

ly not be sustained and orders a new trial. Had the views of the lower court prevailed, four of these men whose sentences were but for one year each would have served their full time before the higher court had found that on account of substantial error the conviction could not be sustained.

Even with the order of the Circuit Court allowing release on bail, there was danger of such injustice. Bail in the cases of these six men was fixed at \$10,000 for those sentenced to one year and \$60,000 for one sentenced to six years. But for the fact that friends were found able to furnish this heavy security, they would have been left to serve as convicts with the question of their guilt or innocence still in doubt. However innocent they may have been, however strong the grounds on which a new trial might be demanded, lack of money or of friends with money would nevertheless have surely forced them to undergo the penalty of guilt. However one may view this case the fact cannot be hidden that a poor man subjected to prosecution in our courts is in greater danger of suffering injustice than a wealthier one.

S. D.

Taxation and Suffrage.

Dr. Anna Shaw urges women to refuse to make income tax returns on the ground of "no taxation without representation." This has been compared with Mrs. Pankhurst's militant policy, but the comparison is unfair. Mrs. Pankhurst's militant acts have injured not only the participants, but others—even some friends of the suffrage movement. Dr. Shaw's proposed action can injure only those who willingly follow her advice, and these, one may safely assume, will act with full knowledge of possible consequences. But if "no taxation without representation" is a valid reason for opposing a tax, it applies to many legal voters as well as to disfranchised women. Present methods of choosing representatives, and lack of control over them after election, make so many votes ineffective as to deprive large bodies of voters of representation. Election of single representatives from districts deprives of representation all whose views on public questions are not held by the successful candidate. In a district electing a Democrat all Republicans, Progressives, Socialists and members of other parties or groups fail to secure representation—to say nothing of Democrats of a different brand than the party candidate. The same is true in a district electing a Republican, Progressive or Socialist. Until proportional representation will be secured ensuring to each party

or group representation in proportion to its numbers there will be almost as much taxation without representation after equal suffrage has been secured as before. All women and men are not only entitled to a vote but to an opportunity to vote effectively.

The phrase "no taxation without representation" owes its popularity to its supposed connection with the resistance of American colonists to the Stamp Act. One must hold a poor opinion of the revolutionary fathers to imagine that they would have tamely submitted to an unjust tax if they had had representation in the Parliament that imposed it. If Benjamin Franklin, who addressed Parliament in opposition to the measure, had been allowed a vote and had cast it against the tax as he certainly would have done—what difference would it have made? The tax would have been robbery just the same. The colonists would certainly not have been deluded into submission. It is not believable that they would have solemnly proclaimed, "We will submit to robbery provided it be done by act of a parliament in which a few members will represent us."

In view of the fact that there are better methods available for gaining representation, Dr. Shaw's advice ought to be rejected on grounds of expediency. Whether it may be ethically justified depends entirely on the government's moral right to levy the tax. If the principle is correct that every one should pay in proportion to his or her ability for services rendered by government, then the income tax is honestly due, vote or no vote, and resistance, for any reason, would be wrong. If the principle quoted is incorrect, if a person's right to all that he honestly earns is such that it is robbery even for the government to forcibly take any, then the tax is wrong even when imposed by vote of one's own representatives. In that event every tax levied on labor and its products is robbery. In that case no other moral objection can be urged against Dr. Shaw's advice than the one that it may be wrong to endanger a just cause through arousal of prejudice against it. Such prejudice may result from unwise insistence on a moral right. Her advice may be "magnificent but it is not war."

S. D.

Unearned Increment.

That the land question lies close to the heart of British politics is evident from the continued comment of the English press on the recent sale

of nineteen acres of land in the heart of London. It was the magnitude of the transaction that first attracted attention; but later the enormous increase in the value of the land while in the possession of the Bedfords has called for comment, and it is this phase that is likely to make the more lasting impression. The price announced at the time of the deal was \$50,000,000; but subsequently it was given as \$13,750,000. Even the amended sum is sufficient, when taken in connection with the sentimental interest attaching to the historic buildings, to serve as an object lesson.



The land in question was given to the first Earl of Bedford by Edward VI in 1552, when Covent Garden, one of its valuable features, brought in a yearly rental of \$30.84; now the Market brings in \$121,750. That this piece of land, nineteen acres in extent, presented by a king to a courtier who had ingratiated himself, should have supported that courtier's descendents for 361 years, not only without wearing out—as a tool, building, or other labor product would have done—but instead, should have increased in value nearly four thousand fold, makes the reader pause. Few of the buildings that were on the land in the time of Edward VI are there today; and had any lingered that long they would now be of no small value. Nor was it the practice of the first Duke, nor the last, nor any of the intervening Dukes during the three and a half centuries, to do much on the way of improvements. The same obliging Englishmen who raised the value of that nineteen acres of land from a few hundreds of dollars to as many millions, also put up the buildings. They constructed the buildings at their own expense, paid a snug rental for the use of the land, bore the expense of government, and at the end of a term of years presented the building to the Duke.



But the Dukes of Bedford have been good landlords, as landlords go. They furnished as good land as is to be found, being full measure superficially, and extending full depth to the center of the earth. Nor did they permit any encroachment from above. Though this pyramid of land was balanced on its apex, it was so carefully and so completely surrounded by similar pyramids that it has never, so far as the records go, shown the slightest inclination to topple over. It is, indeed, generally conceded that the Dukes of Bedford have furnished good, honest earth to support the buildings made by their fellow Englishmen. That the buildings have not increased in

value along with the Duke's land is doubtless due to the fact that other Englishmen also put up buildings. In this the Dukes had the advantage; for no one made any more land. As people continued to pour into London, labor and capital brought in materials and put up buildings for their use. There was plenty of labor, plenty of capital, and plenty of materials, so there were always plenty of buildings; but the land grew scarcer and scarcer as the people became thicker and thicker, until today nineteen acres of land in the heart of London sells for thirteen and three-quarters million dollars.



What superlative regard Edward VI must have had for the first Earl! And what remarkable forethought he exercised in showing his favor. Had he given houses and goods to his favorite, they would long since have fallen into decay. Had he made his political job hereditary the English Revolution would have interrupted it, or subsequent administrations might have thrown him out. But by giving to him and his heirs forever a piece of the earth, upon which all must live who exist at all, the king conferred a boon upon his favorite that must continue to grow in value as long as society grows. Truly a magnificent prince!



But after all, does the action of King Edward VI. differ from that of our own democracy? Many tracts of land might be named in this country that came into the possession of the ancestors of the present owners for less service than was rendered by the first Earl of Bedford, and that show greater increase in less time. Land used as cabbage gardens in New York City a hundred years ago is now worth far more than the English estate that is attracting so much attention, and the owners have done about as much as the English Duke to create that value. The people of England are coming slowly but surely to the conclusion that the value of the great London estate—indeed, the value of all landed estates—is the creation of the public as a whole, and should be taken by means of annual tax to defray the cost of government. Does not the same logic apply to the lands of this country? Does it make any difference whether the grantor be a king or a Congress? Does it matter whether the grantee be a lord or a commoner? The law of rent is no more a respecter of persons than is the law of gravity. Should England push her land tax to its logical conclusion she will gain an advantage in the mar-

kets of the world greater, far greater, than when she adopted free trade. To take taxes off of trade was well; to abolish taxes on production is better. Neither England's trade, nor the trade of any other country, will ever be really free until all taxes are removed from both production and exchange, and laid upon land values.

S. C.



TUBERCULOSIS A PRODUCT OF MONOPOLY.

In an eloquent letter published in the New York Evening Post of December 26, Dr. John B. Huber rightly attributes the cause of tuberculosis to bad economic conditions. "It is neither a hereditary nor a family disease," he declares, "but a house disease, contracted chiefly in unhealthful tenements and workshops. . . It is a disease of the poor, of the submerged; a disease developed in sunlessness, cold, starvation, misery; in the overworked, exhausted, anxious body; in the body devitalized by previous diseases, of which alcoholism is preëminent." And he urges "the rest of civilization" to assist the doctors in making the cure possible.

What are the obstacles in the way, he asks, and points to the tariff which has made a few millionaires while reducing the masses to a poverty which cannot hope for pure food as a bulwark against disease, the overworking of women and children in factories and sweat shops, the employment of men in dangerous trades under intolerable conditions which give to some industries a consumptive death-rate above 80%. He condemns also the faith healers and purveyors of patent medicine, and sees a "ghastly inhumanity" in gauging human labor by a law of supply and demand. He does not perceive that the law of supply and demand is as much a dispensation of Providence as the circulation of the blood and that the evil resides not in the natural law, but in the ignorance of those who attempt to thwart it. He fails to see that land monopoly acts on the body politic as a clot of blood in the arterial system; and so, while condemning private charity and philanthropy and admitting that the model tenement is beyond the reach of the very poor, he can foresee a solution of the problem only through the public charity of government action in reconstructing the slums and providing sanatoria.

It is encouraging to find a doctor who appreciates the significance of tariff monopoly, and we may believe that it will not be long before he sees monopoly in its most sinister form in laws which support the claim of landlords to private owner-

ship of natural opportunities and transform the right to work into a privilege graciously accorded by some men to their fellows.

F. W. GARRISON.



HIGH PRICES AND THE LAND.

An editorial in The New York Evening Post suggested that the present high prices of farm products make this an unusually favorable time for a movement to encourage immigrants to take up farming in this country. Mr. Raymond V. Ingersoll replied to the effect that the trouble was that farm land prices have gone up faster than farm product prices; that this "effectively checked what would otherwise be a normal redistribution of population." This brought from The Post an editorial in which it took issue with Mr. Ingersoll, but not violently. "Except for the question of degree," said The Post, "Mr. Ingersoll's point is perfectly well taken. A great rise in the value of farm lands . . . has been amply verified by statistics."

How much of the increase in the farmer's profits has been absorbed by the increase in land values appears to The Post "an extremely interesting question upon which we would not venture a judgment, but that a large part is left over by way of encouragement to the user of the soil, we feel very sure."

The editorial goes on to point out the increasing attractiveness of city life as a reason for the drift from the country. Next comes a paragraph from which the following extract is taken:

"There is a vast amount of land that can be bought or rented at low prices in such States as New York or Pennsylvania or Massachusetts which could be used for truck farming, raising chickens, and so forth, and evidently of the great advance in the price of eggs, poultry and garden truck only a small portion can be taken up by the cost of the land. Further the census figures which show that average values per acre for farm lands in such States as Illinois and Iowa rose between 1900 and 1910 more than one hundred per cent also show that in New York the rise was only 32 per cent, in Massachusetts only 33 per cent, and in Pennsylvania 14 per cent."

But The Post admits that a rise in land values has been caused by a rise in farm-product prices; points out that Henry George never imagined that his system would destroy economic rent; admits that his system would have some influence in lowering agricultural rents by forcing lands now unused into use; thinks that the effect would not be