

they are not State electors also. This is due to the Council, which has repeatedly rejected woman suffrage bills which had been passed by the assembly.

ERNEST BRAY.

+ + +

BRITISH POLITICS.

London, Aug. 10.—Three weeks in Great Britain is hardly long enough to qualify a stranger to write very intelligently of British politics in detail. But the broader outlines are so much like those of our own politics that one quickly apprehends their general bearing.

+

Between the Liberal party of Great Britain and the Democratic party of the United States there is a singular similarity. There are plutocratic Liberals, democratic Liberals, Liberals by tradition, and Liberal traffickers in politics, precisely as there are plutocratic Democrats, democratic Democrats, traditional Democrats, etc. And just as with us the trend of the Democratic party is toward democracy, notwithstanding all the back eddies, so in Great Britain the trend of the Liberal party is democratic despite every drawback.

There is another similarity. Most reformers of the democratic type in Great Britain affiliate with the Liberal party, as men of like mind in the United States affiliate with the Democratic party, not from any special love for the organization or hero worship of its leaders, but because they recognize in its general following the massing of the public sentiment which springs from a democratic impulse—that massing of sentiment upon which all democratic reforms must depend for political success.

Still another point of similarity is the tendency of certain types of impractical reformers to organize futile side parties, and in doing so to care less for their cause than for their organization, and to prefer Tory success to Liberal success when they can not win themselves. That is to say, these third parties which profess a democratic purpose and cannot win at the polls, nevertheless go to the polls with their own candidates in hopeless constituencies, instead of using their influence within the Liberal party, and in so far as they have any effect at all, promote the election of Tory over Liberal candidates by dividing the Liberal vote. In our country, these tactics result, when they result in anything, in victories for the Republican party, as in Great Britain they result, when they result in anything, in victories for the Tories. For just as the Democratic party with us is like the Liberal party here, so the Republican party with us is like the Tory party here. Transplant a Republican to Great Britain and he becomes a Tory as naturally as a duck's egg hatches a duck. Even tourists from the United States will be found to be instinctively in sympathy with the Tory party if they are Republicans at home.

+

One of the British side parties is a natural group—the Irish party. This represents a geographical section which is denied self-government, and it will doubtless hold together as long as full autonomy is withheld from Ireland.

An analogous claim is made for the Independent Labor party, which, under the leadership of Keir Hardy, has become a power in British politics. As the Irish party stands for the liberties of Ireland, so it is argued does the Independent Labor party stand for the liberties of workingmen, being to a social class what the Irish party is to a geographical section. Strong as this party is, however, it is a party of recent growth—of mushroom growth, as some are saying,—and it has yet to prove its title to permanency. Another election may strengthen it or annihilate it, and no one can foretell which. Whoever attempts a prophecy may be fairly regarded as expressing his desires rather than his judgment.

The Independent Labor party may be described not as a socialist but as a socialistic party. It turns a cold shoulder to the simon-pure socialist organization—called the Social Democratic Federation,—yet it adopts the fundamental ideas of that body: labor class politics, and hostility to industrial competition. Its principal leaders are socialists in greater or less degree, but it is overwhelmingly a trade union as distinguished from a socialist body. Among its influential though not principal leaders are trade union men who are what are known in the United States as "pure and simplers." There is also in the party an influential element of what we know as "single taxers." In Great Britain the single tax idea is better understood as "land values taxation"; and under this name it has permeated the Independent Labor party to such an extent that the party may be said to be completely committed to that reform.

+

The land values taxation movement distinctively, which was begun in Scotland a quarter of a century ago by Henry George, and now colors all British parties except the Tory, and has evoked from that party its best tribute—outspoken and vigorous opposition,—is fostered by non-partisan leagues of George's followers. These leagues are localized, but for greater effectiveness they have formed a United Committee, with headquarters in London. Although non-partisan, they have found after years of experience that their work tells best in radicalizing rather than antagonizing the Liberal party, and in antagonizing the Tory party, which cannot be radicalized. Following this policy, they have brought about a condition in which the Liberal party is officially committed to land values taxation, and will doubtless make it one of the issues upon which its "appeal to the country" will be made at the next general elections. Some legislation along these lines has already been proposed by the Commons, but rejected by the Lords. That which is to come is expected to be more radical. It would certainly have been so had Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman lived, for he was a thorough convert. Mr. Asquith is not a convert, but the political situation is such with reference to land values taxation that it seems hardly probable that the ministry will be so imprudent as to "go to the country" without making this policy a conspicuous issue.

The "tariff reform" issue may figure in the next elections, but whether vitally or not will probably depend upon the boldness and vigor with which the Liberals throw more important issues, such as land values taxation, into the political arena. "Tariff reform" is the British euphemism for tariff protection.

It was started by Joseph Chamberlain, and derives such popular strength as it has, not from its merits nor even from any popular belief in its merits, but from the failure of custom house free trade to secure industrial prosperity and fairness of economic distribution. The masses of Great Britain are disappointed with free trade, just as the masses of the United States are disappointed with protection. In both countries, therefore, there is a revolt; in the one against protection but not for free trade, and in the other against free trade but not for protection. There is simply a feeling in each country that something is wrong with industrial adjustments, but there is only a faint apprehension of what it may be.

In this blind revolt against free trade in Great Britain, the special interests that are seeking protection think they see a prospect for what they call "tariff reform," but what in fact is custom house protection such as we have in the United States. Whether these expectations of theirs are to be disappointed or not will depend, I think, upon the attitude of the Liberal party when it "goes to the country." Should the Liberal party take no advanced ground, or, taking advanced ground, should it do so timidly, I shall look for its overwhelming defeat on the tariff issue and the speedy adoption of a protective policy by a Tory House of Commons and the Tory House of Lords. But if it takes advanced ground strongly, if it makes the truth clear that the failure of free trade is not because it is wrong and protection right, but because it is right only in part, and if in making that truth clear it proposes to perfect free trade as Cobden would have done, then I shall look for a Liberal triumph at the elections.

Protection can win in Great Britain only as a blind protest against mere middle-class free trade. It cannot win against the free trade that would conserve the industrial rights not only of the middle class, but also of the labor class. For this true free trade Great Britain can cite the authority of Richard Cobden. Cobden stood not for any particular method of taxation merely as a method. He stood for equal industrial rights for all. When protection seemed to be the obstacle, he opposed protection and fought for custom house free trade. When that failed in part to realize his hopes—as it did and as he knew it did,—he stood for direct as opposed to indirect taxation; and in addition to this, for freedom in respect of land. The present movement for land values taxation is directly in line with the free trade policy of Richard Cobden; and unless I am misinformed, the Liberal ministry are preparing a program which will bring this question into the very center of the heated controversies of the next general elections.

✱

Thus far the Liberal government have been baffled at almost every turn by the House of Lords. In only one instance have they won a signal victory by forcing the Lords to back down. This is the instance of old age pensions, now established, and which may play an important part in forcing the adoption of land values taxation. If the obstructive tactics of the Lords continue, it is not improbable that the House will enact a radical program such as the people demand, and upon its rejection by the Lords resign and appeal to the country for re-election. In that event the principal issues are likely to be the abolition of

plural voting, the establishment of second elections, the extension of voting rights to women, and some advanced step in the direction of land values taxation.

Plural voting is an old evil. To illustrate it I may mention the instance of one London gentleman of my acquaintance who has five votes in his own right, four of which he is democratic enough to despise. He votes as a householder in the place where he lives; he may vote again if he wishes to because he rents offices somewhere else, and again because he rents a second suite of offices in another place, once more because he is a graduate of the University of London, and a fifth time for some other equally good reason. The propriety of abolishing these plural rights is obvious, but the Tories don't want them abolished and will oppose its being done. To do it might cut down their representation heavily, for the Tory party of Great Britain, like our own Republican party, thrives upon special privileges.

The policy of establishing second elections has recently risen to a place of importance in British politics. It is due to the fact that in consequence of third party voting, several members have been elected by a minority vote. In Liberal constituencies, for instance, Labor or Socialist candidates, with no hope of election themselves, have divided the Liberal vote and thereby elected a Tory. To meet this situation recourse is proposed to the Continental method of requiring a majority vote to elect, and providing that in cases of no majority at the regular election there shall be a second election in those constituencies to decide between the two highest at the first.

The question of votes for women I have considered in a previous letter (p. 535), and that of land values taxation in the earlier part of this one.

With these subjects definitely presented—abolition of plural voting, establishment of second elections, votes for women, and land values taxation,—together with some others of vital popular interest at this time, it is more than likely that Mr. Chamberlain's "tariff reform" will be submerged. The Tories would not even have the advantage of Labor candidates in Liberal constituencies to divide the Liberal vote and secure the return of Tory candidates. On the contrary, the Tory constituencies would probably be contested by Labor candidates supported by Liberals, and by Liberal candidates supported by workingmen. For if the Liberal party takes the steps indicated above, as some of its well-informed members believe it will, co-operation between the democratic Liberals, the land value taxationists, the Labor party, and all other rational radicals, is by no means improbable.

L. F. P.

✱ ✱ ✱

If thou didst ever see a hand cut off, or a foot, or a head, lying anywhere apart from the rest of the body, such does a man make himself, as far as he can, who is not content with what happens, and separates himself from others, or does anything un-social. Suppose that thou hast detached thyself from the natural unity—for thou wast made by nature a part, but now thou hast cut thyself off—yet here there is this beautiful provision, that it is in thy power again to unite thyself. God has allowed this to no other part, after it has been separated and cut asunder, to come together again. But consider the benevolence with which he has distinguished man,