

Tom Johnson has made a tremendous sacrifice for principle. He has spent his fortune, poured out the best years of his life, and fought—for what? For the people! If he had continued his former life—his struggle for personal gain—he could easily have been a multi-millionaire. A study of economics, an analysis of principle revealed to him a duty to himself and to the people—a duty he has abundantly fulfilled, though his reward is defeat. So great and good a man may yet accomplish much. People all over the country are ready to show more gratitude for his service in behalf of principle than the people of his own city—Cleveland, Ohio. He has hosts of friends, millions of admirers. Should his work stop now (and we do not believe it will) his name and fame as a champion of equal rights and foe of privilege will live on and on and be revered long after those plutocrats who jingle the money Privilege provides for them, and who mock and sneer at Tom Johnson's defeat, will be dead, gone and forgotten.

+

Milwaukee Daily News (Ind. Dem.), August 5.—Once more the crushing defeat and utter annihilation of Tom Johnson is announced. We would hardly know there is a Cleveland, Ohio, on the map if we did not get regular reports of Tom Johnson swept off the political map. Again and again his political funeral has been anticipated. Milwaukee's all-day trolley organ is especially pleased. It actually gloats over a temporary set-back by a slight majority in a referendum vote over the entire city of Cleveland. The organ loses its sense of decency and goes so far as to speak of the "fat carcass" of Tom Johnson. The trolley organ shows in its attitude toward Tom Johnson that when it comes to raking the muck and slinging dirty epithets, it is easily the equal of those whom it so readily denounces for defending public interests.

+ +

#### Attitudes Toward Labor Strikes.

The Chicago Daily Socialist (Soc.), Aug. 4.—The employes of the Chicago street cars are asking for a little more of the wealth they produce. They have made many millionaires in this city. They are receiving a wage insufficient to permit a decent life for themselves and their families. . . . Now these men are asking for a larger share of the wealth they create. They are threatening, if this is refused them, to refrain from all work and forego all wages for a time in the hope that the resulting decrease in profits will induce the owners to increase wages. . . . The Daily Socialist is not going to tell these men to strike or to refrain from striking. The Tribune and other organs of the employers are doing that. We are not giving advice on this point, because it is a question which no one can decide for the men and women who are to be affected. It is the wives and families of the men involved who will suffer during the strike, and who are suffering now from insufficient wages, and who will reap the advantages or disadvantages of defeat or victory. For any one else to attempt to decide such a question for them would be impudence. But if they decide to go out on strike they will never need to inquire where the Daily Socialist will stand during the fight. It will be with those who do the work, with those who

are asking for a small portion of what is due them—with the strikers.

+ +

#### Bismarck's American Disciple.

Indianapolis Daily News (ind.), July 17.—We are reminded of Bismarck's famous declaration that "whoever wishes to make the electors discontented with the government will seek to maintain direct taxation. Whoever wishes to see the population contented will favor indirect taxes." Of course, the meaning is clear. It is that a government supported by indirect taxes could do whatever it wished to do, with the assurance that it would be subjected to no criticism from the electors. No matter how extravagant it might be, no matter in how many wicked wars it might involve the country, no matter how imperial its methods, the people would be "contented." But if it should waste money, fight iniquitous wars, and convert itself into an imperialistic despotism, the people would be "discontented" if they were honestly asked to foot the bills. Thus it is that indirect taxes operate to stifle criticism, and to give rulers a free hand to work their will. The same crimes may be committed under either system. Under both precisely the same amount of money is paid by the people into the national treasury. The only difference is that in one case the people do not know they are paying the taxes, while in the other case they do. Men who can be thus deceived are, of course, very childish. But many are thus deceived. So it has come to pass that the indirect system of taxation has served well the purposes of imperialistic and extravagant statesmen. The addition of a few cents to the income tax is enough to raise a howl. But the lifting of a hundred or so duties by 100 per cent, duties the effect of which no one can understand, has little influence on the people. The tax does not come so directly home to them. They may know that they are paying it, but they do not realize it. So they are, as Bismarck said, "contented." . . . Bismarck was right. Aldrich is a worthy disciple of the great German who could get money out of the people without their knowing that their pockets had been rifled.

+ +

#### Progress of the Single Tax.

(Chicago) Real Estate News, June.—Socialism, a name in America, has become to English taxpayers the grimmest of realities. Last summer the needs of the navy were belittled while the enormous burden of old-age pensions was assumed, and now a panic terror is demanding redoubled efforts to maintain the two-power standard on the seas. The result is a deficit of \$80,000,000, with more to come, and a budget that strikes terror to the heart of all vested interests. A significant feature of the ministerial program is the taxation of ground rents, untenanted estates, and leased properties. David Lloyd-George frankly admits the intention of the government to appropriate a large portion of the "unearned increment." The budget is socialistic, and is a distinct victory for the single tax propaganda. The time may not be far distant in this country also when the single tax will have to be met squarely by real estate men, and when it can no longer be ignored

as mere speculative theory. The hunger for revenues will outstrip all ordinary sources of supply.

+

The (Oklahoma) Oklahoman (ind. Dem.), July 25.—Mr. Lloyd-George's budget, for instance, contains proposals which are calculated to shock all but the most extreme of our theorists. In dealing with land, the Chancellor of the Exchequer takes a long step toward the goal which Henry George had in view when he wrote his classic book, "Progress and Poverty." The spirit of the bill is embodied in the clauses which relate to the "unearned increment."

+ +

#### The Great Issue in England.

The (St. Louis) Mirror (ind.), by William Marion Reedy, July 22.—Consequences of almost unimaginable benefit to mankind depend upon the fight the Liberal government of Great Britain is making for the burden-bearers of society against the confederacy of wealth and privilege and aristocracy. The Liberals have a majority in the Commons, but the majority seems to be precarious. All the tremendous influence of the nobility, the landed gentry, the vast business concerns of the Empire is brought to bear in every way against the budget. This opposition is headed by the brilliant Balfour in the Commons, and by Lord Rothschild, the head of the wealthiest family in the world. The power of money and of social prestige is reinforced by the animus of factional bigotry, the discordant tendencies of racial and religious feeling, the subtle bribery of the approval of the successful to break down the ministerial majority. The budget is opposed as being godless. It is an attack upon property. It is insidious treason to the Empire. It is anarchy. And all because the budget proposes to tax into the government's coffers at each transfer of land a small percentage of that increase in value from the time of the last preceding transfer that is due not to the application of any labor to the property by the owner. Every possible appeal on every conceivable side issue of interest to individuals and factions, is made against the budget. There are a million arguments against the budget, but the one feature that concentrates upon itself the antagonism of every parasite of society or finance is the entering wedge of Henry Georgeism. . . . There has been no such fight in the world for the rights of man since Lincoln made his fight. But the American press is mostly silent upon the subject. Why? Because, to print the news of the battle would arouse Americans to the knowledge that all the present fight on privilege in this country is but make-believe and must end in defeat until the issue is changed into a direct attack upon monopoly in land. There's been no such struggle in England since Chartism. The people then won free corn—they thought. Only now are they learning that there can be free nothing until there is free land. But their representatives are subject to every allurement, every seduction that the classes bottomed on engrossed and forestalled land can bring to bear, also to every threat of personal disadvantage and defeat. "The week," says T. P. O'Connor, in Sunday's Chicago Tribune, "ends in darkness, uncertainty and peril. If Lloyd-George were not the most courageous

man in political life to-day, the situation would be hopeless, but his adroitness and courage and tenacity may carry the day." Nothing of this great drama which makes our own tariff rebate mere paltering, in our press. Why? Because the budget shows how to tax the wealth that belongs to all, because created by all, and is held by the few. Because the budget shows that tariffs are but a passing of the burden from the privileged to those whom privilege robs. Because the budget shows how to get at the unearned wealth of a country and therefore how to check the expenditure of government. Make government get its money from the wealth that is made by all the people and get it in such a way that wealth can't make the poor pay the tax in the long run and we shall have no great armies and navies on the backs of the poor. Nay, more; we shall have no poor, because there are the poor always with us for no other reason than that they have to pay for the right to live and then pay the cost of the government that gives the landlord the right to charge for the right to live.

+ +

#### Artificial Soap and Natural Dirt.

(London and Glasgow) Land Values (land values taxation), August.—Speaking at a meeting of the Anti-Socialist Union at the Whitehall Rooms on 29th June, Mr. Long said: "Many forms of property depended on the community. There were men who had made great fortunes from the manufacture of soap. (Laughter). In some degree their success had been due to cheaper and better methods of manufacture, in some degree to advertising, for the people could now read—owing to state expenditure—and one lesson above all others that had been taught in the schools was that cleanliness was next to godliness. Did not the community come into that? (Hear, hear, and laughter). It was not due to the individual that the public was more anxious to wash now than 50 years ago." We would point out that as the demand for soap increases, whether due to state education or not, so also does the supply, and moreover there is keen competition to supply soap. It is different with land. Soap can be manufactured; land cannot.

+ +

#### Landlord Insolence.

The (London) Nation (ind.-Lib.), July 17.—We have never in the history of politics met anything quite like the ill-bred insolence with which the landlords and their friends are conducting their alleged argument on the budget. The insolence is of all sorts and varieties. There is the insolence of the mendicant who whines for a boon, and curses the hand that gives it. There is the schoolboy insolence of Lord Winterton to Mr. Thorne, a Labor member of singularly honest and upright character, who was falsely accused of being drunk in the House, and half re-accused under pretense of an apology, until a real withdrawal and apology were wrung from the offender. There are the ponderous insolence of Lord Balfour of Burleigh and the flippant insolence of Lord Hugh Cecil, who abused the privileges of a deputation in order to bait the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his own room, and were properly trounced for their pains. Mr Lloyd George is the