

all honest citizens than he has seemed to some of them heretofore. There need be no corrupt combine in the legislature to baffle him, as there was in the Council when he was Mayor; or if there be, its exposure will be easy. With such co-operation as is now available to him, Governor Dunne can give to the people of Illinois progressive legislation as well as honest administration, and prove by his record the falsity of the imputations that crooked politicians and grafting newspapers have put upon him. First of all among his duties in this connection is to secure the submission of the twice-demanded and long delayed Initiative and Referendum amendment. This reform calls for his immediate and active promotion, and in his promotion of it, for the cordial support of all progressives in the legislature, of whatever party, and regardless of all patronage and of all Senatorial claims.



Progress in Chicago Traction Graft.

Indications of further grafting multiply in connection with the Chicago traction system. Having secured seven per cent on a heavily "watered" investment, which is at least 1 per cent more than any traction system ought to get even upon a real investment, the manipulators of this system are now trying to get a guarantee from the city that their profits shall not be less than seven per cent in the future. The pretense of consideration is that there shall be universal transfers. A fine sort of deal, isn't it? Think of the city of Chicago *guaranteeing seven per cent* to traction stockholders, over and above all salaries and "profits on the side," without securing any greater interest in or control over the traction system than it already has! Would any business man, having the rights of the city, make such a tomfool bargain? If the city is to guarantee any percentage of profit at all to the traction company, it should do so as *owner*. There might be some sense in taking over the whole system, by mutual arrangement, upon a guarantee of seven per cent to the companies, the companies being retained and supervised as operating agents. But there is no sense at all in making such a guarantee without ownership.



The Police Sweatbox.*

Professor Keedy's article in the current issue of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, in which he criticizes "the third degree" and "trial by newspapers" is welcome. No less so are his specific

proposals for ending this species of lawlessness. He proposes as to the police "sweatbox" that extorted confessions shall not be admitted as evidence in criminal cases, and as to the extortion of such confessions that police officers guilty of it shall be punished criminally. On the subject of "trial by newspapers" he proposes criminal punishment of editors and publishers for publishing statements or comments calculated to prejudice the case of any accused person. It is a curious fact that laws to this effect have existed until recent years. Judges could punish for contempt editors and publishers who obstructed the administration of justice; police officers could be punished for giving the "third degree," and extorted confessions could be ruled out at trials—all in accordance with well established law which police officers, newspaper editors and judges have repealed without any of the formalities of legislation. Such law should be re-enacted *with* the formalities of legislation; and Professor Keedy's suggestions would be better if adopted than the old laws which are now practically obsolete.



Publicity for Real Estate Ownership.

Not a bad proposal, that of requiring city real estate to be labeled with the true owner's name. It would "run to cover" the responsible promoters of a good many abuses, and all the more if vacant lots as well as buildings were required to bear the label.



THE SINGLETAX FORWARD MOVEMENT.

The vote of last week in Missouri and Oregon furnishes phenomenal testimony to the solid growth of the Singletax idea in American thought. It at the same time indicates the great probability of an early injection of a large dose of Singletax principle into the fiscal affairs of this country.



At no time since Henry George polled 68,000 votes for Mayor of New York in 1886, has the Singletax spoken with so much emphasis anywhere in the United States.

Its emphasis now is greater than then.

The New York vote for Henry George in 1886 had been swelled by enthusiasm for the man, by a general revolt against Tammany Hall, by the united support of organized Labor, by discord among George's adversaries, and by numerous other factors having no vital relation to the doctrines that are now known as the Singletax. Although

*See Public of August 11, 1911, page 831.

the elementary principles of the Singletax movement were discussed in that campaign, they were least among all the influences that rolled up the vote of 68,000 for George. Yet that vote for an individual candidate was not as great in proportion to the total vote, as the vote of last week in the populous centers of Oregon and Missouri for the Singletax itself.

As the vote for George in 1886 was 68,110 in a total of 219,097, he received somewhat less than one-third. In the cities of Missouri and Oregon the vote directly for the Singletax approximates one-third. It is considerably more than one-third in St. Louis.

Not only does this vote, *directly for the Singletax*, approximate the much mixed vote for Henry George as a candidate at a favorable juncture. Not only was it secured against the active opposition of a union of all adverse elements. Not only does it testify to the sturdy growth of the Singletax movement. Not only is it prophetic of the extension of that movement over the Union. But simply as a per capita vote, it offers the most powerful nucleus for organization, and the most inviting opportunity for agitation, education and political power, that any of our younger movements in politics have ever had or the advocates of any cause could reasonably desire.



Faint hearts there are, of course; and strong ones grown faint momentarily.

Under the weight of temporary defeat and the stun of disappointment after unstinted expenditures of energy and enthusiasm, it is hard for the best among us to realize immediately that instant success is impossible for any cause worthy of a lasting victory. So a momentary hopelessness is not out of the order of things, when nominal defeat has to be faced.

But only for a little time. As the days pass and the battle-smoke lifts, wider and clearer vision is possible. Then the prospect brightens. What seemed disastrous defeat takes its proper place as a disciplinary experience in the work of preparation—a Bunker Hill to a Yorktown, a Bull Run to an Appomattox.

Those of us who have had many of these experiences, have learned to give them something of their true value. Those of us who are yet raw recruits in the struggle for industrial as well as political democracy, are likely to feel that the war is lost when a battle fails.

So it may be now with many a Singletaxer who was unreasonably hopeful a week ago. But in

this case the battle hasn't failed. Though it be not won, tactical positions are gained.

Won! Why, the worthy cause, the ultimately victorious cause, seldom wins its first battle. Four were necessary to get government railroads for Switzerland. Three have been necessary in England to get only part, and that the least part, of the Lloyd George budget policy. And in Oregon, where the first direct Singletax battle was lost last week, there were five defeats for woman suffrage before it won. But it did win. This half-century-old struggle won with the people of Oregon at the very election at which the young Singletax cause seemed to fail, won after losing again and again. So may it be with the Singletax in Oregon and Missouri. The people there have considered the question, many of them have voted favorably upon it, and the interest of the others is excited. For the rest, let Singletaxers take a lesson in politics from the woman suffragists.



The burden of responsibility for utilizing this gain rests primarily upon the Joseph Fels Fund Commission. Secondly it rests upon those other Singletaxers of the United States who feel that the work of this Commission, thus far successful, should be appreciated and that its obvious supplementary work should be encouraged.

At Boston on the 29th and 30th of November and the 1st of December, that Commission is to hold a meeting* to decide upon future action—whether it shall go ahead on the lines that have been effective thus far, or on other lines, or shall disband. And it has invited all Singletaxers, wherever they live and whatever their opinions on questions of policy, to meet with it on that occasion, in unofficial conference, for the purpose of advising.

This is a critical point in the Singletax movement—one of the most critical it has ever encountered. What is advised by the unofficial Conference and decided by the Commission, may make or mar the excellent work of three years past, and either retard or promote the movement in this country in the future. We say *retard* or *promote*. That is all that it can do, be the advice and the decision what it may; for the movement is not only here, but, thanks very largely to Joseph Fels and the Commission he created, it is today a *forward movement* regardless of commissions or conferences. But it may on the one hand be retarded, or on the other promoted, by that Boston meeting. This is the fact that imposes exceptional respon-

*See Public of November 1, page 1044.

sibility upon the Commission with reference to its decision; with reference to advice, it is the fact that imposes exceptional responsibility upon all responsible-minded Singletaxers of the country who are able to attend.



The Boston Conference will doubtless be the most notable national gathering of Singletaxers since their New York Conference of 1890. It will have a vastly greater responsibility. To the New York conference only a scattered few could come, and there was at that time no large nucleus of Singletaxers anywhere. The constituencies had to be created, and there was but little sentiment out of which to create them. But now there are constituencies, large ones and ready at hand.

In Oregon thousands of voters in three adjacent counties have directly and deliberately voted for the Singletax, and many thousands more in the State at large. With like deliberation scores of thousands have directly and deliberately voted for the Singletax in Missouri. There is no mistake about this. The affirmative votes in both States were *for the reform itself*, not for candidatorial personalities; and the opposition was so pronounced and bitter that few but converted Singletaxers could have voted in the affirmative. All who doubted, as well as all who were opposed, voted the other way.

There was also a substantial vote for the Singletax in California. For, though this was not the specific question, it was so involved in the taxation home-rule amendment, which was opposed as a Singletax measure, as almost to draw a clear Singletax issue; and the home rule amendment, with a majority of 9,000 in San Francisco and 10,000 in Los Angeles, has polled an affirmative vote of at least 140,000 in the State at large.

Then there is the State of Washington. Seattle polled over 13,000 votes last March directly for the Singletax in a total of 40,000, being about a third; and Everett, the fourth city in size of the State, has just adopted the Singletax by a majority of 2 to 1.

Other States show Singletax signs, but in those four States—Oregon, Washington, California and Missouri—the signs are unmistakable. Not only unmistakable are the signs there, but individual Singletaxers who have declared their faith at the polls by scores of thousands, can be reached for all the purposes of useful organization, if the task is properly undertaken; and through them other scores of thousands can be speedily brought to an understanding of the mistake they made in their votes last week.

Not only that. In Missouri and Oregon we now have, thanks to the Joseph Fels Fund Commission, detailed statistical comparisons of taxation as it is under the general property tax and as it would be under the Singletax, of taxation in its effect on each tax payer and each piece of property,—U'Ren and Eggleston's for Oregon and John Z. White's for Missouri.

What shall be done with this great opportunity?

What attitude will the Boston Conference and the Joseph Fels Fund Commission assume?



Will they weakly quit, allowing the Singletax movement, in so far as they can do so, to relapse from its present advanced position in those States into the academic trance it was in throughout the Republic when Joseph Fels extended his generous and effective work for Singletax promotion from Great Britain into this country?

Or will they seize upon the opportunity the vote of last week offers in the States where it was cast?

Here is an unexample opportunity for the organization in those States—and hence over the Union wherever the popular Initiative affords the means—of an effective league in some appropriate form, for agitating the subject, for educating the open-minded, and for bringing the Singletax before the voters again and again until it shall have won at the polls.

For this decision the immediate responsibility rests upon Daniel Kiefer, Jackson H. Ralston, A. B. duPont, Charles H. Ingersoll, Lincoln Steffens, Frederic C. Howe and George A. Briggs, as members of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission. Of their attendance at Boston, therefore—barring insuperable obstacles—there can of course be no question. For the intelligent advice from which their decision will proceed, the responsibility rests upon all Singletaxers who have an interest in the subject and can afford to attend the Boston Conference. Letters of advice to the Conference will be of little value. They would express opinions unaffected by consultation. Personal attendance is the one thing needed. It was never needed more in the Singletax movement than at this moment, when scores of thousands of voters in two States of the Union have by their ballots sent out an emphatic Singletax clarion call.

This is to be no academic gathering merely. It is to be a gathering of Singletax men and women keenly conscious of a heavy responsibility individually and collectively, of men and women with an acute apprehension of the special opportunity for their cause that offers now, and with an in-

tense desire, and the reasonable ability, to deal sanely with the problems which that opportunity presents.

May the proceedings at Boston, like the large Singletax vote in Missouri, Oregon, Seattle and Everett, and the actual victory at Everett, furnish further proof of the forward movement upon which those of us who try to look below the surface in political affairs, believe that the Singletax cause has entered in the United States.



We say nothing of the evidence which the election of at least nine outright Singletaxers to Congress affords that the Singletax movement is now a forward movement. Nor do we point for that purpose to the election of Singletax members of legislatures in different States. Nor yet to the fact that the Land-Commissioner-elect of one great State and the Governor-elect of another are outspoken Singletaxers. They were elected as representatives of progressive policies less definite than the Singletax. Their election therefore gives no indication of affirmative Singletax sentiment in their respective regions, such as is disclosed by the Initiative vote in Missouri and Oregon. But the fact that these outspoken Singletaxers could be elected to Congress, to legislatures, to a Land-Commissionership, to a Governorship, on any platform, is evidence of the beating down of hostile barriers which the Singletax movement has done in these recent years.

By the presence at Boston of those Congressmen and legislators and that Land-Commissioner and that Governor, or any of them, the work of the Conference and the future of the movement would be distinctly promoted. But in the direct Singletax vote in Oregon and Missouri alone, there is a basis for going forward, the bare promise of which only three years ago would have seemed almost millennial to the Singletaxers of the United States.

CONDENSED EDITORIALS

CAPITALIZING MURDER.

A modern writer has made use of Voltaire's famous test to illustrate the lack of a realizing sense of the effect of their doings by the "promoters" of high finance. Voltaire asked the reader to conceive that he had a button before him, the effect of pressing which would be to obtain for himself his dearest wish—love, fame, wealth, power or what not; and at the same time to cause the death of some unknown human being in China. Would he hesitate to press the button?

While the financier's choice of action in the withdrawal from the public of the means of production,

transportation and distribution and the values of land and water, inevitably causes, by indirection, untold suffering through deprivation of opportunity, pain and death itself to numberless human beings, as the effect is remote and unknown like that upon Voltaire's Chinaman, it must be charitably assumed that the moral responsibility is not felt or incurred.

But there is one sphere of operations into which high finance has often been tempted to enter where the moral responsibility cannot be denied or evaded—the taking up and underwriting of loans directly intended for the purpose of carrying on war.

It would seem that, if righteous public opinion still has any influence, good men might be impelled to exert it by refusing to count among their friends individuals, however eminent in the financial world, who lend themselves to this devilish work.

ERVING WINSLOW.



RAILROAD REGULATION.

In 1903 an Act of Congress was passed requiring railroads engaged in interstate commerce to use certain safety appliances.

In February, 1907, one of the companies was operating a train of five cars, two of which were engaged in interstate traffic, the other three carrying goods within the boundaries of a single State.

Should the five cars have safety appliances? Or had Congress jurisdiction over only two?

In 1911 the United States Supreme Court decided that the five should have the appliances; if the other three met with disaster the mere fact that they were not going out of the State would not save the two cars that were.

It took something over four years to decide this point.

The facts are stated in Bulletin No. 98 of the Bureau of Labor. They throw some light on railroad regulation as it is.

WM. E. McKENNA.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

TAXATION! HOME RULE IN CALIFORNIA.

The only information we have on the Home-Rule-in-Taxation amendment up to the 8th is that the total vote in about 60 counties is 138,535 favorable, and 166,731 against, with 20 more counties to hear from. The vote in San Francisco was 37,975 in favor, and 28,379 against. Los Angeles City gave a favorable majority of 6,702, which it is expected will be increased to 10,000 when the returns of that county are reported. In Alameda County the vote was 17,434 yes, and 24,324 no. San Diego was first reported to have given an adverse vote, but later advices give a large favorable majority. The cities of Fresno and Vallejo are said to have favored the amendment.



Our campaign was conducted vigorously, but with little money. Many newspapers all over the State