

It is this difference which has blinded many men to the force that lies behind the woman's movement. It has led responsible officials to jeer at a "policy of pinpricks," and to speak with pride of the way in which men forced the door "at which the ladies are scratching."

The time has come when any available light should be shed upon this darkness, especially as a new phase has been entered upon by the fourteen members of the W. S. P. U., who feel that enough suffragettes have undergone punishment in the Second Division. These latest prisoners are trying in their own persons to ensure that the indignities they suffer shall be the last inflicted upon the women of this country on account of political agitation.

Though the story of human fortitude is older than any history that is written in any books, the fortitude that will go any length still wears to the average mortal an air so strange that it runs the risk of not being recognized. Now, Sir, my point is that these women know that. They undertake their "hunger strike," realizing that it will be supposed they will not go so far with it as to do themselves a mortal injury. They know it will be supposed that they are trying merely to frighten authority, and that they will prudently stop this side of a course that will bring them a release for which neither the Home Secretary's order nor that of the King will be needed.

There are, without doubt, persons so angered against the suffragettes as to say, "Very well, let them expiate their foolishness with their lives."

But that will not be the public view of the matter. Nor will it be the (intended) view of the Government. It therefore seems necessary to say that in dealing with these women it will not do to count upon the usual canons of self-interest. There are those (whether among the suffragettes now in Holloway or the thousands outside)—there are those prepared to pay any price that may be exacted for protesting against more women being made to suffer the indignities of the Second Division—for what? For following to its logical conclusion an opinion they share with the majority of the legislators of this country.

The prisoners know quite well how it may end for any one of them. The people who are not fully informed are those whom the country will hold responsible for the issue. And that seems to me not fair. There should be no avoidable misunderstanding as to the spirit (however reprehensible) in which the "hunger strike" is undertaken. The women are laying hands upon a very terrible weapon, but there is no ground for hoping that if they let it fall others will not take the weapon up. That this should be so may be fanaticism. But it is also hard fact. Calling it names, good or bad, will not alter it.

I know it is said that if the authorities do not deal stringently with these cases general disorder

will ensue in England; and everyone hereafter who has a grievance will think he has only to break a few windows and gather a crowd in Westminster to get his will. But that is childishness. "Anyone," with a grievance hereafter who can get thousands of reputable people to espouse his cause, hundreds to go to prison for it, and the general public to give him fifty thousand pounds a year to spend on it, will have reason to be listened to. No cause is fed so fat on air.

But my aim in addressing you is to prevent anyone having a right to say, when one of these women succumbs in Holloway Gaol, that it was "death by misadventure." It will be no accident. But for the Government it would be a misadventure which even their opponents would gladly see them spared, if one of these women (with the memory of the smiling members of Parliament out for "fun," to see how women meet the nerve-shattering horror of a contest with mounted police)—if, with that memory to nerve her, one of these prisoners force the gates of Holloway and sets out upon the Great Adventure that even heroes evade as long as they with honor may.

+ + +

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE ON GEORGEISM IN ENGLAND.

From the *Emporia Gazette* of August 26. Correspondence From the Editor of the *Gazette*.

The party in power, headed by the Lord Chancellor of the Exchequer—Lloyd George, a Welshman—is enacting a law which looks toward the nationalization of the land of England. It is the old Henry George single tax idea thinly disguised.

Little did Snediker and the single taxers of Elmendaro township, Lyon county, State of Kansas, dream a dozen years ago, when they were leading a forlorn hope in Lyon county politics, trying to sugar-coat their creed and get it incorporated into the Populist platform, that the same doctrine would be preached up and down England by the head of the dominant party, and that successful politicians would be fighting under the slogan, "down with the dukes."

The plan, as outlined in the government budget, is to secure a valuation of all English land. And whenever any land is sold to take 20 per cent of the increase in value of the land for the state.

For instance, there is a vacant 100 foot lot at the corner of Tenth and Exchange in Emporia, which the writer bought for \$500 seven years ago. He has refused \$1,500 for it. Under the English proposal, when he sells it, if he does sell it for \$1,500, the State, in addition to the regular annual taxes, would take \$200 before the deed would be registered, as its share of what the single taxers called the "unearned increment."

And this would be absolutely fair. The man

who bought that lot has done little, if anything, to earn that \$1,000; the people of Emporia have done most of it by living thriftily, peacefully and honestly, making the town a desirable residence place. They should, in all fairness, have their share of the increase in the value of city property.

This is no mere dream. It is a law now in actual practice in certain German cities. In England it is to be applied, not to agricultural lands, which grow in value through the owner's improvements, nor to small holdings, but to big city lots and estates—mostly of the lords and dukes.

Naturally, the proposal of the Government to tax the landlords' unearned increment in England produced a great outcry. And there was a great hullabaloo. But as election after election returned members pledged to the proposition without the loss of a single member, it dawned upon the Tories that Liberalism would prevail.

In July there was a great mass meeting called in Hyde Park, to support the Government in its demand for the proposed tax upon the unearned increment. And we got into a taxicab and went to see the fun. There was a great procession leading to the park. It was composed of laboring men, merchants, professional men—all sorts. The banners they carried are of interest. One read, "Idle Lands Make Idle Hands," another read "Tax Land, Not Food." A third read "Down With the Dukes." A big banner carried Cromwell's picture, and one man carried "a banner with a strange device" that looked mighty familiar to the Kansas eyes. The banner declared for "equal rights to all, special privileges to none." And the great Government of England, the cabinet and a majority of parliament were behind it.

It is a long jump from Jerry Simpson to Lloyd-George, lord chancellor of the exchequer, but progress seems to have made it in "two jumps."

Knowing something of the political temper of Europe, we were not surprised to see the greatest political meeting ever held in Hyde Park, supporting the increment tax. But even if we were not surprised, we were immensely interested at seeing the same deadly seriousness in the English crowd that used to pervade the old Farmers' Alliance processions in the nineties in Kansas.

An American crowd takes its politics ordinarily in a merry mood. There is always a good-natured chaffing and guying and badinage in an American procession of any sort, and a political procession in this land of the free is usually festive. But this great English crowd, to begin with, was flanked with policemen. The police never know where trouble will start in a British crowd, and so, with these banners demanding "land for the landless," and taxes "upon the idle rich and not upon the idle poor," literally thousands of policemen were detailed to march with the procession. Then, in addition to the solemnity produced by the police, there was a ponderous gravity about the crowd

that not even the Scotch bagpipers, playing "The Wearing of the Green"—which, of itself, is enough to make a dog laugh—could shatter the vast gloom of the British temperament.

In the park, 250,000 men gathered. There were fourteen platforms ranged in a crescent about as long as from the railroad over to the city-library and back to the Normal School. On each of these platforms speakers were holding forth. There were members of Parliament, politicians, statesmen and one woman speaker at each stand.

The presence of the woman speakers, though women have no vote, is a British political tradition, and titled women, "ladyships" and "honorable Mrs." were common, as they are at all meetings.

On one platform a red-haired, curly-haired Irish priest, who looked and gesticulated and talked like Victor Murdock, was telling the people to rise against the idle landlords, who toiled not, neither did they spin, but who spent their lives "yatching in the Mediterranean, and marking time in Picadilly."

At all of the fourteen platforms the orators were going at the same time, and the great crowd moved from platform to platform, listening to its heroes.

BOOKS

A CATHOLIC PROFESSOR ON WAGES.

A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects.
By John A. Ryan, S. T. L., Professor of Ethics and Economics in the St. Paul Seminary. With an introduction by Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York and London. Price \$1 net.

A priest in the Roman Catholic Church and a teacher in one of its theological schools, Dr. Ryan presents in this book—to adopt the words of Dr. Ely in the Introduction—"a clear-cut, well-defined theory of wages based upon his understanding of the approved doctrines of his religious body." It is the first attempt in the English language, Dr. Ely states, "to elaborate what may be called a Roman Catholic system of political economy," meaning, as he explains, "an attempt to show exactly what the received doctrines of the Church signify in the mind of a representative Catholic when they are applied to the economic life."

Dr. Ryan is not offering a complete theory of justice concerning wages; he lays down no rules for determining the full measure of compensation for work; he deals only with the question of a living wage, feeling that in the present stage of intellectual development relative to the distribution of the products of labor, any more profound exposition could not be generally convincing. His