

have been faulty and are definitely abandoning the so-called 'one crop' system." That is the finest thing that has come out of Louisiana since the Civil War. That is the way men talk. That is the kind of Americans we like to have Europeans think of when they turn their attention this way. But how long would it have taken those Louisianans to find their manhood, with their hands full of public largesses? This will explain the Doctor-Jekyll-Mr.-Hyde citizen who at one moment boasted that Louisiana had the richest soil and finest climate in the world, and at the next pleaded with Congress for sufficient bounties to enable him to live. It was this pernicious, un-American commercial charity system that did the mischief. Louisiana is a fine state, and her citizens, with the exception of those who have fed on public bounties until their muscles have grown soft and flabby, are good Americans. Now that they have been thrown upon their own resources we shall soon see them all walking upright, and looking the world in the face like men. Never did Congress do a better turn for any state than it did for Louisiana when it put sugar on the free list.

s. c.



Confusing Cost and Price.

The Chicago Evening Post, in a labored editorial intended to show the iniquitous nature of the new tariff law, because the first few months showed an increase in imports and a falling off of exports, says:

If wages and working conditions in Europe were uniform with those in America, no regret might be necessary over this deflection of a part of our home trade. It might act simply as a stimulous to greater enterprise and efficiency of American industries and contribute to lower prices for the consumer. But since the competition of Europe is based on cheaper labor, the tendency is to force a reduction of wages in this country.

Where did the Post learn that labor is cheaper in Europe than it is in America in any goods that come into competition with our manufacturers? Is it not thinking of wages, instead of the cost of labor. The price of labor there is lower than here, but investigation has almost invariably shown that the cost of labor is greater there than here. That high wages mean cheap labor is shown from the fact that it is from the highest waged countries in Europe that we have most competition. If low wages meant cheap labor we should need tariffs against China and India, rather than against England and Germany. Is not the Post encroaching a little on the time limit for the use of the "cheap-labor" argument? It is no longer

considered good form in the more enlightened circles to argue that the earth is flat. s. c.



More Topsy-Turviness.

When Henry George suggested as an alternative to the plan of the good woman who spilt a pot of grease on her kitchen floor—in order that she might give a poor woman fifty cents to clean it up—that she might have accomplished the same result by paying the poor woman fifty cents to make her husband a shirt, he did not qualify himself for an editorial position with the London Nation. That generally excellent journal is cautioning well-meaning citizens who are prompted to relieve the stress of the poor who are suffering on account of the war, lest they do more harm than good. "The first impulse of a man or woman," says the Nation, "who lives a comfortable and leisured life in a time of national emergency is to turn his or her hand to some job for which others are paid, without reflecting on the consequences." Thus they are cautioned against offering their services to the farmers to get in the crops, lest they deprive farm laborers of a job. Women of leisure who have set about making clothing are warned that to do this will be to take jobs from shop assistants who are out of employment. It is announced, however, that this latter nefarious scheme has been checked by protests, and that the Queen has invited the War Emergency Workers' Committee to appoint five representative women workers to serve as an advisory committee to suggest and organize suitable schemes for unemployed women.



It is to be hoped the Advisory Committee will be able to find jobs for everybody, without taking a job from anybody. But in order to do this the leisure class will have to exercise its utmost self-restraint, and refrain from doing anything useful itself. The problem seems really to be one of gymnastic charity, that is, of keeping the people at work without letting them produce anything, after the manner of the poor woman who earned her fifty cents by scrubbing up the purposely-spilled grease. The Committee is, indeed, face to face with the problem that Bolton Hall presented to the Conference of Charities and Correction at New York. "You get a man a job," he said, "— you do not make a job—you cannot make a job. Whose job do you get for him? And having got that man a job, you then have the displaced one—a little less efficient, or a little higher

waged, for whom you have to get somebody else's job."



A strange state of affairs it is. Men suffer for want of food and shelter. All the food and shelter there is or can be is produced from the earth by human labor. And it has come to pass in times of peace, and still more in time of war, that the men of leisure have more food and shelter than they can use, while the men of labor cannot get enough for comfort. If the men of leisure give to the men of labor they pauperize them. If they work for them they take jobs from others. And so they hire the women to wash out artificial grease spots, and employ the men to pound sand. It is hard sometimes to say when society looks the more grotesque, when it is engaged in-war, or when it is pursuing the paths of peace.

S. C.



Democracy and War Taxes.

It is sixteen years since a war tax was levied in the United States. That is long enough for even a party symbolized by the donkey, to make some progress. Yet the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee reports a bill levying the same unwise and unjust taxes that were levied to pay the expenses of the Spanish War. They even imagine that in reporting such a bill they have committed a shrewd stroke of political policy, inasmuch as by accepting the old Republican war measure, they feel that they have blocked Republican criticism. Perhaps it will block Republican criticism—provided Republicans are willing to admit that they have learned nothing since 1898. But it will not block the criticism of genuine democrats, and Democratic Congressmen must answer to these democrats when within a few weeks they come up for re-election.



What should be the position of the Democratic party on this question, or of any party that claims to be democratic? In a letter to President Wilson, Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll, known as a democrat as well as a watch manufacturer—put the case clearly as follows:

Cannot we (you, the Democracy and the American people) add to our laurels by departing from beaten paths in choosing our War Tax?

Why must the costs of war be ever laid at the humble doors of those least able to pay—piled on the backs of the consumers, who are also the workers?

The drones make wars—why not let them pay for them?

Taxes on industry are everywhere piled so high that it cries to Heaven for relief, while real privilege tightens its death grip.

And now, when emergency overtakes us, we look for some place to lay the tax, and can see only the same long suffering common people—and put it on them because they are the only ones who cannot make a noise and rebel!

More than one-half the wealth of this country is in the form of land values, created by all the people, but owned by a relatively few of them. Drawing on this common fund would not be taxation at all, and would affect only a parasitical class whose privileges have long been recognized as having no basis of justice, but as being the basis of all other privilege.

There is incongruity in a war tax in a peaceful country, and consistency may only be established by recognizing unearned increment, as the cause not only of active war, but also of the passive unending warfare on justice—and taxing it.

Such a tax will forestall war in this country; it will restore financial and commercial balance; it will inaugurate the first great measure of democracy; it will lead the whole world toward freedom; it will be the first direct attack upon the citadel of monopoly, around which are clustered every form of privilege now being treated ineffectively.

Such a move would entrench you and our Party in the hearts of the people, and insure our opportunity to further serve them for a decade.

All over the world this great fundamental reform is being recognized, in municipalities, states and countries; Lloyd George is preaching it; Carranza and Villa are agreed on it; Roosevelt has recommended it for Alaska; you have commended it in New Zealand.

Now we have the opportunity of advocating it before the whole world as the next great forward step.

We should not miss this opportunity.

The details are covered in the bill of Congressman Warren Worth Bailey of Pennsylvania.

S. D.



Lungpower Wisdom.

Certain cities of Ancient Greece are said to have chosen their officials by having the candidates pass over the stage of the amphitheater, and allowing the judges, who were in a closed room, to decide the popularity of each by the volume of the shouts of his partisans. The method, slightly modified to suit modern conditions, is still in vogue in the United States Senate. The filibuster against the River and Harbor bill once more calls attention to the fact that reason often plays an inconsequential part in the most dignified deliberative assembly in the world. Men have been chosen to that august body on the assumption that they had reached years of discretion, and that they knew at least enough to go in when it rains. Being charged each with his individual responsibility for the making of laws, it was supposed