

exorbitant and unclean private profits, as having made more juvenile crime than all the ballot-box stuffers of a certain disreputable type that ever operated. That Judge Lindsey's comparison was right, the people of Denver doubtless know. But will they say so? The question for them at this moment is whether they will let Judge Lindsey go on with his good work in the juvenile court, or turn it over to the control of the head of the parasitical telephone system.

\* \*

#### Another "Authentic" Letter.

The New York Times, convicted of publishing as authentic one anti-Bryan pronouncement purporting to be from the pen of Grover Cleveland (p. 635), now puts out another—equally authentic probably. For the sake of Mr. Cleveland's memory, it is to be hoped that this petulant letter is at least no more authentic than the other one for which the Times vouched so vigorously a few weeks ago.

\* \*

#### Russia and American Extradition.

Secretary Root has very wisely and justly, and in accordance with the best traditional American policy, refused to extradite Jan Janoff Pouren to Russia to be tried for his life. Seeking the extradition of this man nominally for trial upon charges of crime, Russia evidently aims at getting possession of his person in order to punish him for political offenses. For the United States to extradite in such cases, is to close our doors of asylum. It was once one of our proudest boasts that our country was an asylum for the oppressed of all nations. Let us hope that we may never yield the right to our pride in this respect. But we shall have to yield it sooner or later if we maintain extradition relations with uncivilized governments like that of Russia.

\* \*

#### Mrs. Humphry Ward.

In a few lines in the St. Louis Mirror Marion Reedy says more about Mrs. Humphry Ward than can be found in all the reviews of her sayings and doings. "Mrs. Ward still writes a good story," says Mr. Reedy, "but her women are of an age that has gone by, let it be hoped forever."

\* \*

#### Public Service for Private Profit.

Irrigation of the arid wastes of the West under national supervision and at national expense is a good thing. But it is a bad thing to turn the

profit into private pockets in the form of increased land values. Yet this is what the national government is doing. One of the reports from the irrigated regions tells of an increase in land values from fifty cents to a dollar an acre. The increase will be much greater as time goes by and demand for these irrigated places augments.

+

Observe, gentle reader, that that increase of 50 cents an acre doesn't mean that 50 cents' worth of improvements per acre have been made by the owners of the irrigated land. If this were what it meant we could gladly say, Let them keep it for it is theirs. But it doesn't mean that. It means not that improvements have been added to the extent of 50 cents in value per acre, but that the owners can now charge 50 cents an acre more for permitting improvements to be made. In other words, the national government has taxed the whole people in order to double the value of sites for cultivating waste lands.

+

To reclaim those lands by irrigation, and yet be just, would be an easy matter. Nothing more would be necessary than to appraise the value of the lands without irrigation, and then to provide (that any increase in the value of sites not due to private fixtures or cultivation, should be a rental charge or a taxation charge upon the sites, and a common fund for public use.

\* \*

#### Mayor Johnson's Traction Fight.

It is not a defeat of Mayor Johnson that occurred at Cleveland last week (p. 729). If there has been any defeat it is a defeat of the compromise settlement. At the worst, this means a resumption of the traction war. And a resumption of the traction war would put Mayor Johnson's traction policies in no worse condition than they were in last winter, when he had the old monopoly company at his mercy. If Mayor Johnson has made any serious mistake in all this long fight, it was in yielding at that time to the pleas for a compromise. Bad faith was to have been expected from such a source, and bad faith is what he has got, and got in plenty. There could probably be no better sequel to last Thursday's referendum than the abandonment of all compromise, and a resumption of the previous state of affairs.

+

In all probability, however, another compromise will be made. The old interests are in a

position where they must begin to see that a further fight can only be disastrous to them. If the official count should show that defective voting has after all left a majority on the affirmative side of the security franchise, matters will go on as before—minus, perhaps, the intriguing that has characterized the conduct of the short-sighted financial interests thus far. If, however, the official count confirms the reported defeat of the compromise of last Spring, the old interests will either have to come into an agreement no less fair (which they will do unless they are both blind and faithless), or else submit to complete destruction in a renewal of the fight. As the matter now stands, the old traction combine can claim a legal right to ownership of all existing traction franchises, provided they commit a gross act of bad faith—repudiate the “gentleman’s agreement” that Mr. Goff made for them, by refusing to restore the condition anterior to the compromise. If they keep their faith, the Municipal company will surrender the lease of those traction franchises in accordance with the same “gentleman’s agreement.” If they break their faith, the Municipal will hold to its lease. Consequently, if the owning company immorally assumes to own all the traction rights, the Municipal company will retain possession as lessee for the benefit of the public.

+

In any event the investors who have supported Mayor Johnson financially are evidently safe. If the battle should go against their desires, their stock would share with the old stock; if it should go with their desires, not only would their investment be secure, as in the other event, but in addition their hopes as good citizens would be realized. The question now at stake is not the financial loss or gain of these investors. That does not seem to be involved. It is the question—as, indeed, it has been since Mayor Johnson’s first election—of private ownership for private profit, or municipal ownership for public service.

+ + +

## NATURAL INSTRUMENTS OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

### III. From Feudalism to Capitalism—Capitalism.

The extinction of feudalism (p. 653) was principally due, I suppose, to influences incident to the return of kingly power, chief among them being the enfranchisement of towns and cities. Charters from the sovereign authority, conferring more or less freedom upon towns and cities, gave

economic potency to manufacturers and merchants, and this was the beginning of capitalism.

Remembering that we should probably speak upon that subject to-day, Doctor, I have brought with me a couple of volumes of Green’s “History of the English People,” for I want to read you one or two observations on this phase of the transition from feudalism to capitalism. Here at page 150 of the first volume, in the middle of chapter i of book iii, Green writes what I shall read you now:

Whenever we get a glimpse of the inner history of an English town, we find the same peaceful revolution in progress, services disappearing through disuse or omission while privileges and immunities are being purchased in hard cash.

That was early in the Thirteenth century. In the second volume, writing of the latter half of the Fifteenth century, Green tells of the way in which the merchant and manufacturing classes of the enfranchised towns invested the surplus wealth which their release from feudal obligations, followed by a business boom such as we of this generation may easily understand, had brought them so abundantly. They began buying out landlords.

But this was not for the purpose, as a rule, of joining the landlord class. They did it for the purpose of securing industrial freedom and power for themselves as capitalists. These later and larger acquisitions of land by capitalists from landlords for business purposes, were not unlike the purchases of privileges and immunities under feudalism at the very beginning of its decline—those purchases, you recall, by which tenants commuted their feudal obligations of service to landlords with money payments or money obligations. In a somewhat analogous way, capitalistic business men freed their businesses from feudal burdens by buying out landlords at capitalized rates. When they had done so they included in their inventories of capital the land they bought.

You see they were not governed by sentiment. Perhaps they were not governed even by expectations of profits from the land. They wanted to use the land in their capitalistic business as manufacturers or merchants, and that was all. But “business is business,” don’t you know? and with reference to these lands there was no more paternalism, no more of the idyllic personal relationships of feudal landlord and tenant, after capitalists came into possession. As land began to be capitalized as an instrument of production, its economic power caught the capitalistic imagination, and its price went up in leaps and bounds,—just as it has done under present-day capitalism