

"goat" to the farmers who *farm farmers*. Some indication of this may be got from that same Census bulletin for Illinois.

To begin with, Illinois farms have in the decade been passing out of the proprietorship of farmers who farm them. Here is a tabulation of the figures by farms:

	1900.	1910.	Decrease.
Total Illinois farms....	264,151	251,872	12,279
Owned by the farmer.....	124,128	107,300	16,828
Owned and hired by the farmer	34,375	37,807	*3,432
Total farmer ownerships	158,503	145,107	13,396
*Increase.			
Operated by tenants.....	103,698	104,379	681
Operated by managers....	1,950	2,386	436
Total exploitation	105,648	106,765	1,117

So, with a total of 264,151 farms in 1900, and of only 251,872 in 1910, we have not only a decrease in the total number, but also a decrease in farmer ownerships and an increase in tenancy and hired management. The decrease in the number of Illinois farms in that decade was 12,279; the decrease in farmer ownerships was 13,396; the increase in tenancy and hired management was 1,117. At the rate, then, of somewhat more than 100 farms a year, and with a diminishing number in the aggregate, the farms of Illinois have for the decade of 1900-10 been passing from working owners to capitalistic exploiters.

Yet the working farmers of Illinois are told, and some of them are simple enough to believe it, that the exemption from taxation of everything but land values would impoverish *them*. While the farmers who are deceived by such "dope" are farmers who farm farms, the farmers who profit by the present situation and administer the dope, are plainly enough farmers who farm farmers.



How soon will working farmers begin to do their own thinking about taxation and land monopoly, instead of allowing land monopolists to do it for them?



You are beaten to earth. Well, well, what's that?

Come up with a smiling face.

It's nothing against you to fall down flat;

But to lie there—that's a disgrace.

The harder you're thrown, why the harder you'll bounce.

Be proud of your blackened eye.

It isn't the fact that you're licked that counts,

It's how did you fight, and why.

—Edmund Vance Cooke.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SOCIALIST NATIONAL CONVENTION.

Indianapolis, May 17.

The contrast between the factions of the Socialist Party came out with new distinctness in the national gathering at Indianapolis, May 12-18.



The revolutionary "left," standing flat-footed on the Marxian platform, has grown more aggressive and militant. Its tendency is to make terms with the ideals and principles represented by the "Industrial Workers of the World," an independent labor crusade which undertakes the organization of working people by industries instead of by crafts or trades, and which promotes concerted action of the entire wage working class against the employing class.

In connection with the "I. W. W." crusade, the movement called "Syndicalism" in France and England has made its appearance in the United States, and has become a factor in the councils of the American Socialist Party. This term refers to the massing, or "syndicating," of labor in response to the consolidating of capitalism.

Another phrase now heard frequently is "direct action," referring to working-class tactics which may or may not involve violence. The extreme direct-actionist has little or no faith in political activity by or for the working class. According to this view, political action, which is by its nature indirect, has but little promise for the common people. This tendency is making its influence felt among the Socialists.

The I. W. W. itself (the independent labor organization just referred to) includes a purely "militant" wing of direct-actionists, as well as those who also believe in connecting political activity with the working-class program. Through the combination of these two methods of activity, William D. Haywood is a leader in the I. W. W., and also a factor in the political Socialist Party.

Haywood believes in the ideal of Socialism—i. e., ownership of the means of industry by the wage-working people themselves; he is a member of the Socialist Party, and he was recently placed on the National Executive Committee by party votes. Haywood has been connected with labor troubles in Colorado, as a consequence of which he was dubbed an "undesirable citizen" by Roosevelt; and he was an active manager of the great strike at Lawrence, Mass.



One of the largest and most spectacular problems before the convention at Indianapolis was, What shall the Party do with its revolutionary "left" wing, and especially with Haywood? The national convention this year was looked forward to with more than usual hope and fear by the entire party. Adherents of both factions had been throwing mud and calling each other bad names with great in-

dustry and ferocity. The "right" wing called the revolutionary faction anarchists; and there was talk of putting the militant Socialists out of the party. On the other hand the extreme radicals taunted their more conservative comrades with being office seekers, "intellectuals," "yellows," etc.

The crisis came to a head over the report of the Labor Committee; and there were some extraordinary occurrences in this connection. The committee included six men from the opportunist faction, and three from the radical faction, the latter being under I. W. W., or Haywood, influence. The majority report, with six names attached, was printed and given to the convention. A stated time was set for the final disposition of the matter. When the set time arrived, the convention was told that the minority report had not been delivered by the printer, but was expected soon. A motion accordingly prevailed postponing action for one hour. Meanwhile there was much activity among the leaders, who were still engaged in shaping the matter up to an issue. When the subject was at last officially before the delegates, the minority report had completely evaporated; and the majority report was read to the convention over the signatures of the entire committee. After speeches from representatives of both factions, this report was adopted by the convention with practical unanimity amid tremendous enthusiasm.

The report begins in a conservative tone by declaring that the Socialist Party "reaffirms the position it has always taken with regard to the movement of organized labor." It sounds no clear note on the subject of trade-unionism versus "industrial unionism" (the I. W. W. plan); but the document goes on to urge closer affiliation in various ways between Socialism and the Labor movement, declaring "that it is the duty of the party to give moral and material support to the Labor organizations in all their defensive or aggressive struggles against Capitalist oppression and exploitation, for the protection and extension of the rights of the wage workers." At the same time, and with great significance, it is distinctly asserted that the Socialist Party has no concern with "technical methods of action" employed by organized Labor in the industrial struggle. The meaning of this is that the Socialist Party undertakes to come into closer touch with Labor, while at the same time asserting that the party is not responsible for the acts of Labor.

In accordance with this principle, the convention appropriated money to support the fights in Lawrence, Mass., where laboring men are still in jail, and in San Diego, Cal., where hundreds of people have been imprisoned. The possibility of legal complications entailed by this policy cannot be overlooked; and it also remains to be seen how long the Socialist Party can maintain this rather vague attitude on the Labor question without a new fight between the factions. In a word, the problem of the Socialist "left" wing is not solved; it is merely compromised.



A clever political move has undoubtedly been made by the American Socialist Party. Temporarily, at least, the compromise is advantageous to all factors and elements in the party. Both extremes

claim to be satisfied, for the present; and they are satisfied in a way. While the "left" wing radicals and I. W. W. men have not been officially endorsed by the party, they have not been denounced, nor excommunicated, nor even told to sit down and be good. While Haywood did not get all that he says he wants, this leader of the Lawrence fight made a strong and favorable impression at Indianapolis. He and his lieutenants were active in all the work of the convention. Haywood himself delivered an illustrated lecture on the strike at Lawrence. His references to the dramatic experiment of sending away the children of strikers during the fight were very appealing. In spite of his opponents, Haywood has made progress; and he emerges from Indianapolis in some sort of triumph and with more prestige than hitherto.

Turning to the "right" wing, or opportunist section, of the Socialist Party, we meet equally interesting and important facts. While a great many reforms were officially adopted and recommended by the convention, looking toward the immediate relief of the wage-earning class, the critical item here, and the one on which the convention spent the most time, relates to the "farmer question."

In recent years, many Socialists have become convinced that the party cannot succeed by appealing merely to the working classes in the city. Two years ago a report was presented to the Socialist National Congress at Chicago,* which emphasized that Socialism could not go on forever ignoring the interests of the farmers, "the largest single division of the working class." That report recommended the exemption of farm buildings and stock from taxation up to the amount of one thousand dollars, and the imposition of a graduated tax on the value of land, whether the land were held for use or speculation. It was charged by "left"-wing revolutionists that this proposal was false to the Marxian principle; the report was tabled, and the problem was put in the hands of a new committee with instructions to report in 1912.

The report now adopted points out (very largely on the basis of Government statistics) that there has been a rapid concentration of farm-ownership in the hands of a small class of proprietors, and a corresponding vast increase of renters and mortgagers in farm communities. The recommendations put forward are more vague and less consistent than those embodied in the 1910 report. In general, this modification reflects the desire of the opportunists to avoid the charge of unorthodoxy, made by the revolutionaries; and it led to dissatisfaction among the "farmer" delegates.

The Socialist Party now comes before the farmer with a complex program which involves a number of contrary principles: Taxation of uncultivated farm land at its full rental value. Retention by the public of land now under public title, and the acquirement of "other land by reclamation, purchase, condemnation, taxation, or otherwise," in order that there may be established a system of "socially operated farms for the conduct of collective agricultural enterprises." "Social ownership of the means of transportation and storage, and of the plants used in

*See The Public of May 27, 1910, page 484.

the manufacture of farm products and farm machinery."

This bulky program is dictated more fully from the Socialist point of view than that advocated in the 1910 report. The Socialist is bound to put "capital" at the center of his philosophy. Otherwise the "comrades" are likely to suspect his orthodoxy.

According to Marx, anything that can be treated as an item of sale, on the basis of income-bearing quality, can be viewed as "capital." In this, Marx differed from the classical economists; but he foreshadowed the tendency of present-day academic theorists, and he was also at one with the "businessman's point of view." The capitalistic logic of Marx must be held constantly in mind when studying the proposals of his followers.



The Indianapolis convention of 1912 will be a distinct landmark in the evolution of American socialism.

Political socialism in the United States has advanced in voting power by leaps and bounds during the last twenty years. Starting out with a few thousand votes, it had 650,000 votes at the last Presidential election; and it expects to poll a million or more votes in the election of 1912.

As the party emerges more conspicuously on the field of political action, it more and more takes on the character of a huge, amorphous mass, held together by the name "Socialism." In order to maintain party solidarity and the prestige of a united, mass organization, it finds itself under the necessity of compromising the problems of both "right" and "left" wings. The "left" wing is more and more influenced by revolution. The "right" wing is more and more affected by Singletax tendencies. Neither faction can be satisfied permanently with the Indianapolis compromises.

LOUIS WALLIS.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

SIDELIGHTS ON THE ALDRICH BILL.

Indianapolis, Ind., May 10.

The facts disclosed by the Comptroller's Abstract of the condition of national banks on February 20, 1912—No. 77—are interesting and important.



From January 7th to December 5th, 1911, the aggregate increase of loans and discounts of national banks was less than \$94,000,000, or at a rate of less than \$334,000 for each business day during that time, almost a year.

From December 5th, 1911, to February 20th, 1912, the aggregate increase of loans and discounts was over \$151,324,000, or at the rate of over \$2,364,000 for each business day of that time, considerably less than three months.

Every dollar of this enormous increase, and more, was made by the 57 central reserve banks. During the time these banks increased their aggregate loans and discounts \$159,486,325. The 324 reserve banks

decreased their aggregate of loans and discounts \$2,243,638; and the 6,908 country banks made an aggregate decrease of \$5,918,576. This was a total decrease of the banks outside of the central reserve and reserve cities of \$8,162,211.

What was the occasion for this enormous manufacture of credits by the central reserve banks? What legitimate business—confined to the reserve cities of New York, Chicago and St. Louis—demanded any such increase, when there was no increase whatever (but a decrease) in the aggregate credit outside of these cities?



During the same time, it appears, the 57 banks increased their holdings from national banks, State banks and bankers outside of these cities by almost \$200,000,000, so that on February 20th, 1912, they held of the resources of these outside banks about \$1,200,000,000.

On February 20th, all this enormous sum had gone into loans and discounts until the 57 banks held, in the aggregate, less than \$24,000,000 with which to meet the daily demands of individual depositors, to keep up their legal cash reserves, and return the amount owing to other banks outside of these cities.

There can be no question that such a situation is dangerous. What is to be the result if this concentration of bank funds, in the central reserve cities, and the enormous inflation of credits is to continue?



The reason for the passage of the Aldrich-Vreeland Act and for urging the present Aldrich currency association scheme ought to be plain to any intelligent man. It ought to be equally plain that the purpose of the influences behind these schemes is to protect the New York banks without any regard whatever to the welfare of other banks, or of the business interests of the country.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.



MASSACHUSETTS AND THE SINGLETAX.

Cambridge, Mass.

The Singletax is fast becoming an issue in Massachusetts. Five speeches in four days in and near Boston indicates the tendency. These speeches were before the following organizations: Cambridge Political Equality Association; Young Men's Hebrew Association of Boston; the Aberdeen Club of Boston; the Men's Club of the Weymouth Baptist Church and the Boston Chapter of the American Institute of Bankers. Congressman Henry George, Jr., spoke before the Political Equality Association. About 150 were present.

One most interesting meeting was before the American Institute of Bankers. It was addressed by Prof. Lewis J. Johnson of Harvard. About 150 of the younger banking men of Boston were present, and although Prof. Johnson spoke after the business meeting the reports of the committees and an address by the national president, he kept the attention of his audience for over an hour. When he had finished, most of those present stayed while questions were asked of the speaker.

REGINALD MOTT HULL.