

Spots worth \$1.25 an acre then, are worth from a million to ten million an acre now. Those values are evoked by the city as a whole. If the city disappeared they would disappear; if the city fell off in population, they would fall off; but as the city grows, they grow. Are not these site values city property? Then why not take them for the city? If the city got them, the city wouldn't be poor. It is as Mr. Hoyne said, the abject poverty of the city of Chicago is because it doesn't get all the revenue to which it is entitled.



### An Object Lesson.

An example of the absurdity of our present system of taxation is to be observed in New York. The city is just finishing a large office building for its own use, for the purpose of gathering under one roof many scattered Municipal departments. The building is located at the entrance to the Brooklyn Bridge, Manhattan side, and the site alone has cost the city the vast sum of \$7,000,000. Think of what that means! The city builds the Brooklyn Bridge with public money, thereby making this spot one of the most congested in America, and therefore, for business purposes, one of the most lucrative. Again, with its own funds the city builds a four-track subway at vast expense. This brings additional millions of people to the same center, again enhancing the business desirability of that spot. Then, when the city needs a building of its own in that locality, it finds itself a victim of its own enterprise. It must pay \$7,000,000 for a few square feet of land over its own subways and adjacent to its own bridge. Why? In economics and in morals, why? The question is referred respectfully to those political economists and publicists who proclaim the wisdom and morality of private ownership of publicly produced land values—Professor Plehn, for instance, of the University of California.



### Press Censorship.

Official and judicial censorship of the press seemed well enough to good people of the smug variety when *The Public* and a few other publications were denouncing official interferences with it. It was applied in some of the most dangerous and drastic forms in the postal service under President Roosevelt's administration, as well as by municipal authorities under police power, and by courts on pretense of punishing contempts. Those instances of autocracy are bearing their natural fruit now. In Idaho a daily newspaper has suppressed a speech by Mr. Roosevelt in fear

of the Supreme Court of the State which was punishing its managers for contempt for having said editorially what this suppressed speech said. There are few things more dangerous to liberty than ignoring the first assaults upon it. To muzzle a Goldman or a Harman when they would advocate unpopular doctrines, is to lay the foundations for censorship of a Roosevelt when he utters opinions that are popular. To throttle the liberties of speech and press of even the least or the worst among us, is to threaten those liberties for even the biggest or the best.



### Mr. Roosevelt and the Progressive Party.

Efforts were not lacking at the Progressive Party conference at Chicago last week to stamp Mr. Roosevelt's proprietary trade mark deeper than ever upon the organization; but they amounted to little outside of newspapers that have tied themselves up to his personal fortunes in politics. This is fortunate. The more distinctly the Progressive Party appears as Mr. Roosevelt's own, the more difficult will it be, in the event of a cleavage in the Democratic Party, for democratic Democrats and progressive Republicans to coalesce in the present Progressive Party. A ready-made party originating in a Republican bolt over Presidential candidates, composed almost exclusively of Republicans, clinging to Protection as a principle, tangled up in the animosities and ambitions of Mr. Roosevelt (formerly a Freetrader but latterly and still a Protectionist), and committed to his candidacy in 1916 and his intermediate leadership, could not make a very strong appeal to democratic Democrats who bolt their own party for playing the Protection game as its reactionaries are scheming to have it do. Inasmuch, however, as the Chicago Conference recommended the Initiative, Referendum and Recall for the government of the Progressive Party, this organization may after all turn out to be an attractive political refuge for democratic Democrats if reactionary Democrats do succeed in controlling the Democratic Party in the interest of the Interests.



### Darrow on Trial Again.

It may be that the prosecuting officials at Los Angeles are acting with good faith in bringing Clarence S. Darrow to trial on another accusation, after his acquittal in their strongest case of substantially the same offense. It does not look so, however, at this distance. The circumstances suggest one or both of two inferences: that Dar-