

them to reduce the hours of these women from 12 to 10; and by thus compelling them to employ 6 women for every 5 they employ now, it would have a tendency to increase wages. They don't like it. So they tell the Governor and their women employes, that if he signs that bill they will displace the women with men. But where will they get men for a 12-hour day at women's wages—if it is true that anybody can get work at decent pay if he wants it? Unless the talk about plenty of employment is a cruel lie, the threat of the elevated railroad companies is an infamous bluff.

+ +

### Bossism.

Boss Cox of Cincinnati was right when he described the political boss as a product of conditions, and himself as not especially worse than other men. Citizens who oppose the Initiative, Referendum and Recall are the conservators of bossism, no matter how much they denounce boss rule and bosses; and defenders of economic conditions that foster involuntary poverty, are responsible—more than all the Boss Coxes put together—for the civic evils of bossism. So long as certain economic conditions, which they defend, continue, boss rule will continue. And who can blame the Boss Coxes if they prefer bossing to being bossed? When the juggernaut lumbered along, wouldn't any of us rather have been above its wheels than under them? If we are not willing to abolish the causes of civic evils, let us patiently endure their effects.

+ +

### The Anti-Trust Law.

Now that the Supreme Court, by *obiter dicta* in the Standard Oil trust case, and decisively in the tobacco trust case, has announced that combines in reasonable restraint of trade are not combines in restraint of trade, are the judicial decks sufficiently cleared for bringing the steel trust to trial and awarding it a verdict of not guilty?

+ +

### Judicial Usurpation.

We of the United States are accustomed to thinking of the British House of Lords as the historical forerunner of our Senate. And so it is if we go no farther back in the history of the House of Lords than the period, before it had begun to lose its power of legislation, when Alexander Hamilton fastened a copy of it upon our system. But if we go farther back we shall find that it is not the Senate that stands in our system for the British House of Lords, but the Supreme Court.

It would seem so at any rate from the following quotation from a foot note to John Milton's famous "Defence of the People of England," at page 190 of the first volume (Bohn edition) of Milton's prose works: "Sir Ralph Saddler, in his 'Rights of the Kingdom,' pp. 84-92, undertakes to prove that all the power of the state originates in the House of Commons, that is to say, is derived through that House from the people, and he treats the House of Peers as *a mere judicial assembly*, which, properly speaking, has *no right to legislate*."

+

Not every bit of political history could be as interesting as that; especially at this time, when the British House of Lords is being divested of its usurped functions of legislation, and the Supreme Court of the United States is girding itself to usurp precisely those functions in our Republic. Shall our posterity see the day when some as yet unborn American Asquith will be leading the way to wresting from the Supreme Court its assumption of legislative power and restoring the power to Congress? May some yet-to-be Ralph Saddler, discoursing upon the "Rights of the Republic," undertake to prove that all the power of the United States originates in Congress, and that the Supreme Court is "a mere judicial assembly, which, properly speaking, has no right to legislate"?

+ +

### News From Mexico.

In less than a year after all the great newspapers were assured that there was no revolution in Mexico nor reason for one—assured into silence,—they are obliged to report the complete overthrow of Diaz by a revolution that was in full vigor while they ignored it. Was this poor journalism? Or what? Not only the American newspapers, but also those of Europe are guilty—even the London Times. The London Times was given a chance, too; but it slept on.

+ + +

### SOCIALIST AND SINGLETAXER.

In a Socialist cartoon a hen is pictured gathering her brood under her wing, while a hawk above them plunges threateningly downward. There is a factory in the background. "Motherhood" is the name of the hen, "Capitalism" of the hawk.

An explanation may be found in that cartoon of why two energetic types of social revolutionaries, seeking the same end, are irreconcilable each to the other's cause. We allude to Socialists and Singletaxers—to Socialists irrespective of Social-

ist parties in politics, of course, and to Singletaxers other than those who are such only for fiscal ends.

+

The difference between them arises out of that kind of misapprehension on both sides that goes with what Arnold Bennett somewhat extravagantly calls "a perfect lack of imagination."

If, for illustration, we were to reproduce that cartoon of the hen and the hawk, the straight-laced Singletaxer would complain of the term "Capitalism" as an improper name for the hawk. In other respects he would be sympathetic with the cartoon to his heart's core. No Socialist could outdo him in indignation at the system that "crowds human beings into noisome cellars and squalid tenement houses, that fills prisons and brothels, that goads men with want and consumes them with greed, that robs women of the grace and beauty of perfect womanhood, that takes from little children the joy and innocence of life's morning." But he would insist that the hawk is "Landlordism," not "Capitalism."

If in order not to displease the Singletaxer we were to reproduce that cartoon with "Landlordism" substituted for "Capitalism" as the name of the hawk, we should encounter Socialistic criticism. Every Socialist whose lack of imagination corresponded in its perfection to that of the straight-laced Singletaxer, would then make merry over our ignorance in supposing that "landlordism" instead of "capitalism" is the cause of the child labor evil.

+

Notwithstanding this direct opposition, however, the Socialist and the Singletaxer mean the same thing. When the one rails at "capitalism" as the economic devil of our time, and the other denounces "landlordism" as the economic devil of all time, the devil that both see is precisely the same devil. Though the Socialist regards "landlordism" as a comparatively innocuous survival of a dead civilization, while the Singletaxer regards "capitalism" with academic tenderness, each is thoroughly hating the same institution by a different name. Lack of imagination is so perfect with both, that neither has the slightest apprehension of what it is that the other means.

Whenever that type of Socialist sees or hears of "capitalism" or uses the word, he thinks of a social system in which all kinds of industrial property, land included, are *capitalized*. Its owners therefore appear to him to constitute a "capitalist" class, personally distinct from the "labor" class. But when the same Socialist sees or hears of "land-

lordism," or uses the word, he thinks only of the Feudal system so far as he thinks of a system at all. So far as he thinks of modern landlordism it is only of those odds and ends of land-ownership that are of trifling importance in comparison with the living, breathing, growing, deadly and devilish Capitalism which has superseded Feudalism.

On the other hand, when the straight-laced Singletaxer sees or hears of "capitalism," or uses the word, he thinks of it merely as an immediate derivative of the economic term "capital,"—of wealth used to produce more wealth, of artificial tools of production—and of this as a definite technical term which excludes all kinds of land. When the same Singletaxer sees or hears of "landlordism" or uses the word, he thinks of it as a system of planet-owning, regardless of whether the system is Feudalistic or Capitalistic in form.

In other words, the Socialist derives his conception of "capital" from the habits of business men, who include all values in their "capital" account—machine values, house values, land values, franchise values, slave values (if there be slaves); whereas the Singletaxer derives his conception of "capital" from the economists who, finding that land functions differently from labor products, have placed them in different economic categories regardless of whether they are owned by the same persons or classes or not.

The real issue, therefore, between Socialists and Singletaxers, who disagree on economic as distinguished from party grounds, is not whether the enemy of true social order is Capitalism (a name which means one thing to the Socialist and an entirely different thing to the Singletaxer) or Landlordism (a name which means one thing to the Singletaxer and an entirely different thing to the Socialist); but whether the evil power of Capitalism is due essentially to ownership of land, or to ownership of land *and* labor-produced capital.

For illustration, the Reading Railroad Company is to the Socialist not a "landlord" but a "capitalist." But in the Singletaxer's understanding it is both "capitalist" and "landlord." And in truth, the Reading Railroad Company is enormously more "landlord" than "capitalist," when those terms are economically distinguished. Its holdings of labor-produced capital amount to a bagatelle in comparison with the value of its land. To say nothing of its 1,700 miles of right-of-way land, its holdings of coal land exceed 132,780 acres, and they are worth fully \$500,000,000.\*

When the Socialist speaks of "capitalism" he al-

\*See "An Instance of Land Capitalism," in *The Public*, vol. xii, p. 1297.

cludes to industrial institutions, such as the Reading Railway Company, which are numerous, and are so unified in ownership by capitalization as to make a vast net work of "capitalistic class" interests the world over. And this is precisely what the Singletaxer means when he speaks of "land-lordism."

+

The Singletaxer's thought does not center upon the labor-produced property which bookkeepers merge with land in "capital account" in their ledgers. The Socialist's thought does center upon that property when its values are mixed with land values as if they were only one kind of value. It is ownership of these mixed values, bundled together in the term "capital" or "capitalism," which seems to the Socialist to constitute the oppressive power of our civilization. The Singletaxer denies that ownership of labor-produced capital, except in so far as its value is mixed with or reinforced by land monopoly, has any oppressive power.

The Socialist, therefore, who argues that there must be coercive power in "capital" over labor, because labor is in fact coerced by ownership of land and capital, seems to the Singletaxer like a man who should argue that soda water must be intoxicating because men get drunk on brandy and soda.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### AUSTRALIA.\*

Corowa, N. S. W., May 4.

Near the end of last December, the State parliament of Victoria passed an act providing for a tax on land values of a half-penny in the pound [2 mills to the dollar] with an exemption of £250 [\$1,250].

+

The annual Labor conference of New South Wales was held at Sydney in February.

It has been for some time an open secret, but this year it was stated publicly, that this conference is the parliament of the Labor Party, and that the elected Labor representatives in the Federal and State parliaments have merely to carry out the dictates of the conference. It was also made public that the conference was dominated by the Australian Workers' Union, the largest and most aggressive union in Australia.

A very warm discussion arose at the conference over the action of some members of the State government of New South Wales in opposing the proposed amendments to the federal Constitution. Finally these members were virtually given the alternative of withdrawing their opposition or leaving the Labor Party and they chose the former.

\*See current volume, pages 79 and 392.

Following is the platform of the party for the State of New South Wales:

1. Constitutional reform: (a) Abolition of the Legislative Council (upper house), and the substitution thereof of the Initiative and Referendum; (b) electoral reform to provide proper machinery for the true representation of the people in Parliament.

2. Regulation of hours of labor.

3. Land and financial reform: (a) Cessation of further sales of Crown lands; (b) a proper system of closer settlement; (c) water conservation and irrigation; (d) restriction of public borrowing; (e) State bank; (f) graduated land tax.

4. Free education: (a) Secondary; (b) technical; (c) University.

5. Nationalization of coal mines.

+

Two proposed amendments to the federal Constitution were submitted to the people by referendum on April 26th.

The first, called the "Legislative Powers" amendment, provided that—

the Commonwealth Parliament shall be empowered to make laws with respect to:—(1) Trade and commerce within the States. (2) Corporations formed under the law of a State. (3) Wages and conditions of employment in any industry. (4) The prevention and settlement of industrial disputes in relation to employment on or about railways the property of any State. (5) Combinations and monopolies in relation to the production, manufacture, or supply of goods or services.

By the second, the "Monopolies" amendment, it was proposed to add to the Constitution that—

when each House of the Parliament, in the same session, has by resolution declared that the industry or business of producing, manufacturing, or supplying any specified services is the subject of a monopoly, the Parliament shall have power to make laws for carrying on the industry or business by or under the control of the Commonwealth, and acquiring for that purpose, on just terms, any property used in connection with the industry or business.

These amendments are very far reaching, and if carried would have extended so greatly the powers of the Commonwealth over affairs now under the control of the States, that practically they would have produced unification instead of federation. And as every State, regardless of population, has equal representation in the federal Senate, it would have been a most unfair form of unification.

The results are not yet quite complete, but it is certain that each amendment has been defeated by a majority of over 250,000 in a total vote of about 1,200,000. Both amendments were defeated in every State except Western Australia, where they were carried by small majorities.

These amendments were submitted by the federal (Labor) government but evidently they did not obtain the solid support of the Labor Party.

+

Penny postage [two cents] was established throughout the Commonwealth on May 1st.

ERNEST BRAY.

+ + +

Justice Harlan dissents. [tf.]—Chicago Tribune.