There would be plenty of room for business houses and homes if one-tenth of the comparatively unimproved property of the city was built up; but it is more profitable in the long run to let property remain occupied only by shanties until demand for the space gives it value that the owners have not earned. And the system of taxation encourages this, for property is comparatively free from the burdens of taxation so long as it is not improved—the present basis of assessment being the money expended upon a property, and not what it could earn if improved and put to the uses for which its location fits it. If the vacant lot or the dilapidated old dwelling had to pay the same tax as the adjoining apartment house, the owner would lose no time in putting up an apartment house, and there would be more room for the people and lower rents. New York has miles of streets that are filled with little time-worn and disease-breeding tenements and small stores, when the space is sorely needed for modern buildings; but the owners are waiting to get a bigger unearned profit, knowing that the demand for their property increases every day, and the only way to force them to build or to sell is to tax them for the unearned increment—the increase in value which the development of the city is giving the property.

That this is true of New York everyone familiar with that city knows. But in varying degree it is also true of every other city and every town in the land.

It is true also of the open country. Both mining rights and farming land in this country are held out of use, to the obstruction of business and the injury of workingmen, to an extent that few people dream of. Take for instance this one case which we quote from the San Francisco Star:

The firm of Miller & Lux own 14,530,000 acres of land, nearly all of it unimproved and used for grazing. This fact accounts for the power they

have shown in the local labor disputes. They own the land on which the cattle for this city's use must be raised. They are thus in a position to say who shall and who shall not be allowed to buy meat in the market. The vast area held by this firm is not conceivable to one who has not traveled through the interior of the state. It is equal to the area of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut together. It is half the size of New York, and three times the size of New Jersey. It is about the size of West Virginia and an eighth the entire area of California. It is as large as Greece, four times the size of Alsace and Lorraine, but little smaller than Ireland, and one-third the size of England and Wales together.

A tax on land values, accompanied by exemption of improvements and commodities, would soon put an end to monopolies like that, as well as to the vacant lot industry of our cities and towns.

Looking back now at the fast subsiding hysteria of the middle of last month, it is difficult to realize its dynamic force. A great tidal wave of insane feeling, it engulfed for the time almost all rational thought. Even the sober and thoughtful Springfield Republican was swept off its feet. But it is gratifying to recall that now and then a clergyman, and here and there a newspaper, stood morally erect while the wave surged against them and finally spent its force. We have already named the Chicago Evening Post, the Chicago Record-Herald and the Chicago Chronicle in this connection. With the Post in the lead, they made an editorial record of which their managers may well be proud. In New York, the Evening Post of that city was almost if not quite the only paper to maintain a dignified balance. Of course the Johnstown Democrat was among the sturdy ones. We say "of course," because that paper has acquired a deserved reputation for measuring all questions by invariable moral standards. Philadelphia was well represented on the sober side by the North American daily and the City and State weekly. It would be impossible, however, to give credit

in all cases where credit is due in this matter.

But the G. A. R. must not be overlooked. This organization was as a rule as crazy as the slaughter house preachers whose pulpits resounded with cries for lynching; but there was at least one splendid exception—Watson post, No. 420, G. A. R., department of Illinois. The resolutions adopted unanimously by that body were drafted by the man who commanded the guard at the scaffold when Surratt, Atzerodt, Harold and Payne were hanged for Lincoln's murder. Instead of proposing to put down anarchy with anarchy, these resolutions, urged upon everybody—that thoughtfulness and calm dignity that ought, always and under all circumstances, to characterize the citizens of a republic that proudly boasts of setting an example of good government to all the world;

and condemned—

as anarchical, the conduct of policemen, who should be the guardians of law, in making domiciliary visits, and in depriving persons of their liberty, without due process of law;

as well as—

the mob spirit that has been exhibited against persons who have been intemperate in their expressions, and who are rather objects of pity than subjects for lawless violence.

These resolutions then proceed with this most excellent civic advice:

Men judge governments more by their fruits, their results, than by their forms; hence we earnestly urge upon every man, comrade or citizen, who truly loves his country, the full performance of his public duty in comprehending and in advocating all measures calculated to promote the welfare, not of a class, not of a few, but of the majority. No possible legislation can prevent the sword of Damocles from hanging over the head of any man who represents a state wherein a considerable number of citizens feel themselves wronged by law, or in its execution, no matter whether that person be called a czar, an emperor, a king or a president. There is more danger in our indifference to public duty than there is in the most rabid rantings of the anarchists of even the Kropotkin school.

Probably no one ever heard Kropotkin rant, but the deference to public prejudice shown in this characterization of the great scientist may be

overlooked for the sake of the lesson it was intended to emphasize.

Though it is quite out of the question to name all the papers, comparatively few as they are, which were serious, sober and intelligent during the stress of the assassination incident, we must make room for a quotation from the Living Church, the Episcopalian organ of the West. This paper rightly insists that writings and speeches which teach that objects, however innocent in themselves, "should be reached by means of murder or any other crime, whether directed against kings, presidents, or other individuals, or indefinitely against 'the rich' or any other class or group of men," should be rigidly punished. But it flatly declares against taking advantage of the recent excitement to enact laws to suppress discussion. Warning its readers against countenancing "hasty and panicky legislation," it says:

The American republic was founded upon the principle of liberty of thought, action and speech. That liberty is absolute, so long as it does not interfere with a like liberty on the part of other people. The right to believe and teach the political principle that all government should cease, and each man be a law unto himself, is a right which cannot be, and ought not to be, abridged. That it is logically absurd has no connection with the case. Anarchy in politics (so understood) and atheism in religion, are twin cults, resting on the same hypothesis. We have outgrown the belief that atheism must be suppressed by law; we must outgrow the belief that anarchy can or should be so suppressed. . . . By discriminating between anarchy as a political belief and anarchy as an instigation to crime, we should be able to reach and punish those guilty of incendiary language, regardless even of whether or not an actual crime should be committed as a result of such instigation, without the slightest degree infringing upon those principles of personal liberty which are the very bulwarks of American freedom.

When the judge who sentenced Czolgosz omitted from the traditional death sentence formula the words, "and may God have mercy on your soul," his omission excited curious comment. Many believed that it was significant of an unwillingness

on the part of the judge to pray for this criminal even in the perfunctory form usual in death sentences. That is, of course, not the only possible explanation. Judge White may have omitted the phrase merely because it is meaningless. He might have omitted it for that reason in any other capital case. But here in Chicago we have a Methodist clergyman, the Rev. William B. Leach, who exhibits the animus which has been, justly or unjustly—unjustly we incline to believe—asccribed to Judge White. In his sermon of last Sunday, as reported by the Chicago press, this clergyman exclaimed:

Pray for Czolgosz? No. The assassin is fixed irrevocably. No murderer shall enter the kingdom. This is enough. Man might as well pray for the devil.

It would be interesting to know what Mr. Leach's religion is.

This Chicago clergyman, who vents his vengeful spirit upon the soul of Czolgosz, has his complement in Chancellor Huntington, of the Nebraska Wesleyan university, who vented his on the assassin's body, by addressing 500 applauding students of his university in this delectable fashion:

I crave for the assassin one mark of distinction. He has earned it and I would it be awarded him. His bones should never be allowed to mingle with American soil. When the death sentence shall be pronounced and executed, as it should be with the swift justice becoming such an unspeakable tragedy, I could wish the United States government would take the remains of the atrocious murderer a hundred miles to sea, and then, pinioned and manacled, with his revolver at his belt and a millstone about his neck, sink the corpse a thousand fathoms to the bottom of the ocean, that thus the anarchist might be warned that he shall not have so much as a grave in a civilized land.

Chancellor Huntington, also, appears to need a label to identify his religion.

How different the spirit of the Rev. John W. Malcolm, of the First Congregational church of Cleveland. How much truer the ring of his sermon, as an expression at once of

Christian sentiment and of sorrow for the murdered president. And how severely yet gently it rebukes such revolting affectations of feeling as the Leaches and the Huntingtons display. Said Mr. Malcolm:

Ah, my friends, a true sorrow does not play with language. A man who really mourns neither swaggers nor swears. People truly sad have few words and no revenge. It isn't possible for a man or woman to feel real grief and real revenge at the same time. It isn't possible for a man or woman in the tears of a wounded love to talk blood and bereavement in the same breath. All this bluster and threat have betrayed both a lack of character and the lack of a genuine sense of loss.

Newspaper readers need no reminder that Emma Goldman was arrested by the Chicago police as the inciter of Czolgosz to the commission of his crime. They know also that the basis of the accusation was Czolgosz's assertion that he had derived his murderous inspiration from a lecture of hers in Cleveland. They may not know, but it is the fact, that there was never, from first to last, the slightest evidence of her culpability. The Chicago authorities so conceded upon consenting to her release from custody. As to the speech, she insists, and the only abstract of it we have seen—published by the Chicago Tribune, a leading republican paper—bears her out, that it not only did not advocate assassination, but opposed it. She is further corroborated in this by the statement of the Tribune, made in connection with its publication of the abstract of her Cleveland speech, that a large force of police was in the hall at the time under instructions to silence her if she said anything of an incendiary character.

For the purpose of demonstrating that this speech was not criminal, Miss Goldman proposed to repeat it before a Chicago audience on the 3d. Her purpose seems to us to have been injudicious, in doubtful taste, and from some points of view otherwise indefensible. But in all those respects she, and not the mayor of Chicago, had, under the American the-

ory of government, the right to be the judge. Had she held her meeting and made an incendiary speech, her case would have been a proper one for the grand jury. But no official had the legal right to assume that it would be incendiary, none had the right to censor it in advance, or to set up standards of discretion or taste for her; none had the right to prohibit her from speaking. Subject to being held to account, in a lawful manner, for any abuse of the right, it was her lawful right to speak. Yet Mayor Harrison, arbitrarily, without law and against law, has ordered the police to prevent her exercise of this right. His act raises a more important question than whether Emma Goldman may make a public speech. It raises a question of whether our laws shall be observed by those who are chosen and sworn to administer them.

Mayor Harrison's reasons for interfering are given in his letter of instructions to the chief of police, and in no particular do they justify his act. He says:

It does not seem to me that the present is the proper time for Miss Goldman to appear in public in Chicago.

Neither does it so appear to us. In that we agree with the mayor. But the law has not invested him or the police with jurisdiction over the proprieties. That reason for his interference is utterly without merit. It is followed by another, and if possible poorer one. Much less, says the mayor, does he think this a proper time—

to deliver a lecture which has been publicly advertised as leading up to the assassination of the chief executive of the nation.

Again we agree as to the question of propriety. But we fail to grasp the mayor's objection to that lecture in particular. If, as Miss Goldman insists, it could not have incited the assassin, then the fact that his assertion and her consequent arrest have advertised it as having led up to the assassination would tend to lessen

rather than to augment the impropriety of her delivering it at this time. The mayor's next objection is stated by him as follows:

The fact that Miss Goldman's name has been mentioned in connection with Czolgosz's act is enough of itself to prevent the city administration from permitting her to appear in public in Chicago for the purpose of delivering an address on anything.

Pray, where does Mayor Harrison find legal authority for that astounding and dangerous, not to say anarchistic, proposition? May anyone forfeit the right of free speech, regardless of the subject he would discuss, merely because his name has been mentioned, however falsely, in connection with a crime? Still another objection, and only this in addition to those already quoted, is raised by Mayor Harrison:

The advertising of her proposed delivery of the lecture which, rightly or wrongfully, at least is claimed by Czolgosz to have first led him to do his act, and that, too, before the customary 30 days of official mourning for the death of the president, as established by the city council, has expired, is little short of the extreme of impudence.

Granted. But from what American law—national, state or city—does the mayor of Chicago, or the police force, derive any legal jurisdiction over questions of impudence? Conscious, apparently, of the illegality of his order, Mayor Harrison seeks to justify it as a peace precaution. Instructing the chief of police to forbid "the delivery of any lecture by Miss Goldman in Chicago at the present time," he explains:

Her appearance in public, as likely as not, would lead to some breach of the peace, and on this ground, if on no other, the police department can justify its action.

The obvious duty of the police, it would seem, if a breach of the peace were feared, would be to attend the meeting and prevent, not the lawful speaking, but the lawless breach of the peace. That is one of the things the police are for. It is not their function to put down speaking because disorderly mobs threaten speak-

ers. It is their function to put down disorderly mobs.

To defend the right of free speech in a case like this of Miss Goldman's is no gracious task. But let those who believe in free speech be warned in time. Should that right be lost, it will be through just such precedents as Mayor Harrison has made in the Goldman case. Little by little these precedents accumulate. Beginning with popularly hated speakers like Miss Goldman, they advance to less and less obnoxious ones, until the right of free speech is lost to all but a favored few in a mass of hostile precedents. Mayor Harrison's order is a dangerous one, and the thoughtless who to-day applaud it may live to taste some of its bitter fruits, for changes are coming with great rapidity. Let the lessons of history be learned before it is too late. The only sure way of preserving popular rights is to insist upon always recognizing and defending them, even though at times the person whose rights are invaded be most obnoxious, perhaps rightly so, and the occasion apparently most inopportune: "Eternal vigilance," our race has been taught, "is the price of liberty." It is a wise saying.

As our readers know, we have never given much credence to the republican boasting about their era of "prosperity." It has seemed to us that this prosperity has been monopolized by a very small proportion of the people. But we had not expected to have that view adopted, as it has been, by the Cleveland Leader, Senator Hanna's home organ. The Leader doesn't like Mayor Johnson. Consequently, when the mayor ordered better food for workhouse inmates, the Leader made this an occasion for one of its virulent attacks; and in that attack, thrown off its guard, it let this frank confession of the prevailing poverty slip into the types:

Mayor Johnson appears to have a tender spot in his heart for these of-