The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making.

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

Vol. XI | CHICAGO, FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1908. | No. 522

Published by LOUIS F. POST First National Bank Bldg., Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents **Yearly Subscription, One Dollar**

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:
The Beginning of a New Decade..... 1
The Eleventh Volume of The Public..... 2
Christian and Jew..... 2
Mr. Root on Immigration..... 2
American Government by Clubs and Cossacks..... 3
The Police Spirit..... 4
American Ideals..... 4
Vacant Lot Gardening..... 4
The Industrial Depression..... 4
The Banking Alternative..... 4
Mr. Harmon's Candidacy..... 5
Old-Age Pensions..... 5
Ownership and Regulation..... 5
President Roosevelt's Policy (A. H. Henderson)..... 5

NEWS NARRATIVE:
The Union Square Meeting..... 6
Emma Goldman..... 8
Local Self-Government in Des Moines..... 8
Taxation in Rhode Island..... 9
Direct Legislation in New York..... 9
Presidential Politics..... 9
The Traction Question in Cleveland..... 9
News Notes..... 10
Press Opinions..... 11

RELATED THINGS:
Watching the Crowd (Jesse S. Dancey)..... 13
A Kick in High Finance (G. T. Evans)..... 13
Opening Editorial of the First Issue of The Public..13
"The Outlook" on Plutocrats..... 15
Labor and Neighbor—Remedies. 4. Justice, Freedom and Co-operation (Ernest Crosby)..... 15

BOOKS:
An Explanation of Anarchy..... 19
British Finance..... 20
Books Received..... 20
Pamphlets..... 20
Periodicals..... 21

EDITORIAL

The Beginning of a New Decade.

When The Public first appeared, just ten years ago, the United States was beginning her war upon Spain. Inasmuch as that war had been precipitated by the insane cry of "Remember the Maine," we loathed it; but in so far as it seemed to be a war for the release of a neighboring people from a foreign yoke they were themselves too weak to throw off, we regarded it as a worthy war. For detestable as all war is, there are things more detestable even than war; and one of them is superimposed dominion. We believed then, as we believe now, that war for the liberation of one's neighbors is as worthy as war for the liberation of one's own people. Possibly not so popular or prudent, yet certainly as worthy. But as the war with Spain went on and developed into war upon the Filipino republic, it became all too evident that its animating purpose had been not liberation but conquest. It proved to be as loathsome in its purposes as in its insane battle cry.

✣

Circumstances prevented the complete consummation of the imperial purposes of that war. To some extent the contemplated conquests were checked. But not altogether. The present colonial policy of this Republic is a sore reminder of the degree to which the spirit of conquest prevailed over the spirit of democracy; and the country still staggers under an inheritance of imperialistic no-

tions which the war with Spain engendered and the war upon the Filipinos fostered. But as the decade has rounded out, evidence of a return to the ideals of Jefferson and Lincoln accumulates. "Back to democracy!" is a growing sentiment—not in the sense of turning backward toward dead ideals that have been discarded, but in the sense of again going forward toward living ideals that have been for a time ignored.

VANTAGE GROUND

During this momentous decade there have been times of pessimism, and there have been times of a silly optimism worse than pessimism; but there has come a time also of rational optimism. We hailed its dawning three years ago (vol. vii, p. 627), and we identify its presence now. This period of industrial awakening, The Public was begun to promote. Wars and conquests intervened and distracted public attention; but the wars are past, the emptiness of conquest is realized, and the political conflict between what Raymond Robins calls the Group of Plunder and the Group of Toil is broadly open. The Public therefore begins its second decade with infinitely better opportunities for serving its purpose than circumstances permitted at the beginning of its first, and may with entire appropriateness reproduce, as it does in the department of Related Things of this issue, the editorial greeting it offered in its initial number ten years ago. What that greeting was then to the beginning of our first decade, let it be now to the beginning of our second.

✣ ✣

The Eleventh Volume of The Public.

When he volunteered, without other personal interest than his interest in the service he believes The Public renders to fundamental democracy, to raise a sustention fund to assure its continued publication (vol. x, pp. 1081, 1088), Daniel Kiefer promised to advise our readers in due time of plans to be formulated for making this fund effective by placing the paper upon a basis of income which would relieve it from further dependence upon any fund. This promise is now partly redeemed with a statement from Mr. Kiefer on the 21st page of the present issue.

✣

To Mr. Kiefer's statement let us add that the eleventh volume of The Public, of which this issue is the first, will close with the final issue of December. The twelfth volume will then begin with the first issue in January, a shifting back from April which had been considered and decided upon prior to the change in the proprietorship of the paper. One other alteration should be explained. The publication date has been shifted from Saturday to Friday. This is because the day of printing has been shifted from Thursday to Wednesday. The object of the latter change has been to assure the delivery of the paper over as wide a territory as possible within the week of publication. The Public has gone into the mails at Chicago regularly on Thursday nights and Friday mornings, and yet it has frequently not been delivered to readers even at such near-by points as Cleveland and Cincinnati until the following Mondays. As the fault seems to lie with the post offices at points of delivery, and to be impossible of rectification, the paper will hereafter be mailed at Chicago a day earlier than heretofore—on Wednesday nights and Thursday mornings, instead of Thursday nights and Friday mornings.

✣ ✣

Christian and Jew.

We are criticized for speaking of the massacre of Jews at Kischeneff (vol. x, p. 1154) as having been perpetrated by "a Christian mob." We did not intend, of course, that any one should infer that we supposed the murderous mob to be composed of essential Christians. That would have been a contradiction in terms. And if Jews had not been the victims of this mob, we should have felt no necessity for describing it as "Christian." But these Jews were massacred by a mob of partisans whose impulse was their own conformity and the Jewish non-conformity to conventional Christianity. We might describe such Christians as fetish Christians; but this seems hardly necessary, since the context plainly shows that "Christian" is used as the historical antonym of "Jew."

✣ ✣

Mr. Root on Immigration.

It is difficult to believe that Secretary Root is really responsible for the interview which comes back to this country in a Vienna publication. Surely he is old enough to know that the same objections he makes to continental immigration were made to Irish immigration in its day. Yet he is reported as saying that the Irish were welcome. So they were welcome, but not by the class of Americans who corresponded then to the classes that want to restrict immigration now. Has Mr. Root forgotten the days when the Irish immigrant was repulsed with, "No Irish need apply!" a phrase so familiar that it became the refrain of a street song? It is true enough, as Mr. Root says,

that the Irish were assimilated; but so will the continental immigrants be assimilated. Mr. Root's alleged idea that these are barbarians who will overrun our country "as their ancestors overran the Roman Empire, in search of riches," borders upon the preposterous. Men who come to produce riches should be welcome to the riches they produce.

✣ ✣

American Government by Clubs and Cossacks.

By all means let bomb throwers be punished and assassination conspiracies be stamped out. But meanwhile let us not allow our attention to be diverted by criminality of this kind from criminality of a more dangerous kind. The most ominous kind of crime that challenges the law-abiding sentiment of this country to-day is not anarchistic bomb throwing; it is police contempt for the law. For many years the query of a New York Congressman, "What's the Constitution between friends?" has passed current as a harmless joke. But there was no joke in the declaration of the policeman in supreme authority at Union Square last Saturday, when he boasted of policemen's clubs as "bigger than the Constitution."

✣

Our police have imported the brutal "sweat box" from abroad, and in defiance of the simplest principles of American law have built it up into an institution. They have usurped the functions of committing magistrates. They have re-established domiciliary visitations. They have seized upon authority to suppress public meetings in their own arbitrary discretion and with the mailed fist. They have organized bodies of mounted men in imitation of the Cossacks of Russia, to ride with murderous gallop into crowds of peaceable people. From a responsible peace force they have become an irresponsible and un-American military power. And the wicked thing about it all is this, that American plutocracy wants such action, and a plutocratic press deceives the people as to its character. In the Union Square episode, for instance, the great fact was the high-handed dispersal of a peaceable meeting, called in the usual way, and at a place which has been dedicated to public meetings for half a century. Yet the plutocratic press subordinates this larger fact to lurid accounts of an individual's wretched attempt at vindictive murder after the police outrage was complete.

✣

The peace-loving and law-abiding people of this country need awakening to the growth of police despotism. They must acquaint themselves with the falsifying tendencies of the newspapers in support of that despotism. They must realize the plutocratic sources of its inspiration. They must insist that the police become again guardians of the peace. Above all they must stand up for peaceable public meetings and freedom of discussion, regardless of their own approval of sentiments expressed. Unless they maintain these rights for others, they will lose them for themselves. If peaceable meetings of workless workingmen may now be assailed with policemen's clubs "bigger than the Constitution," and be ridden recklessly down by battalions of police Cossacks, it may not be long before peaceable meetings of employed workingmen will be dealt with in like manner. From that point to the suppression of all meetings not approved by predatory interests that thrive alike on the workless-workingman, the working-workingman, and the productive business man, will be but a matter of keeping on.

✣

We have every confidence, however, in a reaction from recent tendencies toward the surrender of American liberties to the despotism of police clubs and Cossacks. We believe that at heart the American people are for freedom of speech and press, not alone for themselves and their own opinions respectively, but, as Wendell Phillips was, for the humblest persons and the humblest opinions as well. If they have acted otherwise, it is because they have been deceived as to the facts. But the episode at Union Square contributes to the exposure of such deceptions. The facts there were too obvious for successful misrepresentation; and for other reasons as well as this, the era of systematic newspaper deception is passing away. We firmly believe that the time is very near when the great mass of law-abiding people from ocean to ocean will remember the Union Square event as the culmination of a despotic police policy happily thwarted by its own excesses. We believe that the day is not much farther off when no alderman who hopes for re-election will dare vote money for the support of Cossack police. We believe that the police system is already at the point of turning back to be a peace-guarding system again. We believe that we of this country are soon to see freedom of speech and of the press more secure than ever before, thanks to a self-thwarted tendency the other way. And as we know human nature, so we believe that with the lessening of the size of policemen's clubs relatively to the Constitution, and the increase of freedom of opinion and expression, the inspiration of the bomb thrower will

be gone. While all this is what we wish, yet we predict it not because we wish it, but as a rational inference, as it seems to us, from the inherent character of American manhood and the accumulating signs of the times.

✣ ✣

The Police Spirit.

In perfect keeping with the wanton dispersal by the police of the peaceable public meeting at Union Square last week, is the reply to Robert Hunter's dispassionate comment, which Police Commissioner Bingham is reported to have made:

Robert Hunter! Robert Hunter wants to behave himself, or if he doesn't he may be sorry for it. I'll stand for no inciting to riot. I'll suppress with an iron hand any game of that kind, and it might as well be understood at one time as another. Robert Hunter is one of those hot air pipes that made this trouble. Whenever I think of those wind bags who stirred up this trouble I just want them to know I'll not stand for it.

How can foreigners be expected to distinguish American from Russian police if Bingham is an American type?

✣ ✣

American Ideals.

It is naively suggested that violent anarchists "should be educated in Americanism." There would be no violent anarchists to educate in Americanism if Americans themselves were more Americanistic.

✣ ✣

Vacant Lot Gardening.

The "Pingree potato patch," invented by Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, a dozen years ago, is fast becoming an institution for the encouragement of industry and thrift among the disinherited of the earth. It is a simple plan. Owners of vacant lots in cities permit their use for the season for gardening purposes, and persons of charitable instincts contribute tools and seeds. Workers with more leisure than they need do the rest. Under a superintendent's advice they dig and plant and gather, and with such effect as to obtain in money value as high as $100 or more of market produce in a summer. Whether sold or consumed by the producer, this affords no inconsiderable addition to the worker's income.

✣

A national Vacant Lot Gardening Association now exists, with headquarters at 56 Pine street, New York. Howard Payson Wild is president. He is supported by Bolton Hall as treasurer and the Rt. Rev. David H. Greer, Dr. Henry M. Leipziger, Dr. M. Allen Starr, Whidden Graham, Robert Baker, Lawson Purdy, Dr. L. Duncan Bulkley and Miss A. L. Fairfield as directors. Vacant lot gardening is commended by this Association "to the charitably disposed who fear to pauperize the objects of their benevolence," its influence on character and morals being "wholly good, stimulating the spirit of independence and self-help which lies dormant in even the most debased." Experience is said to show that the gardeners "take a keen interest in learning how to plant and cultivate, and are willing to do any amount of work on the soil." The indirect benefits to large families are described as very great. "In a few weeks after going to the farm," says the Association, "the pale, puny children become ruddy and robust, playing in the grass and living healthy, natural lives."

✣ ✣

The Industrial Depression.

Two large reasons are urged for regarding the industrial depression as at an end. One is the reported fact that money is no longer tight, and the other that business men have adjusted their affairs to lower levels of expenditure. Instead of implying recovery from the depression, both facts indicate its persistence and intensification. The "tight money" of last Fall did indeed spell hard times. But that was because it crippled business men in meeting obligations already contracted. But "easy money" now means no more than that the demand for loans has shrunk, which means in turn that business operations are contracting. And this inference harmonizes with the inference that in adjusting their operations to lower levels of expenditure, business men are promoting hard times instead of ridding us of them. They are thereby diminishing the purchasing power of the people as a whole.

✣ ✣

The Banking Alternative.

If Walter Wellman's report of an extensive inquiry among bankers may be accepted, there is about to be formed a banking federation of vast dimensions and portentous possibilities. Such a federation would rule the government, from party primary to Presidential election and from local tax assessor to secretary of the Federal treasury, with an absoluteness far transcending the present power of the banking interests. If this is to be the alternative of Bryan's plan for governmental insurance of deposits—and Mr. Wellman makes its mutual deposit insurance feature its strong point—then there is little room for choice. Under Bryan's plan the banks could not combine so completely as to swing the banking interests at

will; under the other their combination would be so complete and exclusive as to turn over the banking business into the control of an impregnable ring. Under his plan the banks could be kept out of politics; under the other they would dominate politics.

✣ ✣

Mr. Harmon's Candidacy.

Mr. Judson Harmon, in whose bonnet the Presidential bee buzzes pertinaciously, is reported from Kansas City as having made this shrewd remark: "When I speak with Mr. Bryan, if I speak before him the audience won't hear me, and if I follow him there is no audience left to speak to." What a foolish little bee, then, to keep on buzzing so in Mr. Harmon's bonnet. And Mr. Harmon's little bee is not the only foolish one. Several anxious statesmen might draw a political moral from Mr. Harmon's experience.

✣ ✣

Old-Age Pensions.

Pensions for the aged, a policy that is pushing to the front and with which the British government finds it necessary already to deal, presents some practical difficulties and one very important problem of principle. Why should old age pensions be paid out of taxation? That is the question of principle. And it is a difficult question when taxation is imposed regardless of whether the taxpayer earns what he pays, or gets it as a gift from the public; for it seems like taxing some for the benefit of others. But if taxes were imposed only upon land values, the problem of principle would be easy enough. In that case the aged would draw their pensions from ground rent, a common fund in which they are entitled to participate not as a charity but of right. Ground rent, the evident property of the whole community, is now used to pension land owners with. It would be better used as a pension fund for the aged.

✣ ✣

Ownership and Regulation.

President Wilson of Princeton University sees "no radical difference in principle between government ownership and government regulation of the discretionary kind." Neither do we. There is no radical difference. The only difference is that government ownership of public utilities would eradicate the evils of private ownership of government, whereas government regulation will intensify them. But regulation has the merit of being a necessary step toward ownership. The people, already aroused to the iniquity of private ownership of government functions, will probably have to see for themselves the futility of regulation before they go the length of applying the only effective remedy.

✣ ✣ ✣

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S POLICY.

The policy of Theodore Roosevelt is the policy of English toryism. Roosevelt would not pass or repeal any law that would take away privilege; all he wants is to control privilege by law.

Secretary Garfield, asking how special privileged classes should be dealt with, gives the Rooseveltian answer: "Subject to a careful control." This is exactly the doctrine of Lord Beaconsfield (Benjamin Disraeli), acknowledged the ablest exponent of English toryism of the century. Speaking of a great corporation in England Lord Beaconsfield said: "Restricted and controlled by the state, so powerful a corporation may be only fruitful of public advantage."

Writing of Lord Beaconsfield a biographer says: "Instead of excusing and avoiding he assumed that a government of privilege rather than that based on rights, is the best possible government. No doubt Disraeli's speeches are the best embodiment of tory principle." Like Roosevelt this man talked much of the welfare of the people, but never of their rights. Beaconsfield on one occasion said he hoped the House of Commons would "sanction no step that has a preference for democracy, but that they will maintain the ordered state of free England in which we live." By "ordered state" Beaconsfield meant the grading of society from the king to the laborer; the existence of classes, defined and controlled by law.

According to Beaconsfield there had been in England "established a society of classes which gives vigor and variety to life." This appears the Roosevelt ideal, for does he not solemnly admonish us that unless we "regulate" privilege it may be abolished by dangerous innovators?—something truly terrible in your tory mind.

Beaconsfield believed in what he called "legislative interference," the same that we now know as "regulation." This is an old tory device and did not escape the notice of Thomas Jefferson. Writing to John Adams in 1816 of English tories, Jefferson said: "Their efforts will be to quiet things by the palliatives of reformation; to nibble a little at pensions and sinecures; to bite off a bit here and a bit there to amuse the people." Precisely what Roosevelt is doing, nothing more nor less.

Jefferson did not believe in regulation, but he advocated "laying the ax at the roots of privilege."

He would not, as Roosevelt, "limit" monopoly, for in a letter to James Madison he said: "The benefit of even limited monopolies is too doubtful to be opposed to that of their general suppression."

The real issue then is not the sham issue between the Hanna theory of "business first and last," and the Roosevelt "control" of privilege as in tory England; but whether there shall be any "special privileges," or simply "equal rights for all."

ALFRED H. HENDERSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, March 31, 1908.

The Union Square Meeting.

"Drive them into the East river!" commanded the police inspector. He addressed the magnificent mounted police of New York as "these splendid officers bore down upon the multitude like so many mounted soldiers of the Ney division." And down they bore upon a crowd of workingmen and women, many of whom fell beneath the hoofs of the animals. "On came the charging police cavalry, pushing on, on to the sidewalks with the curveting steeds." A crowd of peaceable citizens scattered in all directions before the onslaught, and then, after the meeting had been broken up, a bursting bomb was heard. This is the story as it came to us in Chicago through the New York dispatches of the Inter-Ocean on the 29th, dispatches which colored the story as brilliantly as possible in favor of the police.

✣

The unemployed of New York had been invited to gather in Union Square on the 28th at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Union Square is the traditional spot for open-air meetings in New York. For twenty-five years or more the porch of the cottage at the north end of the park has been the rostrum, and the broad street in front the auditorium for enormous meetings—political, labor, etc.—and the same porch has often served as a reviewing stand for parades. On occasions of meetings it has been customary to use carts as speakers' stands, in order to reach the outer edges of large crowds beyond the power of the speakers at the cottage to be heard. Police and park permits have been exacted, but only as a formality. Its purpose has been to guard against the confusion of two different meetings at once, and to enable the police to arrange for protecting the meetings from disturbance. The permit has always been regarded and treated as a reasonable regulation and not as an arbitrary authorization. Following the long established custom, the promoters of this meeting of the unemployed had applied in the usual way for the usual permit. But it was arbitrarily refused, and an appeal to the courts for an injunction against the police was denied as involving no assertion of property rights. To the unexplained action of the authorities in denying the permit the promoters of the meeting did not submit, but went on with preparations for their meeting, which began to assemble about 2 o'clock on the day in question—the 28th.

✣

Finding large bodies of police in apparently hostile possession of the usual meeting place and turning crowds away, one of the executive committee for the meeting, Mr. Bruno L. Zimm, a sculptor, went to the cottage and accosted the police inspector—Schmittberger. The interview is thus reported in the Record-Herald's special dispatch, which originated with the New York Herald:

"What are these police here for?" asked Mr. Zimm. "Are you going to try to prevent us from meeting?"

"We are going to preserve order and break up any public meeting held without a permit," replied the Inspector.

There was a lively colloquy between the two men for two or three minutes, Zimm declaring that the police had no right to prevent any peaceable meeting, and the Inspector maintaining that he would allow no meeting whatever.

Finally the sculptor pulled a bulky book out of his pocket and began to open it.

"This is the Constitution of the United States and it is on this that we demand the right of free speech."

Inspector Schmittberger flourished his baton.

"This is bigger than the Constitution just now," he retorted. "Now move on."

✣

By this time large numbers of people were pouring peaceably into the park and the streets in front, but the police ordered every one to move on. Incidentally, three wagons were driven up to be used at the meeting. They bore what the dispatches describe as "incendiary mottoes," namely, "We demand work," "Why should we go hungry?" "Public thievery makes private poverty." Chased away by the police, they went a block above the cottage, to Seventeenth street and Fourth avenue; but attempts at speaking here were instantly stopped by the police, who refused, however, to arrest any speaker. At 2 o'clock, the time for the meeting, a gathering estimated at 10,000 had assembled. Kept "on the move" by the police, this crowd marched slowly around the park, which is bounded by Seventeenth street, Fourth avenue, Fourteenth street and Broadway, and as the police drove them on someone started the "Marseillaise," which was

taken up by the whole crowd in chorus. Then the police sent for the mounted squad, and when it arrived the order noted above, "Drive them into the East river!" was given.

✣

Obeying their orders, the mounted men rode in a body ruthlessly into the crowd. We take the story now from the Record-Herald dispatch:

Inspector Schmittberger gave the order to the mounted men to charge the crowd and disperse it. The men obeyed orders and attacked the solid mass of humanity at its weakest points. It was half an hour of hard work for the police before they finally got the crowd started away from the Square. After the sides of the Square had been cleared the cross streets were still full of people, who showed no inclination to move on when told to do so. Mounted policemen rode on the sidewalk, herding the people before them, only to see them slip around the next corner and join the crowd there. Parts of the crowd thronged into Irving place with the police in close pursuit. To avoid mounted policemen a score or more ran into the lobby of the Academy of Music, where a matinee was in progress. Close behind them rode a policeman, up five steps, into the long lobby, and out the door at the other end, driving the refugees in front of him.

✣

It was not until after all this that the bomb was exploded. The clock had struck three, the meeting of the unemployed had been completely dispersed, and the police were receiving orders to withdraw, when the sound of the bomb was heard. This caused a rush of crowds again to the Square, prompted, doubtless, by curiosity to know the cause of the explosion. Again the crowds were pummeled by the foot police with clubs, while the mounted squad rode recklessly into their midst as before. When the explosion had been investigated, it appeared, as reported, that a young man had tried to throw a bomb at a passing policeman, but the bomb had gone off prematurely, badly wounding the young man himself and killing a bystander. According to Coroner Schrady, as reported in the Chicago Record-Herald of the 29th, the young man who held the bomb, whose name is Selig Silverstein, and whose home is at 21 Van Brunt street, Brooklyn—

said at first that he had been handed the bomb by someone whom he did not know. Later he declared he had made the bomb himself, with some stuff he had bought at a drug store. After that he admitted that it had been his intention to throw the bomb at the police. Asked as to his motive, he said he had been beaten by a policeman a week ago.

He still lives. Arrests have been made of police suspects as conspirators, but no evidence of conspiracy is yet disclosed.

✣

Among the men who were to have addressed the meeting of the unemployed, the arbitrary dispersal of which preceded the explosion of the bomb, was Robert Hunter, who has an international reputation as the author of "Poverty." Mr. Hunter's account of his experience is of special value:

I had been invited by the committee of arrangements to make a speech at the meeting. I read in one of the newspapers on the 28th that permission to hold the meeting in Union Square, as had been arranged, had been denied. I decided to go to the Square anyway and try to make a speech. I believe the police had no right to forbid citizens to assemble, and I was prepared, if necessary, to suffer arrest in order that a test case might be made. When I reached Union Square I saw the police were making a crowd keep moving. I went to a policeman who seemed to be in charge. "I am Robert Hunter," I said to him. "I have been invited here to deliver an address. Why are we not permitted to assemble?" "There is to be no meeting," this policeman said. "If we cannot meet here in Union Square," I said, "it is your duty to tell us where we may assemble." "You may not assemble any place near here," the policeman answered. There was nothing offensive in the answer of the policeman. He said he had to do his duty, but he was not rough or violent in his language or action. The policemen under his command did not at first use roughness in handling the crowd, but gradually they used more and more force, and persons in the crowd began to grumble at the manner in which the police acted toward them. The violence that came was the result of the work of the police. Believing as I did that the police had usurped power in denying us the right to free assembly and free speech, I gathered some of my friends about me and started a procession in Union Square. We walked toward Seventeenth street. There a body of mounted police was drawn up across the street. These policemen advanced upon us in a manner that would not be tolerated in any other country in the world, except Russia. To avoid being trampled under foot we were forced to recede from our position. I and others with me began to sing the "Marseillaise" at that point. My secretary and the others with me were anxious, as I was, to do something that would result in the making of a test case. We again formed our procession and walked into Seventeenth street unmolested by the police. I mounted a stoop in Seventeenth street and with many persons before me I began to speak. There were many policemen about. One of these policemen at once reached up and pulled me down from the steps. "I want you to arrest me," I said to him. "I won't arrest you," he said, "but I'll stop your speechmaking." Seeing that it was useless to attempt anything further, I left Union Square. I left at 2:30 o'clock, and it was after my departure that the bomb was thrown. I did not know a bomb had been thrown until after I arrived home, when somebody in New York telephoned the news to me. I regret there was violence and loss of life, but I insist that the police acted tyrannically. They have no right to forbid peaceable assemblies. President Roosevelt had no right to suppress that anarchistic newspaper in Paterson, N. J. Acts of this nature, acts which are acts of usurpation, tend to make

anarchists. I am a Socialist. You should know that Socialism and Anarchy are not akin. But the spectacle I witnessed this afternoon makes me understand how men can readily give their allegiance to anarchy. The violence today was not the result of the resistance of the persons in Union Square to the police so much as it was the result of the manner in which the police acted toward the persons in Union Square. We all have a constitutional right to free assembly and free speech, and I had no hesitancy in resisting today what I conceived honestly to have been an exhibition on the part of the authorities of usurpation of power. Even though I know the meeting had been placed under the ban by the police, I had no intention of withdrawing from it. I had a right to speak there, as had every man that had been invited. I do not believe any wise judge would refuse to accord a citizen of the United States the exercise of his Constitutional right of free speech. I did my best to be arrested that I might have that question tested and decided, and it was not my fault that I failed.

✣

Among the eye witnesses besides Robert Hunter, who testify to the recklessness of the police, are H. H. McClure and Arthur C. Pleydell, secretary of the Tax Reform Association. In addition to the above quotation from him, Mr. Hunter says:

The mounted officers rode over men, women and children. I have seen many meetings broken up by the police in Russia and in other European countries, but never such extraordinary roughness as was used this afternoon. I met H. H. McClure, the publisher, in the park, and he agreed with me that the conduct of the police was most astonishing.

Mr. Pleydell says:

Coming out of the subway at Fourteenth street at 3 o'clock, just in time to dodge a mounted squad, there was no disorder visible except the confusion created by the police themselves. I did not know of the proposed meeting, and was uptown on business. The statement that the explosion was at 3:30 seems nearest right. At any rate it could not have occurred between 3 and 3:20, or I should have heard it. I saw no actual clubbing, but some of the police didn't seem to care whether they ran over women or not. The Fourteenth street sidewalk is wide and the police drove right along it. The slightest accident would have made havoc.

✣

A committee appointed by the Socialist party of New York to investigate the action of the police has decided to issue a call to all persons who suffered ill-treatment at the hands of the police on this occasion, and to all who witnessed such ill-treatment. The evidence will be compiled, and made a basis for impeachment proceedings. A call is also to be made upon the legislature to institute an official investigation.

Emma Goldman.

The newspaper reports of the bomb explosion at New York were coupled with statements that Silverstein's rooms had been searched and incriminating letters from Emma Goldman found. Being interviewed in Minneapolis, on the 28th, Emma Goldman said, as reported by the Chicago Tribune of the 29th:

I did not know Selig Silverstein. I did not know the dead man Irwin Bassky. I have never heard of either of them. The report that letters from me to Silverstein were found in his room is absolutely false as—well, I think I know my correspondents. You want to know who I think was at the bottom of the whole riot? The police. They do it to show their authority. Such affairs as occurred this afternoon in New York have been traced in many instances to the police, who grasp the opportunity to lay all blame on anarchists. Who knows that Silverstein threw the bomb? Did any newspaper men see him do it? Why do you come to me for enlightenment? Am I supposed to know every anarchist, any more than President Roosevelt is supposed to know every Republican? As soon as there is a riot, a bomb explosion, an assassination, or an uprising, the police immediately try to attach the affair to me. And that is why I say that they even go so far as to instigate these plots themselves for the purpose of incriminating us and heaping praise on themselves. I don't believe a workingman threw the bomb. It would not have been to his advantage. The logical conclusion in my mind is that the police are in some way behind the whole matter.

✣

The speeches of Emma Goldman at Minneapolis are reported to have been to crowded houses in consequence of her persecution by the Chicago police (vol. x, pp. 1201, 1212). She is described by those who heard her as having spoken calmly and quietly but forcibly. In view of newspaper reports that are designed to make her appear as a criminal it is but fair to quote Bolton Hall's estimate of her, made after years of familiarity with her work and purpose. Advising The Public, Mr. Hall says:

With many of her views I do not agree, but I have known Miss Goldman for about ten years and I know no one who is kinder, more unselfish or broader-minded; and withal she has an indomitable courage both in word and deed. Her home and her slender earnings are always at the disposal of the poor, the oppressed and the unpopular.

✣ ✣

Local Self-Government in Des Moines.

The first election under the "Des Moines plan" of city government (vol. x, p. 1233) took place in two Iowa cities on the 31st, non-partisan nominations having been made under the plan two weeks ago. At Cedar Rapids, John T. Carmody was elected mayor, and ex-Mayor Huston (vol.

viii, p. 822), H. S. Keffer, E. A. Sherman and Matt Miles, councilmen. At Des Moines, A. J. Mathis, a Democrat, was elected mayor over Eugene W. Waterbury, but the primary and the election were free from the influence of national politics. The councilmen elected are Republicans—John Macnicav, Wesley Ash, J. L. Hamery and C. L. Schramm.

✣ ✣

Taxation in Rhode Island.

At the hearing on the home rule in taxation bill (vol. x, p. 1188), had before the judiciary committee of the lower house of the Rhode Island legislature on the 2d, speeches in support of the bill were made by ex-Governor L. F. C. Garvin, David Fraser, C. B. Fillebrown, C. H. Merriman and Representative Thomas F. Kearney. The latter informed the committee that the bill had the unanimous endorsement of the Building Trades Council, and is desired because it will lessen cost of production and thereby improve industrial conditions.

✣

No manufacturer or merchant appeared in opposition to the bill. The opposition was almost confined to two Providence tax assessors. One of their arguments was that vacant lots would be improved all over Providence, resulting in many empty tenements. When asked whether factories would not also be likely to be erected, bringing in employes to fill the tenements, no answer was forthcoming. Two letters were presented and read to the committee. One was from Charles Sisson, saying that the present system is unjust and breeds false statements; the other was from Bishop McVickar, also favoring the bill.

✣ ✣

Direct Legislation in New York.

A hearing was had before the judiciary committee of the lower house of the New York legislature on the 24th upon an initiative and referendum resolution for amending the Constitution, drawn by Frederick C. Leubuscher and introduced in the senate by Senator Saxe and in the house by Assemblyman Toombs. There were no speeches in opposition before the committee. Speeches in favor of the resolution were made by Henry B. Maurer, of Brooklyn; Lewis Stockton, of Buffalo, and Frederick C. Leubuscher, of New York.

✣

The officers of the New York Initiative and Referendum League, under whose auspices this resolution was drawn, are Hamilton Holt, president; George Foster Peabody, treasurer; Henry B. Maurer (299 Broadway, New York), secretary; John Martin, chairman executive committee, and Frederick C. Leubuscher, chairman of law committee.

Presidential Politics.

Not much has occurred during the week of an authentic character regarding Presidential politics (vol. x, p. 1233). But the Republicans of Rhode Island, who met in convention on the 26th, advocated tariff revision after election and made no instructions on candidates. The Tennessee convention on the 25th had made no instructions, but commended Taft, Hughes, Fairbanks, Cannon and Foraker.

✣

The Democrats of Indiana on the 26th instructed for Mr. Bryan.

✣

A banquet of huge proportions in point of numbers was held in honor of Bryan at Kansas City on the 30th, under the auspices of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Missouri. Over 10,000 people sat at table. Among the guests were ex-Governors Crittenden, Francis, Stone and Dockery, and Governor Folk. Judson Harmon of Ohio and Mr. Bryan delivered addresses. Of Secretary Taft, Mr. Bryan said:

> The President has picked out Secretary Taft and given him the support of the Administration. Without the support of the Administration the Secretary would scarcely have a State in the convention, and with the President's support he is having an uphill fight. He has no record as a reformer, and his speeches do not indicate a definite purpose or a courageous program. What does Secretary Taft stand for? What does he denounce as wrong? What does he propose as a remedy? What would he do with the trusts? He tells us that he would not exterminate them, but simply regulate them. What does he propose on the tariff question? Revision—but not until after the election. What reform does Secretary Taft propose for the benefit of labor? What relief does Secretary Taft propose to give us from the burdens which imperialism has imposed upon the country? What is Secretary Taft going to do on the railroad question?

✣ ✣

The Traction Situation in Cleveland.

Mayor Johnson's long struggle for a three-cent street car fare in Cleveland (vol. x, p. 1161) with the right to municipal ownership and operation as soon as the necessary act of the State legislature can be obtained, is now believed to have reached a victorious end. Plans are substantially agreed upon to consolidate into one corporation all the street car interests now operating in the city, and to transfer the franchise rights of this corporation and its business management to a "holding" company. Under this arrangement, the street cars will be operated at a three cent fare, the dividends will be limited to 6 per cent on the par value of the stock paid in in cash, and the city will be secured the right to take over for par, plus 10 per cent, at any time after being legally empowered to

own the system. All net income over the 6 per cent dividends will be devoted either to improvements or to reducing the ultimate purchase price to the city. It is expected that this arrangement will be made, or else that all negotiations will be broken of, on the 6th, when the stockholders of the Cleveland Electric ("Con-Con") and of the Forest City ("Threefer") are to meet.

✚

The stockholders of the Forest City ("Threefer") held their first meeting on the 28th at the City Hall. Over 400 were personally present. Mayor Johnson, who was present by invitation, strongly advised the stockholders to consent to a consolidation with the Cleveland Electric Co. under the name of the Cleveland Railway Co., saying that under such an arrangement the Forest City interests would be taken care of dollar for dollar. Some objection to consolidation being voiced, Mayor Johnson explained:

This company has served its purpose. It was organized to get for the people of Cleveland lower fares, and in this it has succeeded. With this success there is no longer necessity for competition. Under peaceful conditions, when it came time to build new lines, the conflict over which either company should be given the grant, if there were two companies, would constantly arise. Added to this, with consolidation there would be no contest as to the value of stock. Of course your wishes in this matter must govern. I feel most strongly with you stockholders of the Forest City Railway Company. You notice my voice was rather husky when I began talking. I am not easily affected that way, but when I saw this outpouring and remembered what your investment in this enterprise meant, I could not help myself. Your investment in this enterprise has been patriotic. All credit is due you, for I want to say that without the competing 3-cent company, this settlement could never have been brought about. Your wishes in this matter will be absolute, but it is my opinion that consolidation would be most desirable and profitable to you in the long run.

Responding to questions, Mayor Johnson fully explained many involved details. He was cheered when he concluded, and after he had left the room the stockholders' meeting took a recess until 10:30 o'clock, April 6.

✚

Meanwhile work for the restoration of the Central-Quincy lines, torn up by the "Con-Con" a year ago (vol. x, p. 854), has begun. It is being done under the supervision of the city. A franchise is to be granted to a new company, "The Neutral Street Railway Company," to be organized and controlled under a compromise arrangement, giving all present companies equal operating rights over this particular line, whether the larger negotiations result in consolidation or not.

NEWS NOTES

—The Governor of Florida appointed Hall Milton on the 27th to succeed the late Senator Bryan (vol. x. p. 1233) as United States Senator.

—Agreements were made on the 30th for the purchase by the City of Winnipeg (vol. x., p. 1037) of the entire holdings of the local electric company. This purchase comprehends the gas works and the street railways.

—The Aldrich Currency bill (vol. x, p. 1210) passed the Senate on the 27th by a vote of 42 to 16. The party division was 39 Republicans and 3 Democrats in the affirmative, and 11 Democrats and 5 Republicans in the negative.

—The volcano of San Felippe in Guatemala, for two hundred years considered totally extinct, broke out last week, according to reports received by steamship at San Francisco. The city of San Felippe has been totally deserted (vol. x, p. 153).

—The first step toward the active trial of the case of Hearst against McClellan for the Mayoralty of New York (vol. x., p 1214) was taken on the 30th, when the Commissioner of Jurors drew 100 talesmen from whom a jury is to be selected.

—Sir Robert Hart (vol. ix, p. 657), Inspector General of Customs in China since 1863, has at last retired from the Chinese service and is returning to England. Sir Robert has long been held to understand China and the Chinese better than any other Englishman.

—Fifty-eight miners, if not more, lost their lives in explosions at Hanna, Wyo., in the No. 1 mine of the Union Pacific Coal Company, on the 28th. The larger number were lost in a second explosion, while attempting to rescue the victims of the first explosion (vol. x, p. 922).

—"Militant Methods for Votes for Women" are to be discussed by the Chicago West Side Equal Suffrage Association at 811 Masonic Temple, Saturday afternoon, April 11, at 2 o'clock. Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCullough and Mrs. Winona S. Jones are among the speakers.

—An order was issued on the 29th by the Pennsylvania railroad to discharge all foreigners and employ none but American citizens. It is suspected that the Pennsylvania railroad is going to take a hand in the coming Presidential election, and is preparing to give employment to men who can use their ballots to help save the corporation from further political hindrance in its operations.

—Judge Carter of the Illinois Supreme Court decided on the 31st that the appeal of the Chicago Election Commissioners from the decision of Judge Walker sustaining the referendum of the United Societies (vol. x, p. 1226) operates as a stay of proceedings. Consequently the question petitioned for cannot be placed upon the public policy ballot at the municipal election next week.

—While sleeping on an outer porch of his house at Telluride, Colo., on the 28th, Gen. Bulkeley Wells was blown with dynamite many feet from the house. Although the side of the house was torn completely

out and hardly a stick of the bed in which Gen. Wells was sleeping remained, Gen. Wells himself, though shaken up and bruised by the explosion, was not seriously injured. So say the newspaper reports.

—The second class mailing privilege of La Questione Sociale, an anarchist publication issued at Paterson, N. J. (vol. x, p. 1227), was annulled by the Postoffice Department on the 26th upon allegations of being devoted almost entirely to exciting and defending violence, riot, arson, murder and assassination. The technical reason officially given is that the publication is not a newspaper or other periodical within the meaning of the law.

—Durham W. Stevens, who was shot by Korean students in San Francisco on the 23d (vol. x, p. 1234), died on the 24th. Mr. Stevens had been in the service of the Japanese government, and dispatches of the 30th state that the Mikado has bestowed upon him the decoration of the Grand Rising Sun, the highest decorative order in Japan, and that the Japanese government will give 150,000 yen (about $75,000) to Mr. Stevens' family, and the Korean government about 50,000 yen—in all about $100,000.

—Severe earthquake shocks (vol. x, p. 779) occurred in Mexico on the 26th. In the City of Mexico walls were broken and four persons injured, one fatally. The shocks were widespread, but outside the State of Guerro did but little serious damage. In that State, which lies southwest of the City of Mexico on the Pacific, several small towns were destroyed, and Chilapa, a town of 15,000 inhabitants, has been reported to have been thrown into ruins and burned.

—A resolution looking toward home rule for Ireland, but only academic and general in scope, was moved by John E. Redmond in the House of Commons (vol. x, page 1213) on the 30th, and passed after much debate. The resolution declared that "in the opinion of this House a solution of this problem can only be attained by giving the Irish people legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs"; and was amended by adding the words: "all subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament."

—The Circuit Court of Ohio at Toledo on the 28th affirmed the decision of the lower court in the cases of twenty prominent lumber men of Toledo who last July were sentenced to the workhouse for six months under the Valentine antitrust law (vol. x, p. 368). The Supreme court having decided in the ice trust cases that imprisonment must be in the county jail instead of the workhouse, the lumber men were sent to the lower court for resentence. The defendants are reported to be wealthy and leading citizens of Toledo.

—Trouble in Hayti, after having apparently died down (vol. x, p. 1234), seems to be breaking out again. It was reported on the 30th that President Nord Alexis had decided to expel a Mr. Reinbold, head of the firm of Hermann & Co., charged with contributing funds to the revolutionists; and that Germany had decided to oppose his expulsion and to exact the immediate payment, with 6 per cent interest, of Haytian government bonds amounting to $300,000, which Herr Reinbold purchased for cash in 1900, and also the payment of other debts which the Haytian government owes Hermann & Co. The German cruiser Bremen was reported as being on its way from Jamaica to Port-au-Prince.

—The monthly statement of the United States Treasury Department (vol. x., p. 1115) for February, 1908, shows the following for the fiscal year up to and including that month:

Gold reserve fund	$150,000,000.00
Available cash	268,845,804.41
Total	$418,845,804.41
On hand at the closs of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1907	418,581,437.51
Increase	$ 264,366.90

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States (vol. x., p. 1115) for the eight months ending February 29, 1908, as given by the statistical sheet of the Department of Commerce and Labor for February, 1908, were as follows (M. standing for merchandise, G. for gold and S. for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M.	$1,357,012,349	$836,122,625	$520,889,724 exp.
G.	21,326,746	135,664,389	114,337,643 imp.
S.	40,663,575	30,548,400	10,115,175 exp.
	$1,419,002,670	$1,002,335,414	$416,667,256 exp.
From 1897 to June 30, 1907			5,008,699,071 exp.
Total from 1897 to date			$5,425,366,327 exp.

—The monthly Treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government (vol. x., p. 1115) for February, 1908, shows the following for the fiscal year up to and including that month:

Receipts.		
Tariff	$201,716,924.39	
Internal revenue	170,642,065.75	
Miscellaneous	42,813,821.21	
		$415,172,811.35
Expenses.		
Civil and miscellaneous	$ 97,695,852.10	
War	74,011,756.77	
Navy	77,950,983.15	
Indians	9,502,625.42	
Pensions	103,551,841.21	
Public works	63,927,913.79	
Interest	15,622,625.89	
		442,263,598.33
Deficit		$27,090,786.98

PRESS OPINIONS

Journalism.

The (Kansas City) News Book (ind.), March 28.—The printed word has come to be the one channel for the dissemination of general information. The people, save in such cases where an outcry is flung from town to town, and set echoing throughout the country, are absolutely dependent upon the newspapers for their facts. The monopolists and rich corruptionists, long ago appreciative of this, have practically gained control of the daily papers of the country, likewise the great press associations. This control is manifested not only in the suppression of news, and its distortion where it cannot be suppressed, but in the manufacture of news. . . . What is there to do about it? Well, not much, as

a matter of fact. But don't be fooled any longer. Be chary of passing judgment until you have the facts.

✣ ✣

Police Anarchy.

The (Chicago) Daily Socialist (Soc.), March 30.—Those men and women who met in Union Square were absolutely within their legal rights. They were breaking no law, committing no violence. In so far as they were Socialists they were endeavoring to teach the workers the only way to secure relief without violence. There was one violent anarchistic speech made there. It was one which we venture to say will become historic. When a young sculptor pled for the right of free speech with Inspector Schmittberger, who had charge of the police, and pointed to the Constitution of the United States as guaranteeing that right, it was the supposed representative of the law who replied as he pointed to his upraised club: "This is bigger than the Constitution just now." Then and there the first anarchist bomb was thrown. These words announced that law was to be tossed aside and brute force was to rule. To the man who could not see beyond that upraised club, who did not realize the forces of which that policeman was but the puppet, and who could not comprehend that there is a way in which that club may be torn from the hands of those who would use it to crush law, the bomb seemed the logical answer.

✣ ✣

Free Speech.

The Chicago Evening Post (conserv. Rep.), Mar. 13.—Freedom of speech is a treasured inheritance of Americans, native sons as well as adopted. We boast of it in idle hours and assume to contemplate with something akin to contempt those supine fellow men who are content to dwell in countries where the measure of one's utterances is in the hands of king or ministers, army or police, to regulate. Ere we boast further we should know that among all the great cities there is none where freedom of speech is so unrestrained as in London. The capital of the British empire is the paradise of agitators. There everyone may exploit his pet enthusiasm, be it socialism, anarchy, woman's rights, or any other of the thousand and one theories that man has found to talk about. Trafalgar Square is a popular gathering place, but greater than it is the expanse of meadow in Hyde Park, where around the "Reformers' Tree" the red flag flutters and orators hold forth from early of a Sunday morning till dark. The authorities keep hands off, for the general belief is that these gatherings act as a safety valve to let off the pent-up emotions of the heterogeneous masses of the metropolis. And the penalty of this unlicensed talk? None apparently. No other capital of Europe is more free from "anarchistic outrages"; in none is royalty or government official so safe. Is this a coincidence or is it something of vastly deeper significance, something that deserves the study of other governments, including our own? For in America, despite our tradition and our Constitution, the measure of free speech is far smaller than it is in London and in other cities abroad. In fact, only in Spain and in Russia will we find more limitations thrown about those who protest against the "established order." Speech is no longer absolutely free in this land of freedom.

✣ ✣

A Socialist View of Anarchy.

The (Chicago) Daily Socialist (Soc.), March 30.—The insane wretch who was taunted and tormented by anarchistic police brutality into throwing that bomb in New York did a greater service to the oppressors and exploiters of Labor than any of the open champions of capitalism have been able to accomplish in years. The ill-concealed gloating with which his act is heralded forth, with a wealth of lies, upon the pages of the organs of capitalism proves this point. It has been in the hope of provoking something of this kind that the police of Chicago and of New York have sought in every possible manner to aggravate the starving workers into violent resistance. In Chicago this effort failed and the forces of reaction were in full retreat. Then came this act in New York, which is to-day being exploited with almost open exultation by every enemy of labor. . . . Such acts have a very evident cause. It is not hard to discover the forces which produced that bomb. Here is a recipe which has been tried over and over again in all countries and among all races and has never failed to produce such outbreaks: Take a half-starved victim of capitalism, cut him off from the opportunity of producing the wealth for lack of which he is perishing, then beat him over the head with a policeman's club when he dares to protest against those who are profiting by his misery, and most important of all, keep him from learning that there is any peaceable way in which he can change these conditions, and you will produce a maniacal murderer making insane war upon society.

✣ ✣

Sound Principles of Taxation.

The (London) Nation (ind.), February 1.—True Liberal finance consists in what to the alarmed imaginations of Lord St. Aldwyn and his friends appears a predatory attack upon property. In reality, it is based upon a thoroughly sound distinction between two sorts of income and of property, that which is earned by the output of useful personal energy, skill, and foresight, and that which is not. Earned income, in the shape of wages, salaries, minimum interest or profit, is the only sort of property which is really "sacred," and its sanctity is vouched for by the fact that any attempt to appropriate it by taxation, or otherwise, impairs the incentive of the owner to apply his ability, his labor power, or his savings to the effective processes of production. This is why taxes upon tea and sugar are so injurious. They constitute an attack upon the standard of living of the workers through the purchasing power of the money-wage, and pro tanto diminish the efficiency of labor and production of national wealth. Herein consists the folly of those who urge that every worker should be made to bear some tax, in order that he may contribute his share to the upkeep of Government. Any tax whose incidence is upon a "living wage," or a living rate of profit, or upon any other income commercially necessary to evoke the best use of the skill, labor, or capital its recipient owns, is a truly injurious attack on property, and is, ipso facto, a bad tax. Conversely, the only sound and

safe tax is one which lies on incomes or property which are "unearned," in the sense that they evoke no useful productive energy.

RELATED THINGS
CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

WATCHING THE CROWD.

For The Public.

I often journey through the town,
And watch the forms go up and down—
Go up and down.
Unsignaling they course past me,
Like stranger vessels on the sea—
The human sea.

Swept fiercely on in Self-Love's wrath,
They brush me hastily from the path—
I choke their path;
Or like a child's self-acting toy,
Their shifting thought I give employ—
Soulless employ.

But in these forms I look below
The surface life that frets them so—
That frets them so;
And buried deep in all I see
Imprisoned souls look out at me—
Yearn big toward me.

I hear these souls, unheeded, plead
Through forms that chase the phantom need—
The phantom need:
"Oh, Brother! We are one with you;
Our life must rise or fall in you—
In stranger you.

"With you we know the feast is spread,
With you is peace for weary head—
Tormented head.
One circle we—no gulfs divide;
What seems our difference is outside—
Yes, all outside."

So in the throng I ever wait
The falling of the prison gate—
That ancient gate;
When fettered souls at last set free,
Join in Love's merry liberty—
Her life-completing liberty.

JESSE S. DANCEY.

✣ ✣ ✣

A KICK IN HIGH FINANCE.

For The Public.

After indulging in no little amount of wrangling—for big men in the making of their deals wrangle not less than do lowly hucksters and housewives in their bargaining, though they sheathe their feelings with far better skill—the trolley nabob and the millionaire manufacturer of street cars came to an agreement touching a price for the contemplated new equipment of rolling stock.

The form of contract already bore one of the necessary signatures, and the nabob had begun to affix his autograph to the paper, when he suddeny paused and raised his pen. "Of course," said he, a little insistent note of caution and suspicion breaking through his well-trained sangfroid, a note often manifested when he was on the buyer side of a transaction, "of course, this price covers absolutely every detail?"

"Certainly," declared the manufacturer, with loud earnestness, adding, however, after a moment of hesitation, and in a voice softer and almost apologetic, "but the figure is so extremely, so absurdly low, that, to come out even, I fear I shall be compelled to make a small extra charge for the straps."

A scowl gathered on the nabob's face, and he laid down his pen and sat up very straight in his chair.

"Extra for the straps!" he exclaimed. "Why, sir, the charge would be preposterous. What do you think would become of me and my company, the 'Great Universal Traction Combine,' if we ventured to charge our patrons extra for the straps?"

G. T. E.

✣ ✣ ✣

OPENING EDITORIAL OF THE FIRST ISSUE OF THE PUBLIC.

Published April 9, 1898.

No apologies are necessary for launching a paper like The Public. Though a wearisome superfluity of periodicals burdens the market, none satisfies the desire, widespread and strong, for a paper in which the news reports are not distorted by editorial bias nor discolored with impertinent opinions, but are simple, direct, compact, lucid and veracious; a paper which aims to be right rather than sensational; which is not padded; which clearly relates to their appropriate place in general history those events that have historical value; and which, in its editorial policy, unflinchingly puts public questions to the supreme test of obvious moral principles and stands by the result. For the paper which shall satisfy that desire, there is yet ample room. Whether The Public will do this or not, only experience can show; but it will make a faithful effort.

✣

Some one has noted the resemblance of most modern newspapers, in their news departments, to old-time gossips swapping scandal across the fence, and in their editorial departments to the gossips' husbands talking politics and "jawing" one another down at the tavern. Perhaps the resemblance is remote; but it is close enough to suggest to the imagination of an evolutionist the possibility of kinship.

Yet the newspaper is unquestionably a useful institution. Although editorial writers are too often mere literary machines, who, by tossing aside their self-respect with their intellectual honesty, and obediently writing at the dictation of unscrupulous bosses, now one way and now another, have taught the public to distrust the sincerity of editorial articles not verified by the signatures of writers whose eccentric sense of honor may have won them public confidence; although sensational news is padded to the bursting point with frivolous details, while other important though comparatively common place matter is robbed of the space necessary to make it intelligible; although both perspicuity and truth are often sacrificed to "hustle"; although many papers are not above catering to the prejudices of rich and poor alike, playing the demagogue now to the galleries and again to the boxes—notwithstanding all these weaknesses, the daily press, as an institution, is nevertheless indispensable. It sweeps the world for news. What if it does, as a rule, pour out its news upon the reader in an inflated daily volume of unassorted, undigested, unrelated facts, semi-facts and fiction, good, bad, scandalous, trivial and bewildering, and introduced with shrieking headlines? Most of these faults are inseparable from daily journalism. Good editing, though a few daily papers are notable for approximating to it, is not possible under the pressure of gathering news by lightning and printing it as fast as it comes in, and often faster.

But just here the weekly paper may be made to supplement the daily. Having the benefit of the great news collections which the dailies make, and being under no constant pressure for time, the editors of weekly papers may discard frivolous details and idle gossip, may separate truth from misrepresentation and fiction, and, garnering the really valuable news of the world, may report it at leisure in compact form, and point out its relation to the news of the week before, the year before, the century before, or the age before.

Thus may the weekly paper enable ordinary men, whether they attempt to read daily papers or not, to understand the history of their own time as it develops. To him who reads daily papers, it may be a newspaper interpreter; to him who does not read them—and the number who have found regular newspaper reading an unbearable burden is not small—it may be a newspaper reader, a species of private secretary who saves his time and energy by reading and sifting the newspapers for him.

✣

Some weekly papers have undertaken this work. So have some monthlies. And their service has been warmly welcomed. But, unfortunately, from a mistaken notion of what makes news interesting, most of them inject into their news reports a flavor of editorial opinion which not only offends readers holding adverse opinions, but breeds among all scrupulous readers a suspicion of the trustworthiness of the reports themselves. Useful, therefore, as their news reporting is, they do not satisfy the desire as to news reports to which we have referred.

And most if not all of them fall still further short of satisfying that desire in respect to editorial policy. They, like the daily newspapers, are often offensive not only to the democratic public in general, which knows of them but does not often read them, but also to many of their regular readers, on account of their abject submission to plutocratic influences.

✣

By "plutocratic," let us stop to explain, we do not allude to the rich. Rich men are not necessarily plutocrats. Very often they are on the contrary genuine democrats. Very often, too, the most pronounced plutocrats are poor. He is a plutocrat who, be he rich or poor, sets up wealth as the test of respectability and the insignia of industrial or political authority—that is to say, who favors government by or for the rich. Goldsmith hit off plutocracy when he wrote:

Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.

What we mean, therefore, by plutocratic influences, is influences which make for the elevation of the rich to industrial or political mastership. To these influences the general press—daily, weekly, monthly—is submissive to the extent of servility. There are few exceptions outside the organs of social reform movements. Even the Democratic papers, most of them, and those Republican papers which still feel the democratic impulse of abolition days, are safely relied upon by our plutocracy to turn in their tracks whenever plutocratic privileges are seriously menaced.

✣

These considerations justify the advent of a weekly paper like The Public, and we repeat that it makes no apology for appearing. Whatever else may be said of it, no one can assert that there is not a field for the kind of paper it aims to be. Such an assertion would imply what is evidently untrue. It would imply that a paper which prints in intelligible form the really valuable news, winnowed from the trash that goes by the name of news, and divested of partisan bias and color, a paper which, moreover, consistently and persistently, not as an organ of some reform movement but solely with reference to fundamental moral principles, is editorially hostile to plutocracy in all its phases and throughout all its ramifications, —it would imply that a paper of that character is not wanted. We believe that in fact such a paper is wanted, and that the paper which shall realize

this ideal will enjoy abundant success, not merely as a business enterprise but also as a trusted teacher and leader. Conscious, however, of the difficulties of the undertaking, we make no promise for The Public except that it will be held as closely as we can hold it to the ideal here indicated.

✣ ✣ ✣

"THE OUTLOOK" ON PLUTOCRATS.

From an Editorial in The Outlook for March 21, 1908.

By the plutocrats we do not mean the very rich. There are very rich men who are not plutocrats; there are plutocrats who are not very rich men. A democrat is a man who believes in government by the people for the people; a plutocrat is a man who believes in government by the rich for the rich.

The plutocrat believes that the object of government is to protect person and property—especially property. Government should simply preserve order while the individuals make money. For the chief end of man is to glorify money and enjoy it for—as long as he lives and his children after him. If government does this, the shrewd and sagacious will make money; the less shrewd and less sagacious will make less money, but they will generally make enough to live, and that is enough—for the less shrewd and sagacious. The plutocrat, therefore, measures all government policies by their effect in dollars and cents. A policy which reduces the chance of the shrewd and sagacious to make money and increases the chance of the less shrewd and sagacious to make money is an unjust policy, because money rewards should be proportional to shrewdness and sagacity. In the view of the plutocrat the object of government is to promote money-making; and the money made should go to those who show the greatest shrewdness in making it. If a policy tends to weaken the confidence of the plain people in the shrewd and sagacious money-maker, it is a dishonest and disastrous policy, and is to be condemned. For if the public confidence in the moral infallibility of the great money-maker is impaired, his power to make money will be seriously weakened. And this is fatal to the ends for which society is constituted —the making of money.

This is the first principle of the plutocrats; the second principle is a natural deduction. Clearly the best and wisest in the community should govern. But since the object of society is to make money, and the standard of excellence is ability to make money, it follows that the shrewd and sagacious money-makers should control the government. Or, to put the principle in other language, since the object of legislation should be to promote prosperity, and since the shrewd and sagacious money-makers have demonstrated their ability to secure prosperity for themselves, they should direct the legislation. The plutocrat is not necessarily dishonest; but his standard of honesty is a little apt to become the Turkish standard. He does not always think it dishonest to buy legislators; this is only dividing the profit of shrewdness and sagacity between the partners in the enterprise. Honesty does not require that legislators should not be bought; it only requires that they should stay bought.

✣ ✣ ✣

LABOR AND NEIGHBOR:

An Appeal to First Principles.

A Posthumous Work
By ERNEST CROSBY.

✣

CHAPTER XI. Part 1.*

Remedies—4. Justice, Freedom and Co-operation.

The social problem of the future we consider to be how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labor.

—John Stuart Mill, "Autobiography," chapter vii.

To regret that socialists fail to avail themselves of natural laws is not to assert positively that these laws are all-sufficient by themselves to secure absolute justice to all. All that we know of them is that they have that tendency, that they have always been grossly hampered by artificial obstructions, and that if left to work out their natural results they would ensure a far greater degree of justice than we now enjoy. Friction always interferes with the mathematical precision of a machine, and there will always be friction in human affairs. To prophesy how much and how little there would be under free conditions, is an idle pastime, and the foretelling of a Golden Age belongs to the realm of poetry and not to that of practical economics. It has never been possible to predict future social systems, but it is always in order to put a stop to injustice. It may be necessary when all impediments to natural laws are removed still to do something more to prevent all exploitation of man by his fellow, but I contend that first we should make all the use possible of

*Mr. Crosby left with the manuscript of this book several notes and memoranda. The four which follow seem to be properly connected with this chapter.—Editors of The Public.

"Land value question the most important because all other reforms but increase land values."

"The introduction of machinery has greatly increased and centralized land values, and the equable distribution of land values will also equalize the effect of the introduction of machinery."

"Monopoly is the king of robbers for it strikes at the root of the tree."

"The foolish thief stealeth his victims' goods and is cursed by them; but the wise thief stealeth their opportunities, and behold, they rise up and bless him."

unobstructed natural laws before we try to determine how much artificial interference is required of us, or rather how little interference we can get on with. We should have only so much interference as is necessary to prevent injustice; but we cannot tell where to draw the line, unless we first abolish unnatural privileges. We must make a *tabula rasa* before we can build effectively upon it. We must clear away the rubbish before we grade the ground. Set your clock straight on the mantel before you call in the clock-maker, and it may go without him, or at any rate it may need much less repairing than you suppose. If you find a man escaping from brigands, hobbling painfully and fettered and gagged, which is the best way to treat his ailments—to construct a complicated wheeled-chair for him, which may never work at all, and then pull him about with his fetters on, or to knock off his fetters and release his limbs? Common sense says, "Knock off his fetters, and then if he turns out to be permanently lame, it will be time enough to get a chair for him." Let us consider the fetters which now shackle our industrial life, and briefly suggest the way to get rid of them.

And first among the fetters I would name the tariff, because of all of them it is the most obviously immoral and artificial. We have already discussed the folly of forcing our own citizens to pay more for their own products than foreigners pay,—of "holding up" visitors to our land and taking away their goods,—of punishing as a crime the act of adding to the wealth of the country. We have seen that the cost of transportation is sufficient protection of itself against the competition of civilized countries, and that the instability of the social conditions of uncivilized countries, by rendering capital insecure, would do away with the competition of "pauper labor" if the civilized world would only abandon an imperialistic policy. It is here again the infringement of a natural law which produces the injury which we endeavor to cure by another equally unnatural law; but two wrongs cannot make a right, and we are bound to suffer so long as we heap up evil upon evil in the hope of balancing one with the other. And it is not merely a matter of economics, but rather one of good manners and morals. I passed a week in Canada recently and was most of the time within hailing distance of the frontier, and I blushed for my country and was ashamed to speak on the subject of custom-houses. Along that line, much of which is imaginary, we have placed an almost insuperable obstacle to friendly intercourse. We spend millions to bridge rivers and pierce mountains, and then in sheer wantonness by a stroke of the pen we raise a barrier more effective than the Andes and Himalayas with the Atlantic Ocean thrown in. The Canadian merchant who dares to bring his goods into our territory is relieved of half of them, and we have thus done what we can to shut that narrow strip of Empire out into outer darkness. The average cost of bringing goods from Europe to Canada varies from five to fifteen per cent. but to carry them across the invisible line between Canada and the United States costs fifty or sixty per cent! It is worse than a slap in the face to our next-door neighbors, and I wonder that Canadians are willing to speak to us. Why is it that nations will not behave like gentlemen? Tariffs upon importations should everywhere be abolished. First their protective features should be obliterated (for a much stronger opposition can be marshalled against them), and then after the necessary period of public education, they should be rooted up and cast out forever. The only good that they have ever done has been to provide a revenue (which, as we shall see, can be much better provided otherwise), and to build a wall of defence around the preserves of monopolists. The ruins of our custom-houses will seem to our descendants as monstrous a relic of barbarism as the amphitheatres for gladiatorial shows and contests with wild-beasts appear to us.

But how is the revenue, supplied by a tariff on imports, to be made good? We find the answer to this question in the solution of the difficulties presented by another monopoly, and the greatest of them all—the monopoly of land values. We are accustomed to look upon property in land as if it were identical with property in manufactured articles, but there is in fact a wide difference between them. The principle upon which the right of property rests is that a man should possess that which he makes. I make a coat or an axe, and it belongs to me or to the person to whom I assign it. A company constructs an engine and the engine is theirs or their assignee's. With land, however, it is another matter, for no man made it. The right to land is in its essence a right to space, for the law conceives of a piece of land as a sort of cone-like enclosure, extending from the centre of the earth to the zenith, and embracing the heaven above, the earth beneath and the water under the earth. Now it cannot be held that the ownership of space and the ownership of a thing are of the same nature. The ownership of a thing does not involve the ownership of the space which it occupies, for a thing is movable and passes over the land of many people without affecting the ownership of it. Even a house may be moved, and it is a common thing for a house to be the property of one person, and the land upon which it stands (that is, the space which it occupies), of another. I think that in drawing this distinction it is better to speak of "site" or "space" rather than of "land," for the latter term is confused with the soil contained in the space, and this soil is merely an incidental matter. The ownership of the land involves access to the soil and minerals

contained in it and to the use of them, just as it involves access to the street or harbor upon which it fronts, but these are all mere accessories of the possession of the space. Now how can a property right in space be founded? There is really nothing but occupancy and force upon which to base it, and these are flimsy pleas to present to other claimants. If it is necessary in establishing new standards of justice to examine the titles of all possessors, mere occupants must yield priority to those who possess what they made or what was assigned to them by the maker or makers. There has always been a lurking suspicion in the minds of the great thinkers of the world, ancient and modern, that property in land differed from property in things, and the secret lies, I believe, in the idea of fixed space, which is involved in the one and not in the other.*

There is no sound foundation for property in space, and by recognizing property in that which ought not to be the object of property, we have brought upon us the evils always incurred by the violation of natural law.

The ownership of space is a natural monopoly, and the value of land, or site value, as I shall call it, is the measure of its monopoly value, increasing with the value of the monopoly. This increase is the "unearned increment," not produced by the owner, which John Stuart Mill first named, and which he suggested should be taken by taxation. We have here certainly a monopoly, and one that enters into almost all other monopolies. A monopoly is a right which is exempt from equal competition, and the right to occupy a given space is often thus exempt. The right of way of a railway along a natural highway, the right of way of a street-railway along a public street or road, the terminal facilities of a railway or pipe-line in a city, the frontage for wharfs on a harbor or for shops on a thoroughfare—all of these are in their nature restricted and not open to the general competition to which the manufacture of things is usually open, and their value is easily measured by the price which they bring in the market; and this price, irrespective of the value of improvements made by the owners, is the measure of the advantage which the owners possess over the rest of mankind—or, in other words, of the value of their monopoly. Site value proceeds from two sources, access to natural opportunities and access to the community. It is thus always a right of access. In the case of a piece of land in a city the access to the community is usually the only element of value, but in the case of a mine it is the access to a gift of nature that prevails. But to natural opportunities must be added also access to the community, for a mine in a wilderness without means of transportation would have no value. Site value does not spring in any way from the owner of the site, and this is the reason why he cannot claim any right to it above others. It is not true, however, that the basis of the claim of the community is the fact that the community has created the value, for the community in a sense creates all values, the demand of the community being a constant element in value. The value of a thing depends on supply and demand. Supply may be said to produce the article, and demand to produce its value. Thus the community may be said by its demand to create the value of a diamond or of a suit of clothes, but that does not give them a title to it. The case of the community depends upon the fact that it is unjust for an individual to monopolise that which he did not create, and upon which all men have an equal claim with him. There has been a good deal of confusion of thought in the arguments used by advocates of land reform, and it may be that only gradually will this branch of economics be properly analysed and systematized. It is clear, however, that the possession of space must be distinguished from the possession of the materials contained in that space, and that natural deposits of soil and minerals and natural advantages of situation must be distinguished from community advantages, and that the claim to values based upon the fact that the community created them, must be dropped.

In what way can this site monopoly, this privilege resulting in no way from private merit, be abolished? It has been suggested that the land should be nationalized and administered by the state as landlord, and this is in part the plan of socialism, but it would involve a great amount of labor and an intricate system of bookkeeping. We know what a large office-force is required to manage an ordinary large estate, and it is evident that for the state to manage its real estate in the same way would necessitate an army of office-holders and a very complicated administration. The method proposed by Henry George would accomplish the same purpose, and yet actually simplify our present governmental system of taxation. His plan is merely to tax land, that is, sites, to their full annual value, which is the exact measure of their monopoly-value. The value of the site must be separated from the value of the buildings and improvements upon it, but this is perfectly practicable and is already done wherever ground-rents are collected. Some of the finest buildings in New York are thus built upon leased sites. Where each owner of monopoly pays annually the full value of that monopoly, the result is that the monopoly is entirely neutralized, and the equal rights of the community in the space of the earth restored. We already levy a tax on land-values in America, and the only difference would be that the tax would now be greater. No new duty would be laid upon

*See my "Earth for All Calendar," G. P. Hampton, New York, publisher, 1900, containing quotations from upward of two hundred authors of all countries and ages on this subject.

the administration except to separate site values from improvements, and this is the practice already in New York and elsewhere, although both sites and improvements are still equally taxed.

Superficial thinkers sometimes assert that a tax on site values is not really paid by the owner of the site, but that he adds it to the rent and that it is eventually paid by the tenant. But this is not the case. The amount of the ground-rent is fixed by supply and demand, and is not affected by the taxation of the site value. Taxation tends to diminish the supply of all manufactured things, including houses, thus increasing the price to consumers and raising house-rents, but a site value tax cannot alter the supply of sites, and all economists are agreed that this is a tax which cannot be shifted.

The indirect advantages of such a "single tax" would be enormous. It would involve the abolition of all other taxes upon personal property and buildings. Such taxes, including the tariff, discourage manufacture and trade. Put a tax on an article, and its production is at once diminished. A tax on land, however, forces the owner to make the best use of it, so that he may pay his tax, and stimulates building and manufacture. The result would be low rents and low prices. At the same time all speculation in land would cease, for the unearned increment would cease to go to the purchaser, and the suburbs of cities and towns would be available for builders and residents at their actual and not at speculative values. Business of all kinds would flourish, and necessities and luxuries would be cheap, and there would be no speculative element in the change to bring on a crisis. This site tax would really make land free to all who can use it, and it would thus open a means of retreat to workmen suffering from hard conditions and enable them to demand their rights. Benjamin Franklin shows us how this safety-valve of free land worked in colonial America, although there too the best sites were already monopolized. "Notwithstanding this increase [of population]," he writes, "so vast is the territory of North America, that it will require many ages to settle it fully, and, till it is fully settled, labor will never be cheap here, where no man continues long a laborer for others, but gets a plantation of his own; no man continues long a journeyman to a trade, but goes among these new settlers and sets up for himself." ("Observations concerning the Increase of Mankind," 1751, Works of Benjamin Franklin, vol. ii, page 225.) So in South Africa the ability of the natives to support themselves upon the land, gives them the power to treat upon an equality with the mine-owners, who consequently wish to enslave them. There is still an ample supply of land in America which this site tax would throw open. It would not, indeed, take us back to a primitive life; but by keeping the door open to such a life, it would enable workmen to insist upon good terms of employment under modern conditions. It is impossible here to enumerate the many blessings which such a system would bring upon society, and the reader is referred to the eloquent pages of Mr. George's "Progress and Poverty," for a full consideration of them. As to the fiscal aspects of such a tax and its sufficiency for all national and municipal purposes, Mr. Thomas G. Shearman has clearly shown the facts in his "Natural Taxation" (G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1895). It seems, indeed, as if another natural law had been discovered, and that nature provides a fund adapted to communal wants from the excess-productivity of valuable sites.

Let me give an example. A, B, C and D settle upon a piece of frontier land, dividing it between them, and build their four houses near each other. Each one works his farm alone, and they all work with the same ability and energy. They soon discover, however, that A's land is more fertile than B's, and B's than C's, and C's than D's. At the end of the year A has earned say $400. B $375, C $350, and D only $300. Now it becomes necessary for these four friends to provide for some public expense—a common road, or a school-room for their children. How shall they contribute? Would it not be far fairer to take $100 from A, $75 from B, $50 from C and let D pay nothing, thus bringing the earnings of these four equal workers to an equality, than it would be to make each pay an equal quarter of the $225 to be raised? In this little community the real and natural reward of labor is the $300 which D earned on the poorest land in cultivation, and the surplus above this sum which A, B and C obtained, and which D would have obtained upon their farms, was an unearned contribution from nature. The same result would have been occasioned by the superior access of A, B and C's farms to the market, and then their unearned increment would have been drawn in full from the community. Adam Smith in declaring that the produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense of labor, expressly makes an exception of this contribution of the site value to the product. In an ideal community A, B, and C would see the justice of paying their excess into the common treasury, but so long as we indulge in forcible taxation it is better to take *in invitum* that part of a man's income which is unearned and due to his site advantage, than to spoil him of his earnings. The surplus of income above D which nature or the community gave to the sites of A, B and C, is the value of their site monopoly and the true ground-rent of their land, and it is this which Mr. George proposes that the state shall take, while D would not be taxed at all. It is a measure of ideal justice.

This proposal has often been received in a way which almost suggests lack of good faith. It has been treated as a harsh measure to farmers, and as if it had a special bearing upon rural communities, when as a matter of fact it is aimed at unearned increments and its chief operation would be in cities where such increments are centered, many farmers being in the situation of D, or not far removed from it, and almost their only values consisting in personal property and improvements, which would go untaxed. It is the farming community of all others which would benefit by the Single Tax, most of its members finding their taxes reduced and many finding them altogether removed, as in the case of D in the above example.

It is sometimes asked, Why, if you are taxing unearned increments, not tax also the unearned increment of personal property? Stocks rise in value as well as sites. Then why not take this increase by taxation? This argument is specious. Shares of stock are not really property, but merely represent property, and this represented property is itself usually in large part site values, including the franchise values attached to site. Railway stock, for instance, represents land, rails and rolling-stock. If the value of the stock advances, it means either speculation, or an increase in the franchise value growing out of the right of way, which is real estate. The rails and rolling-stock do not appreciate in value, but depreciate. And this marks an important difference between site values and the value of personal property, including buildings. Personal property is always wearing out and tending to disintegrate. Even the most substantial houses rapidly fall to pieces unless they are constantly repaired, and gold coin in time wears thin, while most personal property lasts only a few months. Hence the unearned increment in personal property is a rare thing and trivial in amount. Wine for a certain time, works of art of a high class—these things may indeed have an unearned increment, but it is only until they spoil or fade away, and it is hardly worth while to seek them out and appraise them. A store of wheat may rise in value, but at most it is a matter of a few months, and it would cost us more perhaps to search for such values than we should gain by taxing them. Sites, on the other hand, never wear out and their values are of a permanent character. Besides this, another principle conflicts with this taxation of the unearned increment of personal property, and this is the principle that a man is the owner of what he has made or procured from the owner. The unearned increment which attaches itself to an article thus earned is a very different matter from the unearned increment which attaches itself to particular sites which no one made. In any event the taxation of personal property, whether or not it covers an unearned increment, tends to drive property out of the state and is hence undesirable. From every point of view, therefore, there is a distinction between the taxation of unearned increment in land and in things, and we do well to reject the latter and hold to the former.

BOOKS

AN EXPLANATION OF ANARCHY.

Anarchism. By Dr. Paul Eltzbacher, Gerichtsassessor and Privatdozent in Halle an der Saale. Translated by Steven Byington. Published at New York by Benj. R. Tucker, and at London by A. C. Fifield.

When so much that is false and ignorant and infamously malicious is being said of Anarchism, Dr. Eltzbacher's scientific exposition of the whole subject has especial value. It is all the more valuable because Dr. Eltzbacher is not an anarchist. He is a scholar who, seeking to know Anarchism scientifically, has produced a work which the translator, who is an anarchist, describes as "the most complete and accurate presentation of Anarchism that ever has been given or ever will be given in so short a space."

The author approaches his subject with the declaration of a simple scientific purpose, as calmly and with as evident indifference to conclusions as if he were a naturalist investigating the habits of a unique animal or the nature of a strange plant. He wishes, he says, to penetrate the essence of a movement that "dares to question what is undoubted and to deny what is venerable," and to reach a conclusion as to "whether it is not necessary to meet such a movement with force to protect the established order, or at least its quiet, progressive development, and, by ruthless measures, to guard against greater evils."

The two conditions which Dr. Eltzbacher formulates for a scientific investigation of Anarchism are, first, familiarity with jurisprudence, economics and philosophy. These are truly discouraging conditions for police experts who shoot boys at sight because they "look like anarchists," and hardly less so for newspaper men who foster crime by filling their papers with shrieking headlines, denouncing anarchism indiscriminately at the slightest excuse for this kind of sensationalism. But Dr. Eltzbacher appears to have complied with the conditions.

The first anarchistic author whose writings are presented is William Godwin, the English clergyman of the last century, who, while not calling himself an anarchist, preferred "the horrors of anarchy to the horrors of despotism." Proudhon, who comes next, based his concept of anarchism upon justice as the supreme law, and contract as the social tie. Then comes "Max Stirner" (Johann Kasper Schmidt), the philosopher, who (vol. x., p. 403), rejecting the idea of duty and right and truth as mere verbalisms, found the su-

preme law for each to be his own welfare, and the overthrow of government by force a necessity. To Bakunin, the Russian revolutionist, the supreme law was the natural law of evolution from a less perfect to a more perfect existence, and the sanctity of contracts the social tie. He expected a violent overthrow of government, but naturally through the current of events. Kropotkin derives the concept of justice from the evolutionary law of progress, and looks forward to the early substitution of contracts for enacted law as a result of violent revolution coming to pass automatically. Benjamin R. Tucker derives the law of equal liberty from the supreme law of self-interest, to be accomplished by abolishing government through refusal of obedience, but without violent resistance so long as freedom of speech and of the press continues. Tolstoy does not call his teaching anarchism, but is included by the author because he rejects law and government as institutions. His supreme law is love, from which he derives the law of non-resistance. All these representatives of anarchism, whose teachings the author conscientiously summarizes, oppose the legal institution of property, but differ in their views of what we commonly call "rights of property."

In his classifications Dr. Eltzbacher finds that the various species of anarchism have nothing in common but negation of government as a future condition; and in conclusion, while leaving the question of violent suppression to the legislators of each country in view of "the special conditions existing therein," he sensibly says: "One thing we must at any rate do with regard to Anarchism, examine its teachings as to their soundness or unsoundness, with courage, composure and impartiality."

It might be added that in pursuing the same method of criticism with reference to property, the fact should be noted that anarchistic opposition to property would be far less plausible if organized society were more careful to distinguish between property in the products of labor and property in the natural resources of labor. We governmentalists are very strenuous about the natural law of "mine and thine," but exceedingly careless of the fact that this law in its fullness is the law of "mine, thine and ours." So long as industrial property in what is naturally *ours* continues, just so long will the anarchist have a large measure of justice on his side in denouncing governmentalism as larcenous. Isn't he culpable, do you ask, in not distinguishing what is justly common property from what is justly private property? Possibly. But who can condemn him so long as governments neglect the same distinction?

✠ ✠ ✠

Art knows no classes, and the self-expression of a class, though that class be the very heart of the nation, cannot be immortal.—Vida D. Scudder.

BRITISH FINANCE.

The Financial Reform Almanack and Year Book, for 1908. Published by Financial Reform Association, 18 Hackins Hey, Liverpool.

An excellent handbook for reference to the fiscal operations of the British government. The editorial for this year contains an interesting and valuable explanation of the public income and expenditure of Great Britain from 1692 to 1870, and of the rise of the national debt. Its story of the transition from feudal burdens upon landlords to tax burdens upon producers is of exceptional interest.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—The New Theology. By John Bascom. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1892.

—The Belle Islers. A novel. By Richard Bronsley Newman. Published by Lothrop, Lee & Shepard Co., Boston. 1908.

—School Reports and School Efficiency. By David S. Snedden and William H. Allen. For the New York Committee on Physical Welfare of School Children. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. 1908. Price $1.50 net.

PAMPHLETS

Democratic Foundations.

Under this title Mr. J. Ulrich of Milwaukee makes a lucid analysis of popular government, inclusive of a brief exposition of the initiative and referendum.

✠ ✠

Land Values Taxation in Great Britain.

In its report for the nine months ending December 31, 1907, the United Committee for The Taxation of Land Values (20 Tothill St., Westminster, S. W., London) briefly outlines the recent work and its progress in British politics for the taxation of land values as a social reform.

✠ ✠

The Chinese Question.

Americans interested in the problem of Chinese immigration should not overlook the considerate pamphlet of Ng Poon Chew, editor of "Chung Sai Yat Po," the Chinese daily of San Francisco. He complains of ill treatment of the classes of Chinese who are allowed by law to come into this country.

✠ ✠

Three Kinds of Banking.

Don C. Seitz, of New York, proposes three kinds of banking—savings banks, discount banks, and checking or "clearing" banks. The savings bank is already differentiated and guarded. The discount bank should be strictly limited to a discount, or credit-brokerage business. Checking banks should be organized upon small capitals and should be sus-

tained by small fees for making clearings, their funds to be used for no other purpose than to cash checks and settle clearing house balances.

✣ ✣

Henry George and Christian Ideals.

An impressive little pamphlet is that of J. S. Paskins on Religion and Economics (Otto K. Dorn, 2517 Woodland Ave., Cleveland) in which, with a very agreeable literary touch, Mr. Paskins shows that "the philosophy taught by Henry George, commonly known as the Single Tax, is in the highest sense a Christian teaching."

✣ ✣

Municipal Ownership in Duluth.

Another practical contribution to the problem of municipal ownership is made by the Ninth Annual Report of the Water and Light Department of Duluth—the report for 1907. The net surplus earnings for that year, after deducting increased expenditures, are more than $15,000 in excess of the net surplus earnings of the year before; the reductions in rates for gas and water since the city began operation are $1,500,000 net; and while there is a bonded indebtedness of $3,121,000, the plants are worth far more than $3,331,229.23—the amount at which they are inventoried.

PERIODICALS

Admirers of Frank Parsons, who are astonished at his desire to see President Roosevelt succeed himself, will find the explanation in his paper on the subject in Government (Boston) for March.

✣

The bi-monthly Single Tax Review (New York) for March-April opens with a story by Louis H. Berens, and begins a series of economic fables by J. W. Bengough. The much-talked of speech of Ray-

DANIEL KIEFER TALKS FOR THE PUBLIC

WHEN I succeeded in raising a Sustaining Fund for THE PUBLIC, I found myself under a further responsibility. ¶ It is not enough to collect and disburse that Fund. The Fund must be made to serve the purpose of placing THE PUBLIC on a firm financial footing. ¶ This is something I cannot do alone—no more than I could have given the Sustaining Fund alone. But as I asked others to join me in that, and got them to do it, so I can ask them to join me in this, and—well, I shall ask and hope. ¶ What does THE PUBLIC need to make it self-supporting? Just two subscribers in addition to every one it has. ¶ Who will join me in getting those new subscribers? Don't write me about it, but get them. I am doing it. You do it too. ¶ Some of you can't; I know it. Others won't; no blame to them. But many could, and would if they knew how. Let these listen. ¶ There are many ways, but I shall mention only one or two, for I expect to talk again in this fashion, and again and again. ¶ To begin with, then, be sure to subscribe for yourself. If you are a subscriber already, renew as soon as your time expires. ¶ Next, if you can afford to, subscribe for one or two or three of your friends who ought to read the paper, and are willing to try it at your expense. Whether you can afford to subscribe for others or not at your expense, get as many persons to subscribe at their own expense as you can. Don't let up while the year lasts—remember! it's a campaign year. ¶ And don't feel that you must get a year's subscription or nothing. Ten cents apiece will scatter the paper far and wide for a month. Twenty-five cents will do it for three months. Whoever wants fifty cents' worth, can get the paper for six months, and a dollar covers a year. ¶ This will do for the present. I am busy getting rested now—down at Fairhope, that Single Tax experiment station, in which I believe, and which is proving a great success. When I get back home you'll hear from me again. Maybe sooner.

DANIEL KIEFER.

Fairhope, Ala., March 28, 1908.

mond Robins at the Single Tax banquet in New York last Fall, is reproduced in full and justifies the praise it has received.

✣ ✣ ✣

She: "Was that mind reader able to read your thoughts?"

He: "No; I did him by thinking in French, and you know my French is perfectly awful."—Illustrated Bits.

✣ ✣ ✣

The wife of a naval officer attached to the academy at Annapolis has in her employ an Irish servant, who recently gave evidence of nostalgia.

"You ought to be contented and not pine for your

The Public

is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second-class matter.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Yearly	$1.00
Half yearly	.50
Quarterly	.25
Single copies	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks	.10

Extra copies in quantity, $2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, $3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders or Chicago or New York Drafts are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper.

The date on wrapper shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING

One page (240 lines), each insertion	$20.00
Half-page (120 lines), each insertion	10.00
Quarter-page (60 lines), each insertion	5.00
One inch (14 lines), each insertion	1.20
One line (agate), each insertion	.09

Two columns (240 lines) to the page. Length of column, 120 lines. Width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

old home, Bridget," said the lady of the house. "You are earning good wages, your work is light, every one is kind to you, and you have lots of friends here."

"Yis, mum," sadly replied Bridget; "but it's not the place where I be that makes me so homesick; it is the place where I don't be."—Lippincott's Magazine.