

to, for the owners of unused land would unload if land value taxes were too high to leave an unearned profit. Besides adding to the economic strength of labor, this would increase the economic weakness of labor exploiters. And not for a time but for good and all. It would literally "cut the ground from under" the exploitation of labor.

After that, the whole problem of labor exploitation would again be simply one of "going on," but of going on in the opposite direction from now. With land monopoly at the base of our industrial system, it is labor exploitation that gains by the "going on;" but with land monopoly shriveled by taxation of land values and industry stimulated by exemption of labor values, the "going on" would be toward a complete uprooting of labor exploitation and the absolute economic independence of labor.



Other methods of destroying labor exploitation may be more spectacular than this one. They may exhibit more of the poetry of motion. They may be more complex. They may be more superficially attractive. They may appeal more strongly to the sociological microscopist who thinks that "life isn't as simple as all that." They may give promise of helping the worker without hurting the exploiter. Any one of them may better serve the purpose of fanatics or of dabblers in industrial reform. But this method answers best to the three tests—ease in application, speed in operation, effectiveness in result.

It could be easily applied in our country. For in its beginning it might be but a mild extension of a custom already established. We tax land values now, and we often encourage improvement by partial or temporary exemptions of improvements. Let us have more of both.

It would be speedy in operation. For when the good effects of its primary applications were recognized, movements to extend it would be popular and spontaneous. This is human nature.

It would be effective in result. For exemption of industry from taxation, along with heavy taxation of land values, would so continuously encourage industry and discourage land monopoly as to keep demand for labor constantly ahead of supply. This is an economic truism.



Still further advantages over other methods for uprooting labor exploitation are offered by this one. It needs no revolution to adopt it. Its benefits begin with its first applications and grow with their extension. And when it is in full operation,

it furnishes a secure foundation for any other or further industrial reform that may then be needed or desired.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, April 19, 1910.

Republican Politics.

President Taft's bill for the regulation of monopoly, under consideration in the Senate in the form of a Court of Commerce bill, furnished the occasion on the 12th for a ruthless exposure of the bill by Senator La Follette. In the course of a speech of four hours, for which careful and minute preparation was evident and which alluded to the Standpat speeches of Mr. Wickersham and Mr. Taft (p. 347), Mr. La Follette said:

Never before has any one undertaken seriously to put through Congress a charter for the monopolization and oppression of the commerce of this country such as is carried in the devious language and hidden purposes of this measure. Never before has it been attempted, with the support of the national Administration, and of the party organization in Congress, to legislate for special privilege and against the public interest.

The mask is off. Mr. Mellen, Mr. Byrnes, and others of their kind are but hired megaphones, through which a beefy, red faced, thick necked financial bully, drunk with wealth and power, bawls his orders to stock markets, directors, courts, governments and nations. We have been listening to Mr. Morgan! No arguments worthy of the name have been advanced to justify this measure. The statements and arguments heard by the President's committee which led it to agree upon the original bill, the bill which formed the nucleus about which the railroads and the Attorney General subsequently arranged the really important provisions of this bill, are not disclosed to Congress, but repose in the archives of the Department of Justice. Nor has the Attorney General deigned to make public the considerations placed before him by representatives of railroad financial interests which led him to make the changes which he did make in this bill. These changes were made and such reasons as the Attorney General offered to the committee on interstate commerce in support of them were presented after the public hearings on the bill were closed to Congress and to the public. No representative of any public interest was notified of the changes or given any opportunity to be heard concerning them. They are embodied in a complete new bill, introduced in the Senate and reported by the committee for passage

in the same day. Yet, if we pause to inquire, if we are not already convinced beforehand to vote for and pass this legislation without investigation of the conditions with which it deals, without any knowledge of its effect in application, without even being informed of the reasons which controlled in framing it, we are accused of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy." We are denounced by the Attorney General as traitors to the Republican party and threatened with the displeasure of the Administration. Mr. President, men who have grown gray fighting the battles of the Republican party are not obliged to have their Republicanism certified by an Attorney General, who, until recently, was known to the public chiefly as attorney for the Big Business and financial interests of New York. Nor will they be intimidated by him or his kind in their efforts to bring the Republican party in Congress and convention, as it still is among the people, back to the Republicanism of Lincoln, to the service of public interests and of public interests alone.

The pending bill has been heralded to the country as "a bill to create a court of commerce." It is true that the bill proposes in the first section to create a court of commerce, but the court of commerce provision is relatively of so little importance among the many provisions of this bill that, giving not the slightest clew to the real purposes of this legislation, it amounts, in effect, to a misnomer. The bill is before the country under false pretenses and a false title. The court of commerce provision is little more than a mask, behind which lurk unknown and unnumbered villainies of proposed legislation. This bill, Mr. President, is the boldest raid upon public right in the form of legislation upon this great subject that the System ever has succeeded in forcing upon the serious consideration of Congress.

+ +

Democratic Politics.

Jefferson's birthday dinners on the 13th brought out expressions from leading Democrats upon the present political situation in the United States. The most notable in that respect were the dinner at Washington and the one at Indianapolis, at both of which a letter from William J. Bryan, who was traveling in South America when he wrote it, was read. Objections to parts of it were made by some of the Democratic leaders. Following is the part of the letter that contained the expressions to which objections were made:

I notice that we seem likely to win a victory over the meat trust. Monopoly prices at last have provoked a popular protest, and now that the people are looking for a remedy there is hope that they will accept the Democratic remedy. It is not unnatural that they should use the boycott, even if they punish themselves while they are inflicting punishment on their oppressors; but I am sure they will in the end, find legislation more satisfactory than abstinence from meat, and join with the Democrats in declaring a private monopoly—not the meat trust only, but every private monopoly—indefensible and intolerable. Another item of news has just come to my attention. President Taft, in his Lincoln speech at New York Feb. 12, attributes present high prices

mainly to the increase in the production of gold and the consequent enlargement of the volume of money. This unexpected indorsement of our party's proposition in 1896, when we demanded more money as the only remedy for falling prices, is very gratifying. How valuable that admission would have been to us if it had been made during the campaign of that year, when the Republican leaders were denying that the volume of money had any influence on prices, and asserting that it did not matter whether we had much money or little, provided it was all good. We may now consider the quantitative theory of money established beyond dispute and proceed to the consideration of other questions. But the President and his predecessor have admitted the correctness of the Democratic position on so many questions that further argument is hardly necessary on any subject. We may take judgment against the Republican party by confession.

+ +

Another Landslide.

A Standpat Republican was defeated for Congress on the 19th at Rochester, N. Y., by James S. Havens, a Democrat, by 5,000 plurality. The Republican, whose death had caused the vacancy, was elected in 1908 by 10,167.

+ +

Bryan's Return.

After a tour of South America and the West Indies, William J. Bryan returned to the United States on the 18th, landing at New York. After a call upon Mayor Gaynor, he was received at dinner by the Circumnavigators' Club, which had elected him to membership. Asked by newspaper interviewers if he would consent to accept another nomination for the Presidency, Mr. Bryan said: "I have said all I am going to say on that subject. I think my position is understood perfectly. I don't think it necessary to deny stories that I am going to be a candidate for the United States Senate or that I am going to embrace the Prohibition movement."

+ +

Convention of Women Suffragists.

The most memorable national convention of women suffragists in the history of that movement in the United States (vol. xii, p. 664; vol. xiii, p. 256) assembled at Washington, D. C., on the 14th and remained in session until the 19th. They were addressed by President Taft on the opening day; and among the speakers at their mass meetings were Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Ella S. Stewart, and Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Robins. In a long procession of taxicabs on the 18th they sent to Congress a petition for a Constitutional amendment giving suffrage to women. The petition, which was signed by 400,000 persons, was delivered to Senators and Representatives in bundles by States. These were presented to the two Houses by the members entrusted with them. Senator La Follette made an eloquent speech in the Senate in behalf of the petition as he pre-