ment which does not secure to all the low fare investors their full capital and its guaranteed dividends.

A vital question is now before the people of Cleveland. The issue is clearly drawn. It is between the traction ring on one side, and on the other the public interests for which Mayor Johnson has fought steadily for nine years. It is a vital question, and it involves a fight to the finish. As in the past, so now, Mayor Johnson has all the odds massed against him that Big Business in partnership with corrupt politics and befooled respectability can command. But the City Council has proved its fidelity, and the people of the city are responding with the old enthusiasm. There is no reason to doubt that they will stand behind these men who are standing for them.

## The Chicago School Lands Bill.

The true character of the Commercial Club's bill for reorganizing the public schools of Chicago (p. 555) was crisply exposed by Senator Cruikshank when this bill came before the Senate with a recommendation from the committee on education that it do not pass. We quote from the stenographic report of what occurred in the Illinois Senate on the 28th of May:

Senator Landee—Mr. President, the Committee on Education reports back a bill.

Secretary Paddock.—The Committee on Education reports back House bill No. 588 with a recommendation that it do not pass, but lie on the table.

Senator Jones—Mr. President, I move that the Senate do not concur in the report of the committee.

Senator Cruikshank—Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table. Now, Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I ask leave to state what this bill is, that the gentlemen may know what it is about. [Cries of "Leave," "Leave."] I will make the explanation very brief. This is a bill which gives to the School Board of the city of Chicago the right to lease their properties there for ninety-nine years without re-valuation. If that is a fair proposition, if you gentlemen think that that is a fair proposition, if you would do that with your own property, then I will be satisfied to have you vote this bill in.

Senator Dunlap—Was the Senator a member of the committee that reported the bill out?

Senator Cruikshank—I was, and I was opposed to the passage of the bill—I proposed to the lobby that they put an amendment in there, making it twenty-five years, but they declined to do it. They wanted the ninety-nine years, or none,—

Senator Dunlap—If this goes on second reading, will you not have an opportunity to offer such an amendment?

Senator Cruikshank—And furthermore, I do not believe that the position of the committee ought to be questioned. If these were unimproved lands, there might be some justice in it, but the land is all improved with permanent structures, and I say that to tie this property up, which is for the benefit of the children of the city of Chicago, and for the benefit of your children, because your boys are coming to the city of Chicago every day and every hour—I say to tie it up for three generations, because the average life of man is thirty-five years—to tie this property up for three generations in the interest of the rich men is an outrage, and I hope the motion will be laid on the table.

Senator Hamilton—If this bill doesn't become a law, is there any law now that provides that a school board may lease property for so long a time?

Senator Cruikshank—That question is now in the courts, and for that reason this bill is here. It is pending in the courts, and is now being litigated, and the fellows who have these leases are afraid of what the court may decide and so they come down here and try to fix it up with a bill.

The lobby referred to by Senator Cruikshank was composed of Theodore W. Robinson, of the steel trust and a Busse appointee of the Chicago school board; of Otto C. Schneider, of the tobacco trust and a Busse appointee of the Chicago school hoard of which he is president; of a large number of other Big Business representatives; and of the secretary, the attorney, and the assistant attorney of the Board of Education, who were in the lobby under orders from the inner ring of the school board and at school board expense without school board sanction. The "fellows who have these leases" and of whom Senator Cruikshank said that they were "afraid of what the court may decide and so come down here and try to fix it up with a bill," are the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Evening News, and various other business interests which are preying upon the school fund. The Senator Jones who made the lost motion that "the Senate do not concur" in the report of the committee adversely to the bill, a man of abilities and character, is a Senatorial representative of Governor Deneen, who sometimes allows factional obligations to transcend those that are essentially more important.

## The Core of the Social Question.

As defined by Philip Snowden, one of the Labor members of the British House of Commons and a pronounced socialist, socialism may be much more widely accepted than is commonly believed to be possible. In an article on the British budget, which appears in the London Socialist Review for June, Mr. Snowden says: "The main object of socialism is to obtain social wealth for social use; nationalization of the means of production and distribution is not socialism, but the condition of socialism." It will be observed that in this defini-

tion the object of socialism is distinguished from the method which such socialists as Mr. Snowden believe to be necessary for realizing the object, and that the object, however realized, "is to obtain social wealth for social use."

> • state

Be Mr. Snowden's statement accepted as orthodox or not, it is certainly a correct interpretation of the social problem, whether you call it socialism or something else. For the core of the social problem is such a distribution of values as that the values of individual contributions to wealth shall go to individuals in due proportion while social values go to the community. Every consideration which divides men who seek this result is a consideration of method in contradistinction to object. Questions of exactly what are social as distinguished from individual values, or of how they may be exactly distinguished, or of how the distinction may be practically asserted—all these belong in the category of tactics. The essential consideration is that the aim shall be to render unto the individual the things that are the individual's and unto the community the things that are the community's.

To men who devotedly seek this object, it should make little difference whether they are called socialists or not, either in approval or in derision. There is nothing more in a name than in a uniform, except to the unthinking. But there is much, and evil at that, in the pride of cult and of opinion and of organization, which keep apart men who seek the object Mr. Snowden describes. This is one of the things that enable the common enemy to divide and conquer. In fact the dividing is done for them; conquering is all they have to do. So long as any particular kind of wealth is conceded by all shades of progressive thought on the social question to be social wealth, the socialization of that wealth, when the issue is up, should be the object of united effort.

It is, therefore, highly gratifying to find the Parliamentary leaders of the Independent Labor party, among whom Mr. Snowden is distinguished, so cordially supporting the land value measures of the British budget; and most earnestly is it to be hoped that their example will be followed by all who believe in socializing social wealth. Whenever and wherever this question comes into practical politics, whether on the issue of land value taxation or of

proble ownership of public utilities, or of anything else that reasonably looks toward the socialization of what is social, and in respect of which cooperation of forces offers a fighting chance for realization to that extent, may this union of forces be encouraged. Nothing is to be gained and much is to be lost by segregation over points of difference as to doctrinal exactitude or completeness, when the question at issue in practical politics involves the essential principle.

## The Emma Goldman Affair in New Jersey.

Allen Freeman made good his determination that Emma Goldman should speak in East Orange (p. 532), police or no police. He had engaged a hall for her, but the police forbade the meeting, Russian fashion, without the slightest idea of what she intended to say, and with no evidence whatever that she has in any of her speeches violated any law. Regardless of the prohibition, she undertook to speak; but, intimidated by the police, the hall owner refused to honor his contract. Mr. Freeman then opened his barn for the meeting, and threatened the police with damage suits if they interfered. They did not interfere. And now behold what the Associated Press reports as to this "red handed" woman's "bloody" speech:

The police would not let her talk in English's hall, so she went over to Alden Freeman's barn and told about Sudermann and Hauptmann, and Ibsen, and Brandes, and how their plays had disseminated radical thought. It was a talk that for the most part could have been delivered in a church.

Is it for speeches like this that the police are encouraged by de-Americanized Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution to overturn the most vital principles for which their ancestors fought?

## Reorganization of The Arena.

It is to be deeply regretted that Albert Brandt's brave fight, along with B. O. Flower, to restore the Arena to its old place of wide circulation and strong influence, has resulted in his bankruptcy. But out of this disaster there is promise that the seed these two men have sown together for the Arena will bear fruit in the reorganization, which contemplates continued editorial control by Mr. Flower. The secret is an open one that Mr. Brandt's devotion of energy and money would have won success for the magazine, but for its independence. The business boycott is much more effective than the labor boycott, and the business boycott was thrown across the path of this enter-