

appeared in print, its readers were thrown into confusion, the editor-in-chief into hysterical rage, and the skillful editorial writer out of his job. For the blunder had resulted in enfoldng a very attractive young woman "in the arms of the Mincio." We recall this old yarn of New York's "Newspaper Row" about the New York Times, because a recent editorial in the Times reads as if the ghost of the writer who participated in getting that young woman placed affectionately "in the arms" of an Italian river had returned to comment upon the British budget. At any rate the budget editorial in the Times of May 26 might have been written as two editorials, either by a Liberal and a Tory, or by an ambidextrous writer with Liberal sympathies in one cerebral hemisphere and Tory sympathies in the other, and have got mixed in the distribution of "copy." It has all the absurd flavor of the old Times article on the young woman "in the arms of the Mincio."

+ +

The Futile Fundamental Argument Against Land Value Taxation.

The weakness of the Tory opposition to the land value taxes proposed in the British budget is well illustrated—aye, it is demonstrated—by the editorial summing up in the London Times (May 13th) of Harold Cox's "damaging indictment," as the Times calls it. According to the Times, Mr. Cox "demonstrated in close-packed and incontrovertible argument that the alleged difference between land and other forms of property" has no substantial existence, because land "is offered in the same way as other property in the market, and is acquired in the same way by the investor, small or large." That truth, says the Times, and it calls it a "fundamental" truth, "lies at the root of the whole question, and upsets all the distinctions" between property in land and property in the products of human industry. This must be gratifying to Lloyd-George. He would be a captious man if he were not pleased with the assurance from such irreproachable authority that the best argument the Tories can make against land value taxes, that their fundamental principle for considering property in what Nature alone supplies as identical with property in what labor only can furnish, property in natural sources and sites with property in artificial products, is that which the Times puts forward when it argues that both are offered and acquired "in the same way." Why, in our country, this was once also true of property in men. Under our slavery regime, Negroes were

"offered in the same way as other property in the market," and were "acquired in the same way by the investor, small or large"—great planter, thrifty workingman, or poor widow. Do the British defenders of landlordism, Mr. Cox included, believe that this "fundamental truth" of the market "upsets all the distinctions" between property in slaves and property in houses or wheelbarrows? Doesn't the fact that slaves are men and not industrial products, count for something "at the root" of that question? And doesn't the fact that the planet is the natural abiding place, the source of supply and the workshop for all sorts and conditions of men, and not an industrial product of any—doesn't this count for something "at the root of the whole question" which Lloyd-George has raised in the British Parliament? Fundamental differences such as these cannot be obliterated by parallelisms of the market place.

+ + +

THE PERSECUTION OF EMMA GOLDMAN.

We are constrained again to ask (p. 508) the motive for the persecution by the police in so many places of Emma Goldman.

Not only is she persecuted to the extent of deprivation of unquestionable rights under American law, but peaceable and law abiding persons who wish to hear her speak and have the right under American law to hear her speak, are treated as rioters and dispersed without a shadow of necessity or right.

When a hall is engaged for her to speak in, the owner is threatened, lawlessly threatened, until he breaks his contract. Should he withstand this pressure, his hall is invaded by anarchistic policemen who disperse the peaceable audience with threats of violence.

+

That is what happened in Lexington hall, New York, a few days ago. The facts reported at the time (p. 516) have since been more definitely presented in a letter to Mayor McClellan from Alden Freeman, a well known and respected man both in New York and the New Jersey suburb of East Orange.

Mr. Freeman, who had twice before heard Miss Goldman in New York, and hadn't, as he explains, the slightest premonition or thought of the experience before him, went to hear her Lexington hall lecture on the Modern Drama on a Sunday morning two weeks ago. He describes himself as "a law-abiding citizen who has always believed