case of Fred D. Warren of the Appeal to Reason. Mr. Warren was convicted by a Federal court in Kansas (vol. xiii, pp. 469, 1133, 1141) of sending scurrilous matter exposed to general view through the mails. What he had done was to print on envelopes an offer of a reward for the kidnapping of ex-Governor Taylor of Kentucky, a fugitive from justice who had found an asylum in Indiana, whose Governor, a co-partisan, arbitrarily refused to extradite him for trial for murder upon the requisition of the Governor of Kentucky. Mr. Warren had no personal interest in Taylor's case. But certain socialists had been kidnapped in Colorado and taken to Idaho for trial for murder (of which they were finally acquitted), and the Supreme Court had refused to interfere in their behalf. In this affair Mr. Warren, as a socialist, did have an acute interest. Arguing that what was lawful against Colorado Socialists ought to be as lawful against a Kentucky Republican, and finding that offers of reward on exposed mail matter for the capture of fugitives from justice is common, he made an offer on exposed mail matter for the kidnapping of Taylor and taking him to Kentucky for trial—just as in the case of the Colorado Socialists. He wanted to see whether the judge-made law of Federal courts works with Republicans as with Socialists, and he has found that it does not. The Idaho kidnappers were protected against the Colorado Socialists; on the other hand, the Republican fugitive was protected against Socialist kidnappers. Not only in the lower Federal court, but also in the appellate court, Mr. Warren has been held to account criminally for trying to have done with Gov. Taylor what was done with the Colorado Socialists, not unlawfully as the Supreme Court held; and in trying it by means in common use by sheriffs, bankers, etc. Mr. Warren refuses to appeal to the President for pardon, insisting he has committed no crime; and Socialists generally are protesting against the discrimination of which his case is an example. We have heretofore commented on the case (vol. xii, p. 700) and have nothing to add. As we said then, we say now, that the sending of scurrilous matter through the mails exposed on postal cards, envelopes or the like, is and ought to be prohibited by law; but that in Warren's case there has been "a gross abuse of the machinery of government for the purpose of penalizing a political journal whose views are obnoxious to the party in power." This abuse is traceable from the office of President Roosevelt's attorney general, through the Federal court in Kansas to the appellate court at St. Paul. That it is an abuse throughout is evident from the fact that the law in question is commonly violated by business men in precisely the way in which it was violated by Warren, if he did violate it, and they are not prosecuted, while he is. His prosecution was inspired and has been vindictive, and for political reasons.

✦ ✦

Race Associations.

We are sympathetic with the feeling among self-respecting Negroes that a Young Men's Christian Association for Negroes is, as the Cleveland Gazette calls it, a "Jim Crow" Y. M. Christian A.; but the strongest position for Negroes is to ignore the insult implied by their exclusion from the white man's organization and remember that the truest self-respect avoids unwelcome association.

✦

This matter raises a different question from that of public utility service and public schools. It is purely a question of voluntary association. If blondes object to association with brunettes, it is their right; and on the other hand it is the privilege of the brunettes to smile and leave the others to the enjoyment of their own narrowness. Why not make Negro Y. M. C. A.'s exclusive, admitting no whites to membership and but barely tolerating them, if at all, as occasional visitors? It wouldn't be Christian, to be sure, but it might put an end to foolish race antipathies quicker than any other course.

✦ ✦

Railroad Regulation.

When John Moody was before the Hadley commission (vol. xiii, p. 1163) at Chicago last week as a witness, he told that body that there is only one remedy for the traffic evils which they are trying to diagnose, and that sooner or later they must see it. He explained that he meant public ownership.

✦

The way in which men of "light and leading," such as those on that commission, seem to dodge the inevitable, might be comic if it were not prejudicial to the public interests they are trying to protect. But can they hope to extract from railroad capitalization the "unearned increment" which fills the place in value of dead and gone equipment? Wouldn't public purchase be easier? Yet that element becomes annually of more and more importance.

✦

If there were no special privileges in railroading, the capitalizing of wornout equipment would soon

bring on bankruptcy. A carpenter, for illustration, who went into debt for his tools, and instead of paying this debt out of his earnings used up his earnings in interest and dividends, and then increased his debt upon buying new tools to replace the useless old ones, would reach a point quite early in his business career at which he couldn't keep his I. O. U.'s up to par unless he owned the site of his shop and it grew in value. Railroads do own the site of their shop—the right of way, side holdings of farming and mining land, important terminals, etc.—and these do grow in value with the growth of the community. Consequently railroad capitalization of dead and gone equipment is kept up in value, not by earnings, but by financial confidence in the growing value of rights of way, etc. If that value does not grow fast enough, or are speculative (bringing in little or no present income), it may be necessary to increase rates, just as the debt-ridden carpenter might find it necessary to increase his charges, in order to keep going. That railway stock jobbers should do this is as easily accounted for as the motives of a burglar, but for courts and commissioners to solemnly compare income with dead equipment for the purpose of regulating rates, is—well, why is it?

✣ ✣

Poor Rip Van Winkle.

An antique objection to land value taxation has been resurrected by the Milwaukee Sentinel. If increases in land value are taken from landowners for public revenues, why shall not decreases in land values be made up to landowners out of public revenues?

✣

That is the Sentinel's resurrected question. It is another illustration of the confusion into which parasitical minds are thrown when a proposal is made to abolish parasites. They think of their graft as their property. But if land values to any extent at all—not improvement values but site values,—if these were justly the private property of land owners, there would be no temptation for the Sentinel to ask its question. Prove the justice of private ownership of land values, and that is enough. But on the theory, which no one has yet rationally refuted, that the public owns land values, where is the sense in proposing to pay land gamblers for losses if you take winnings? The winnings are not to be taken because they are winnings, but because they don't belong to the winners and do belong to the public. However, the single tax, which the slumberous Sentinel thinks it knocks out with that long abandoned device of setting off "undeserved decrement" against "unearned increment," would allow fairly for the loser in land gambling. It would so adjust taxes that only the "unearned increment" of land would be the basis of taxation—industry being wholly exempt,—and the tax would be ad valorem: the greater the "increment" the greater the tax, the greater the "decrement" the lower the tax. If any "undeserved decrement" dropped to the bottom, it wouldn't be taxed at all.

✣ ✣

Tariff Boards.

If the outgoing Congress finishes the work laid out for it, the Tariff Board will be increased to five members—two of them Democrats of some brand or other, perhaps of the brand from which President Taft draws his Democratic cabinet members. Even that may be better than the present Board, which, composed altogether of Republicans, is strictly non-partisan—provided it does nothing to expose the fallacies and frauds of protection, or that may peradventure help the Democrats.

✣ ✣

Two Notable Plays.

Contrasting "The Passing of the Third Floor Back" (vol. xi, p. 711) with "The Servant in the House" (vol. xi, pp. 581, 591, 678, 710), one might call the latter a poem and the former a modern comedy, with the same theme, vitalized by the same impulse, and the former more perfect in its kind and grade of art than the latter. In describing the lesson of the former, the Inter Ocean's critic, Eric Delamater, summarizes that of both: "The dramatist says frankly: 'Regeneration is not the act of emptying out individual temperment and pouring in a sort of molten spiritual sentimentality; it is the careful developing of the better traits.' Purification, not persecution. And to point this idea, he marshals this company of wrinkled souls, who might come from any section of any city."

✣

The principal character of the "Third Floor Back" charmingly interpreted by Forbes Robertson, is just "one of the folks" all through the play; so much so that one wonders how he makes converts from selfishness to service so easily and quickly, until in his voice one begins to detect, as each of the other characters does, an echo of that character's past which awakens the regenerative influences within himself.