# The Public

**A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making**

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR



Vol. XI | CHICAGO, FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1908. | No. 523

Published by LOUIS F. POST
Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

Single Copy, Five Cents | Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.



# EDITORIAL

## Removal.

The publication office of The Public has been removed to the Ellsworth Building, 357 Dearborn street.

✣ ✣

## Moorfield Storey on Free Speech.

One of the fundamental democrats of New England, a great lawyer and a publicist of national distinction, Mr. Moorfield Storey, joins Mr. William Dudley Foulke (vol. x, p. 1237) in condemning recent interferences with freedom of speech. Mr. Storey says:

> I cordially endorse every word in Mr. Foulke's letter published in your issue of March 28, 1908. The right of free speech in this country is fundamental, and such action as was taken by the Chicago police cannot be too strongly condemned. When those whose duty it is to enforce the law, themselves disregard it, the whole fabric of government is endangered.

✣ ✣

## Freedom of Speech.

The police of New York have failed utterly to connect the alleged bomb thrower at Union square (p. 6) with any group of "criminal anarchists." It is generally realized, furthermore, that the throwing of the bomb hadn't the slightest connection with the meeting of the unemployed, not even of coincidence in point of time. Possibly, then, some reasonable consideration may now be given to the suppression of free speech by the au-

thorities of New York who with a high hand prevented that meeting.

✣

It is true that there was no violation of the Constitution of the United States. This instrument protects free speech, not against restraints by local authorities, but against possible attempts of Congress to suppress it. But there may have been a violation of the Constitution of the State of New York, which provides that "no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech." The New York authorities, whether they acted arbitrarily or under some law or ordinance, acted in defiance of the supreme law of the State, if the purpose of their action was to restrain equal rights to freedom of speech.

✣

It is said that the people who contemplated attending the Union square meeting were not acting within their rights, because their meeting was in violation of laws forbidding riotous assemblages. But this was not a riotous assemblage. It had not been called for riotous purposes; and, as it was not permitted to assemble at all, it could not have been riotous. The unresisting behavior, under extreme provocation, of those who tried to assemble, is strong evidence of their peaceable purpose and law-abiding spirit. Clearly, the dispersal of the meeting was not under any law for the suppression of riots. But it is said that the attempt to assemble without a permit was riotous conduct. If that contention were conceded, liberty of speech in New York would depend upon the mere whim of the authorities, which would be a clear restraint upon the constitutional right. The refusal of the permit was itself a flagrant denial of that right if it was refused for the purpose of restraining liberty of speech.

✣

Was the permit refused from that motive? This is the marrow of the question in the case. And how shall that question be determined? As all such questions are, by the circumstances. Consider them. Union square is a common meeting place, and has been such for from twenty-five to fifty years; therefore the refusal of the permit had no such justification as a refusal of a permit for a meeting in Central Park would have had. Its justification must be found in some other motive than the reasonable exclusion of a mass meeting from an inappropriate public place. No other meeting had been arranged for at that place; therefore the motive for refusing the permit could not have been to protect one meeting from disturbance by another. The application for the permit was made under circumstances which gave the police ample notice to be on hand to preserve the peace; therefore, the motive for refusing it could not have been apprehension of disorder arising from lack of police protection. What object could there have been, then, in refusing the permit to these people? There could have been no other than discrimination against a particular social class with reference to the common right of free speech. That being the motive, the New York authorities restrained and abridged liberty of speech and thereby violated the highest law of their State.

✣

It is said that the Socialists are investigating the circumstances. Their efforts in this direction should be welcomed by every one, regardless of his attitude toward socialism, who believes in the American right of free speech. This is a traditional right to be conserved, and unless it is conserved in behalf of every class it will be lost to all classes.

✣ ✣

**Puck.**

The tendency of the humorous periodicals to play in the role of court fool for old King Plutocrat does not appear to be at all to the liking of Puck. At any rate, Mr. Keppler seems inspired by memories of the best days of his father, when Puck stood out courageously for the common good. For several issues the cartoons have been of a kind to delight the democratic Democrat and the democratic Republican; and the ringing full-page editorial in last week's issue makes it clear that Puck's pen and pencil and shears have not gone carelessly astray. They evidently have intelligence behind them and a purpose ahead.

✣

When Puck says that "the only humor that is worth while—the only humor that ever was worth while—is the humor that has a serious foundation," it declares a truth to which Mark Twain's career bears convincing testimony and for which Puck itself goes now upon the witness stand. "We have certain convictions," it says, "of what is right and wrong," and adds that "at no time in its career has Puck been more in earnest than the present, at no time has jocularity had a more serious basis."

✣ ✣

**The Election in Des Moines.**

Now that the first election under "the Des Moines plan" charter has taken place in Des

Moines (p. 8), readers who are interested in this promising experiment in municipal government will doubtless be glad to know something more of the result than appears in the bare statement we were able to make in our news columns last week. The councilman whom the dispatches named "John Macnicav," is really John Macvicar, former mayor of Des Moines and widely known as secretary of the League of American Municipalities. He is a trustworthy specialist in municipal subjects. Two groups were trying to control the election—the old "City Hall gang" and the silk stocking or "business man" crowd. The latter, which had much to do with originating the "Des Moines plan," especially its autocratic Galveston features, is said to have promised the public utility interests that Macvicar should not get into the council. A survey of the result indicates that the election was a defeat for both the "City Hall gang" and the "business man" crowd, and a victory for Macvicar and union labor, two of the councilmen being labor candidates. Although the Mayor is credited to the "City Hall gang" he is understood to be a good man personally. The public utility people tried to defeat him at the primary with a man of their own, who came in at the bottom of the poll. The Mayor was a "wide-open" candidate; and as the new city government announces a policy of strict enforcement of the law, it would appear that the item of mayor is not overwhelmingly important under "the Des Moines plan."

✣ ✣

**Why They Fear Bryan.**

At a recent meeting in New York City a number of conspicuous representatives of predatory wealth, three of whom bitterly denounce President Roosevelt, were discussing the approaching Presidential election and its probable result. While they could not find language severe enough in which to condemn Roosevelt, they were also opposed to Bryan. One of the gentlemen present, a Southern Democrat, asked these "captains of industry" and railroad magnates why they feared Bryan, reminding them that if he should be elected President there was a reasonable probability that the Senate and the House would nevertheless be safely Republican. One of the most aggressive of the predatorialists candidly replied: "We fear him for the Attorney General he would appoint."

✣ ✣

**Governor Johnson's Campaign.**

It is now quite evident that Governor Johnson is the choice of the Eastern syndicates for thwarting the democratic demand for Bryan as the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party. Bryan's nomination is the one thing these interests now fear. They would risk any man to sidetrack Bryan. But they do not regard Governor Johnson as a risk. James J. Hill's "o. k." is good enough for them.

✣

The one specific virtue urged in behalf of Governor Johnson is that he would surely win. The same assertion came four years ago from the same sources regarding Judge Parker. It is as baseless regarding Johnson as it proved to be regarding Parker. Governor Johnson has no popular strength outside of his own State. The prediction that he would carry Wisconsin is the veriest moonshine. If La Follette were the Republican candidate no Democrat could carry Wisconsin, and Bryan is the only Democrat who can carry that State against any Republican. As to Governor Johnson's own State, Minnesota, no Democrat can carry it for President. With all the support which Governor Johnson had from the corporations in his campaign for Governor, and even with a Republican candidate whose candidacy the corporations should ignore, as they did that of Governor Johnson's gubernatorial adversary, Governor Johnson could not secure the electoral vote of his State. He could not carry a single State that Bryan would lose; and he would lose States that Bryan can carry.

✣

There has never been any probability of Governor Johnson's nomination. There would be less than ever, were it possible, now that one of Mr. Hill's handy men has opened Governor Johnson's headquarters at Chicago under the evident and only thinly concealed patronage of Mr. Roger Sullivan, and that the Republican papers are singing Governor Johnson's praises in chorus, as they did Judge Parker's about this time four years ago. Democrats who put principle above pie have come to understand fairly well that any Democrat whom corporation magnates vouch for and Republican newspapers exploit, adds nothing to his Presidential availability by encouraging their overtures. Such a man must win his spurs as a Democrat of principle, free from Big Business entanglements, before he can hope to command the confidence of democratic Democrats.

✣ ✣

**Single Taxers and Democratic Politics.**

One of the minor manifestations of the Big Interests movement in Democratic politics that are masking under the Governor Johnson candidacy,

is of special concern to single taxers. It consists in a resolution purporting to come from the "Pennsylvania State Single Tax League," but without other authentication than the signature of Walter Evans Smith, a name which single taxers generally will not readily recognize. The resolution proposes Governor Johnson for President, because, as stated in the preamble, he "has declared that it may be that some of the principles of the single tax on land values could be adapted to work out a satisfactory system of taxation," and William H. Berry for Vice-President, because he "has frequently stated that the land question is a fundamental question and that the single tax is an equitable and practicable solution of the question." These gentlemen are therefore recommended "to the suffrage of a quarter-million (as estimated by the secretary of the American Single Tax League) single taxers of the United States." It is interesting to observe the avidity with which the Big Interest newspapers have seized upon this resolution for publication, and regrettable that others, notably the Springfield Republican, have been misled by it.

✣

If the resolution were an expression of single tax sentiment at all general, it would exhibit some indications that are significantly absent. It would, for instance, bear signatures more familiar to single taxers, coming as it does from Philadelphia where single taxers of national reputation abound. And whatever the signatures, if the resolution were intelligent as well as genuine, it would hardly relegate to second place a straightforward single tax man like Mr. Berry, while naming for first place a man who, if he may not indeed be called a pronounced opponent of the single tax, would certainly be the last to acknowledge that he accepts it. Another consideration is the fact that Mr. Berry is a Bryan leader in Pennsylvania—*the* Bryan leader there, it is perhaps safe to say—and a man whose high sense of honor would not under existing circumstances permit him to consent to this use of his name. Those single taxers of Pennsylvania who, under the signature of Walter Evans Smith, if there be any such in addition to Mr. Smith himself, may honestly enough suppose that Mr. James J. Hill's choice for the Democratic nomination for President may also be a good single tax choice, or they may have acted without knowledge and impulsively. They are entitled at any rate to all possible credit for good intentions. But we have more confidence in the judgment on this point of the single taxers of Minnesota, who know Governor Johnson and his affiliations, than in that of the best of our single tax men in places as far distant as Philadelphia. The single taxers of Minnesota, inclusive of some of the ablest and truest democratic Democrats of the whole country, are, without dissent so far as we have been able to learn, opposed to the Presidential candidacy of Governor Johnson.

✣

For the benefit of non-single-taxers, it should be explained in this connection that no organization does or can represent the single tax movement politically. If there are a quarter of a million single taxers in the United States, as there probably are, and more—at any rate we hope so,—they are not organized and cannot yet be organized for political action. Some are Democrats and some are Republicans; some are wealthy, and of these some are perhaps aristocratic; many are poor, and many are of the middle class. Some believe in promoting the single tax idea by local, and some by national agitation; some through the Democratic party, some through the Republican party, some through third parties, and some outside of all parties. All are doing work for the single tax in their own way and none without good effect. Some of those in the Democratic party believe that a popular leadership like Bryan's, though the single tax issue be not yet specifically raised, and measures not strictly in line with single tax dogmas must be sometimes tolerated, will best promote progress toward single tax issues, and most certainly secure the ultimate triumph of single tax measures. Others in the Democratic party cling tenaciously to academic principles, regardless of political exigencies and regardless of the side of a dominant issue in Presidential politics which this fidelity to doctrine may compel them to take. And then there are many believers in single tax ideas in a general way, who are nevertheless not thorough-going single taxers. Their tendencies are toward it, but its label is not upon them. Yet they are a highly important factor. For these reasons among others the strength of the single tax movement does not lie at this period of its development in political organization. No organization, no organ, no person, can speak for single taxers politically.

✣ ✣

**The Single Tax in Oregon.**

Under the initiative and referendum clause of the Constitution of Oregon (vol. x, pp. 827, 1229) a fiscal amendment of the Constitution is to be voted upon in that State at the election in June. It is in these terms:

All dwelling houses, barns, sheds, outhouses, and

**all other appurtenances thereto, all machinery and buildings used exclusively for manufacturing purposes, and the appurtenances thereto, all fences, farm machinery and appliances used as such, all fruit trees, vines, shrubs and all other improvements on farms, all live stock, all household furniture in use, and all tools owned by workmen and in use, shall be exempt from taxation.**

✣

This is not a single tax measure in any comprehensive sense, for the single tax would exempt all products of labor from taxation. But it goes so far in the direction of exempting labor products that it has drawn the fire of the monopolists of Oregon land, resident and non-resident, and a single tax campaign is consequently fully under way. Not only do its opponents call it "the single tax amendment," but they frequently characterize it with profane expletives. On the other hand, its advocates acknowledge freely that it is in line with the single tax, and support it with single tax arguments.

✣

The friends of the measure have done this in their official argument. By official argument we allude to the clause of the initiative and referendum provision of the Constitution, which allows both the advocates and the adversaries of a proposed amendment to deliver through official channels at nominal expense a copy of their argument, reasonably limited in length, to every registered voter. Under this clause all Oregon voters will receive from the Secretary of State a single tax argument of 2,500 words, in consequence of which an extended discussion of the subject is expected throughout the State. In addition, the merits of the question are being presented orally at meetings by volunteer speakers.

✣

As usual in such contests, the supply of money is very meager. The demand for speakers and literature far exceeds the financial ability of the committee to supply them. Money is needed to pay the expenses of speakers to stump the State, for literature by the thousands of pieces, for a house to house canvass, especially in Portland, and for headquarter necessities. It is predicted by the promoters of the amendment that with $3,000 they could probably carry it, and that with $10,000 it would be a certainty. Wherever speakers for the amendment go, it is reported that opposition melts away. As one of them writes, "The State could be set aflame for the amendment if we had a little kindling."

✣

Without any hesitation we commend this Oregon campaign, not only to single taxers everywhere but also to every one who believes in removing the burdens of taxation from industry and thrift. The men who are leading it are able, enthusiastic and honest. Some of them are brilliant speakers, and all are tireless workers. The amendment proposed is a vital one. It is in the interest of farmers, mechanics and business men. It would promote the progress of the State of Oregon, and make that commonwealth serve as an object lesson for other States. And whether it wins or loses, the campaign for it will educate a multitude of voters in the fundamental principles of sound economics and just taxation.

✣ ✣

**Steel Trust Property.**

The newspaper item quoted in a recent issue of The Public (vol. x, p. 1227) which put the net earnings of the steel trust at $757,014,768, confused net earnings with sales. The former are reported by the trust itself at $160,964,673.72. The figures would look quite as big, no doubt, to the 300 hungry men who fought for jobs at the Cleveland plant of the trust.

✣ ✣ ✣

## INSTITUTIONAL CAUSES OF CRIME.

I.

Isn't it true that crime springs from poverty? Not from poverty when and where all are poor, to be sure; nor in every instance from poverty of the individual offender; but from social poverty—that is, the social condition of abject and hopeless want, in the midst of plenty to the point even of luxury.

Each of us naturally tries to escape this social condition. Each may indeed be generous enough to desire that all shall escape. But if one cannot escape the slough of poverty without thrusting others in, who is there that won't sacrifice his neighbor? And he who makes that selfish sacrifice, he who thrusts others into poverty in order to escape it himself, isn't it he that is labeled "criminal"?—provided, of course, that he resorts to methods that are under social condemnation, and gets found out.

✣

Of predatory crime, at any rate, there seems little room for any other explanation than poverty in social conditions where plenty abounds. Were this social condition unknown and unfeared, what motive would there be for theft of any species? And how could there be predatory crime if there were no motive for theft?

Though it be true that predatory crime is often inspired by love of adventure rather than sordid greed for spoils, the spoils being only trophies—like a bear's skin to the strenuous hunter, or a province to the militant conqueror, or ransoms to the brigand chief—nevertheless poverty where plenty abounds, and the horror that the fear of it engenders, seem to lie beneath all things else in the region of furacious impulses. Isn't there a notable lessening of predatory crime, not only when war offers opportunity for reputable exploits, but also when general prosperity invites to useful adventure? And isn't there a notable increase of crime when hard times augment the difficulty of earning an honest living? These undeniable facts of common observation, of vastly more importance than a whole volume of petty facts which are difficult to prove and doubtful of interpretation, go far to indicate that poverty inspires the adventurous type of predatory crime as well as that which is only sordid.

Testimony to the same effect is abundant along the whole history of criminal adventure. The careers of those old highwaymen of the English heath who robbed the rich and gave to the poor, are highly significant of the influence of poverty in originating adventurous crime. The story of American trampdom is rich in evidence of like import, for it was not until poverty among us became general and for a growing proportion of our people inevitable, that the adventurous tramp got to be a type.

Similar testimony comes from Mexico. It was his appreciation of the true impulse to criminal adventure that enabled President Diaz to suppress Mexican brigandage. When he came to the Presidency, brigandage had long made travel in Mexico insecure and the possession of property dangerous. So inclusive and defiant was it that an army of troops could not have suppressed it. But President Diaz caused it to suppress itself. He is quoted as having made an address to a council of brigand leaders in which he said: "You fellow don't like to do anything but fight. But all you get out of it is a living, and sometimes it is a miserable living. If you will fight for me, I will see that you are given a better living than you get now, that you have good horses and that you live in the mountains as you please. All I ask of you is that you obey my orders as to when to fight." The criminal banditti were thereby turned into soldiers of the Republic. This incident, which is valuable in its suggestiveness whether it be fact or fiction, is borrowed from a writer who concludes that "crime is only misdirected energy." Let us add that the primary influence which misdirects this energy is poverty in contrast with plenty.

✣

But though it be admitted that poverty accounts for predatory crime, for that which is adventurous as well as that which is sordid, it may not be admitted that poverty accounts for other forms of crime. If you reflect, however, upon what you know, you will have to admit that crimes of passion, both homicidal and sexual, are often obviously attributable to the malign influences of poverty. When this cause is not obvious, a little investigation beneath the surface is almost certain to reveal it. Homicidal passions usually develop from some unfair reaching out for property, a reaching out that would be childish but for the specter of want in the midst of wealth. And who shall say that this is not also true of sexual crime? The coarse and brutal kinds of sexual criminality which we find in the slums, are so immediately associated with poverty that the relation of cause and effect is unmistakable. Isn't it almost as obvious, too, with the more subtle sexual crimes of the over-rich? Rich roués could not buy vicious indulgences if there were no poor men's daughters to be tempted out of environments of want into lives of luxury.

Let us be careful not to ignore the point that poverty of the crime-breeding sort is that which comes in contrast with abundance. Were all without wealth, envy and lust would lose themselves in the noble passions that common privations always stimulate. If all had wealth, we should look upon predatory criminals with the amiable contempt with which we regard greedy boors who hustle for the first drink of lemonade at a picnic where there is plenty for all. But inasmuch as a few have wealth in superabundance, which comes to them for the most part as tribute, and others are in a constant struggle to keep themselves and those they love out of the slough of poverty, society is infested with criminals.

✣

Are we told that crime is a product of heredity, or of environment, or of both? This does not affect the contention. These hereditary tendencies disappear when there are no great contrasts of want with wealth to stimulate them. The influences of environment are away from crime if they are not vitiated by the contrasts of wealth with poverty. Criminal tendencies are stimulated or checked as poverty is more or less imminent and repugnant, as the fear of poverty is more

or less intense, and as useful or innocent opportunities for escape from it are less or more inviting. Even in amusements, the youthful vitality which makes a daring yachtsman of the rich man's son, may, with no more evil intent, make a daring criminal of the poor man's son.

✣

An anecdote used to be current in New York—so dreadfully current that it would have been called a "chestnut" if this bit of slang had been in vogue—an anecdote about a business man's mortifying experience with phrenology. It illustrates the point and we venture a repetition of it.

Strolling up Broadway at the close of a busy day down town, the business man of this threadbare story dropped in at Fowler and Wells' to amuse himself with the new fad of which they were the leading demonstrators. He was a wealthy man, as wealthiness went in that humble commercial era, and he had a distinguished name; but as half-tone portraits had not been invented, his features were unfamiliar to the public and the phrenologist didn't recognize him. To that extent, therefore, the conditions were favorable to a phrenological test; but how true the resulting character chart may have been, only the subject himself could have known, even if he might be considered an impartial judge.

As the story goes the chart was in no wise deficient in candor. A present day psychologist could hardly be expected to discover in a star convict any finer assortment of criminal propensities than that phrenologist ascribed to his wealthy and distinguished and correspondingly respected subject. No species of predatory crime seemed from that reading of this virtuous business man's bumps to be alien to his propensities. He had the impulses of a sneak, the daring of a burglar, the skill and tact of a forger and the conscience of a mummy.

In its day this overworked anecdote was interpreted as a huge joke on phrenology. But isn't it possible, and this without passing any judgment whatever upon the merits of phrenology, that in fact the joke was on the business man? May it not have been that the phrenologist, uninfluenced by any knowledge of his client's reputation, had either read or guessed at the good man's propensities aright?

We say "good man" deliberately, for we are not implying that the mortified hero of that anecdote was a hypocrite. Neither are we hinting that his idea of honesty was of the piratical business type of our own day, the idea, namely, that if you live a conventionally respectable life, are true to your crowd, your ring, your class, or your associates, as you choose to designate them, and keep out of the penitentiary, you may do anything you please. We mean simply that while the criminal propensities charted by the phrenologist may have actually existed in that business man, circumstances had enabled him to cultivate them profitably to himself in ways that seemed useful to society instead of detrimental. May he not have been somewhat like those bandits of Mexico, who needed only opportunity for profitable and energetic usefulness, to turn from a career of venturesome law-breaking to one of social service?

✣

Perhaps this view might find further confirmation in a comparison of the propensities with the activities of detectives. May it not be that the old saw about setting a thief to catch a thief is a wise one with reference not alone to skill, but also to psychological adaptation. Isn't it a reasonable inference that the natural qualifications of a born detective are such as would have made him a criminal if the opportunity to chase criminals had not offered a more satisfactory career of adventure in eluding poverty? We offer this observation only suggestively, and in no sense assertively. Whether true or not, it makes little difference to the point under consideration, which is that poverty in conditions of plenty is the mother of crime—or may be the step-mother.

Nor are we trying to prove this with minute circumstantiality. We only submit it as an incontrovertible general fact of human experience and observation. In the anecdote about Chief Justice Marshall and Judge Story, Marshall is made habitually to say of the cases argued before them—"Story, the law of this case is so and so; you look up the authorities." Similarly we assert that crime springs from poverty in conditions of contrast with wealth, telling those who doubt it to look up the facts. In our judgment they will find few facts to discredit the assertion and none to controvert it.

## II.

But what then? What has that to do with institutional causes of crime? Is poverty an institution?

No; poverty itself, individual want, is not an institution. But poverty as a social phenomenon, poverty in the midst of plenty, the poverty that inevitably engulfs so many in spite of their industry and usefulness, this conception of poverty,

whether it be an institution or not, is certainly institutional.

The condition of poverty from which it is impossible for all to escape; the condition of poverty that would persist for some though all were industrious and thrifty; the poverty that falls to those who lose the race, run they never so fast; the poverty that falls to those who lose the game, play they never so well; the poverty for the many who work, when and where there is luxury for the few of leisure—this is the poverty that generates crime, and this poverty is distinctly a product of social institutions.

✠

One of the great speculative philosophers of our civilization, probably the greatest that America has produced—Henry James the elder,—summarized the whole matter in his lecture of sixty years ago on "Democracy and Its Issues," when he said: "If the institutions of society do not incessantly endeavor to lift *all* men up out of the slough of natural destitution, and equalize culture, refinement and comfort among them, they are not faithful to the divine intent and must fall into disuse. It is nothing but this legalized injustice among men, this organized and chronic inequality among them, which begets what are termed the 'dangerous classes' in the European communities. These communities tolerate a privileged class; that is to say, they will ensure a child born of one parentage, a good education, good manners, a graceful development in every respect, sumptuous lodging, sumptuous food, sumptuous clothing; and they will ensure another child born of an opposite parentage, the complete want of all these things; and yet they wonder at the existence of a dangerous class among them. Let them change these institutions, let them ensure all the children born among them a precisely equal social advantage and estimation, and they will soon see the dangerous classes disappear. They will soon destroy the sole existing motive to crime; for crime is always directed against mere arbitrary advantage. I admit that a man whose passions have been wounded by another, even without any blame on the part of that other, may be tempted, in the anguish of disappointment, to blaspheme his innocent rival, and even take his life on occasion. But this is not the criminality society chiefly suffers from. Men willingly bear with the injury springing out of a wounded self-love, knowing their own liability to need the same forgiveness. It is deliberate, systematic crime from which society suffers, crime that gives name to large classes and localities; and this criminality is the product exclusively of vicious legislation, of institutions which insist upon distributing the bounties of Providence unequally."

✠

It is easy to say that every man is responsible for his own poverty. Most of us who have eluded both poverty and the penitentiary are over-glib in attributing the poverty of others to their personal incompetency or vicious propensities. But this is confusing effect with cause. Trite is the saying that every one may make an honest living if he wants to. Most of us who say it doubtless believe it until we ourselves feel the pinch of poverty, and then we attribute our misfortune to hard luck or hard times. Very good, but let us remember that with armies of people there is hard luck or hard times all the time.

✠

That personal qualities are factors in enabling their possessors to escape the slough of poverty is doubtless true. But these qualities fail unless they are exceptional.

The man of common or ordinary qualities never becomes rich except by accident, and he is pretty lucky if he escapes being poor. Men of exceptional qualities, it is true, need not be poor, provided their qualities are adaptable to the money-making tendencies of the period—high finance it may be in one period and high-sea piracy in another.

When physical strength is the desideratum for success, men of exceptional physical strength succeed. But there are often conditions in which the strong man fails while the puny man triumphs. Why? Not from superior muscular ability, of course, but from superior ability of the kind that pays. The puny man's superiority fits the circumstances.

A bulldog is more powerful than a cat, but if superiority in the catching of mice were the measure of success, the cat would be rich and the bulldog poor—unless the dog had a way of sharing all the mice that cats catch.

Able lawyers with a nice sense of honor would fail while inferior lawyers without sense of honor would succeed, if perversion of the law instead of its just administration were the object of having a lawyer.

Not only ability but adaptability is necessary to escape poverty. But the real question is not whether individual abilities are factors in determining instances of individual poverty. It is whether poverty as a dreadful social condition in the midst of plenty is due to social institutions.

III.

We all agree, of course, that poverty is lack of wealth, just as we agree that darkness is lack of light. It is therefore a condition into which every one is born, for every one comes naked into the world.

But the same God—the same natural law, if you prefer this form—which brings us into the world poor even unto nakedness, endows each of us with the capability even in our own persons, and furnishes us with the opportunity in our natural and social environment, of abolishing our individual poverty. In primitive circumstances this is obvious. We have only to apply our capabilities to the earth, the fruits of which are abundant if we but foster them. This gives only a meager living, to be sure—primitive and monotonous, probably, rather than meager. But add to our natural environment our developed and developing social environment, and our powers to abolish poverty multiply. By uniting our abilities with those of our fellows, through co-operation—division of labor we call it,—we make the planet yield us an abundance for all, and in such variety as to enable us to live civilized instead of primitive lives.

Intelligent men who reflect know that under social conditions every man who lives by work contributes to production more than the share he gets from production. If this were not so there would be nothing for those who don't work; for it is only by work, somebody's work, that anybody can live. That everybody does not work we all know. The criminal doesn't work until he is caught and imprisoned. The privileged classes do not work for what they get from their privileges, though they are seldom caught. Then there is a class that does not work and is not privileged. We call this class the unemployed. It would be truer to call it the disemployed, for it is prevented from working—prevented by institutions which discourage honest work, and while punishing conventional crime encourage the economic spoliation that generates crime.

✣

Since the disemployed are dependent for a livelihood upon their work, and as a class are continuously denied opportunity to work, their condition exemplifies the poverty that generates crime.

Their class is continually changing in its personnel. If it were not it would die off. The disemployed individual to-day may have a job to-morrow or next week, and the employed individual of to-day may be out of work in a day or two. But the disemployed class simply as a human mass, is constant. In good times it contracts, in hard times it expands, but in all times it is visible to such of us as are willing to see—to all of us but those optimists of whom Kipling writes that "when their own front door is closed they'll swear the whole world's warm."

✣

This disemployed mass is the generating cause of crime. Men seek crime to get out of it; men commit crime to keep out of it; men become habituated to criminal living because criminal living and impoverished living for the many where there is luxurious living for others, are by action and reaction affiliated.

The constancy of the disemployed class is attributable to social institutions. It is a disemployed class because social institutions close the door of opportunity that nature leaves open.

IV.

Shall we enumerate the social institutions which close that door of opportunity?

It might not be practicable to name them all. But we can point to two fundamental ones—so fundamental that if every other were abolished these two would soon reproduce crime-fostering conditions. Indeed, one of them is so much more fundamental even than the other that if all the rest were abolished this alone would re-establish the poverty that generates crime.

The two institutions to which we allude—or rather the two classes of institutions—are those that obstruct industrial interchanges, commonly called trade, and those that interfere with a square deal in the use of the planet upon which we live.

✣

Any social institution which interferes with trade—and we do not mean protective tariffs alone, for they interfere only with international trade in commodities—any such institution checks co-operation in the production of wealth, and any check upon the production of wealth helps to make disemployed men.

We should see it easily enough were we to contemplate the effect of prohibiting all trade. If there were no trade at all there would be no demand for workers, and if there were no demand for workers no one would have work to do except as he might do it for himself crudely, as the savage does.

Precisely what this extreme of trade restriction would do, anything less than the extreme would do with a difference only in degree. Make trade restriction greater than it is, and the disemployed

class would increase; make trade freer, and the disemployed class would diminish.

This is not an allusion to the absurd notion that a class of employers is necessary to employment. It is an allusion to the fact that our industry is specialized, and that an arbitrary check upon any specialty is by action and reaction a check upon all. Workers are not employed by an employing class. Except as employers are also workers, they are parasites upon industry. Workers are employed by one another. They employ one another by means of trading the products of their respective specialties. To check this trade is to check mutual employment. But to check mutual employment is to increase the disemployed class; to lessen the check is to diminish the disemployed class.

As the disemployed class increases or diminishes, so do criminal statistics rise or fall. This is no guess. Nor is it alone an inference from general principles. It is demonstrated by experience. Crime increases with hard times and diminishes with good times. Didn't most of us see this in the '90s? Didn't some of us see it in the '70s? Don't we read about it in the late '30s and early '40s? in the period from 1809 down into the early '20s, and in the period from 1784 down to 1809? Don't we see it now?

✣

But restrictions upon trade constitute only one of the two great causes of disemployment with its consequent poverty and crime; and that is the least fundamental of the two. Even if trade of all kinds were absolutely free, the other social institution that makes disemployment would be as effective in that respect as both institutions together before.

Civilized life demands not only that men shall be untrammeled in exchanging their products, but also that they shall be untrammeled and equal in the right to the use of the planet. For it is from the planet, and upon the planet, and by means of the planet that men must live, whether they live without trade or with trade.

Just as the individual man is dependent upon the earth for a solitary or primitive livelihood, so co-operative man is dependent upon the earth for the highest co-operative life. Indeed, there are but two primary factors in any phase of our planetary existence—man and the planet. All else is secondary—division of labor, trade, government,—all these are secondary.

Think of what would happen if all institutional causes of disemployment were abolished except the institution of monopoly of the planet.

At first, prosperity would be tremendous. Everybody would be busy at making and trading, and enthusiastic over their work and in the enjoyment of its results. There would be no disemployed class and consequently no impoverished class; and if this condition lasted a generation or two, fear of poverty also might disappear and with it the criminal class.

But it wouldn't last a generation or two if the institution of planet monopoly remained. We should have a boom, a great land boom, but the boom would burst. Why? For the same reason that the land booms of towns and cities and even of nations burst when the pressure of planet-owning conditions snaps the tension of speculative prosperity.

✣

Prosperity makes demands for land. If it is local prosperity the demand is for town sites; if the prosperity is general, the demand is for all kinds of land, from farming sites to mineral deposits and city lots; and under all kinds of title, from simple deeds to options and stock certificates. Prices soar, not only the prices of products but the prices of land—of space on the planet. The rising price of products soon checks prices of products, but it doesn't check the price of land. On the contrary it raises it, for the greater production and the speculation which it stimulates make demands for more land. For foodstuffs or machinery or any other labor product to double in value is phenomenal even under the greatest pressure; but land doubles and quadruples again and again. Most labor products are cheaper now than when Manhattan Island sold for $26. But what of the value of American land? After a while the cost of production, including the pressure of the speculative prices of land, the source of all production, will in any period of speculative prosperity make production unprofitable, and then credit will crumble and the crash come. This is the underlying explanation of all industrial crashes.

Other explanations may be true as far as they go, but they don't go to the bottom. This alone explains every bursted boom from Chicago in the '40s to Seattle in the '90s; it explains the depression of 1784, which was followed by the booming times beginning with 1791; it explains the depression of 1809 which extended into the '20s, that of 1837 which extended into the '40s, that of 1857 which was checked by the Civil War of 1861, that of 1893 which continued until 1898, and that of 1907 which is now upon us.

What these phenomena have shown us in little we should see enormously magnified if all the in-

stitutional causes of poverty were abolished except the institution of land monopoly—the monopoly of the planet. The inflated values of the planet would fall in the general crash just as they did in Chicago in the '40s and in Seattle in the '90s; but they would recover and rise higher as prosperity revived and production increased, just as they have done in Chicago and Seattle. But what of the disemployed? The burdening of industry by the owners of the natural *sine qua non* of industry, the planet itself, would create a disemployed class if the old one had passed away, and would maintain it if it had not passed away; and in that disinherited and outraged class the culture of crime germs would still go on.

In the monopoly of the planet, therefore, we may find the underlying and all inclusive institutional cause of crime.

Not that there are no other institutional causes. There may be many. Not that there are no hereditary, educational, or other personal causes. There are many. But in a generalization of causes, this one either comprehends most of the others, or would do duty for them all if the other social causes were abolished and the personal causes were cured.

V.

Mankind has not been insensible to the evil character of planet monopoly. As far back as history goes it tells us of an appreciation by our ancestors of the importance of equality of the right to the use of the earth. They understood it in Rome long before the Gracchi. The landlords of England understood it when they enclosed the common lands. To secure this equality of right has been a part of the American struggle for liberty. We thought we had succeeded when we established free trade in land. We thought for generations of every American as his own landlord. But we are now slowly and painfully learning that through the inevitable operation of the law of economic rent in a progressive society, land values advance. Thus we are recreating through real estate transactions a more powerful land oligarchy than that of the feudal barons—an oligarchy all the more powerful because it strengthens with natural law instead of human leadership.

It strengthens as the flood does, gathering force as it flows. Feudal landlordism has passed away, but capitalized landlordism has taken its place. Feudalistic landlordism governed through personal relationships, plainly and brutally; capitalistic landlordism governs by economic pressure and convulsion with the subtlety and severity of natural law.

How to check this evil is evident enough to some, but we shall not discuss that phase of the matter now. Readers who are in earnest about ridding society of the criminal class will study institutional causes of crime as a practical question, and with at least as much care as they study what they may suppose to be hereditary causes.

If they do that, they will inevitably conclude that most of our crime has an institutional origin; that is, that it is in the nature of spasmodic reaction, responsible and irresponsible, against society by individuals for crimes that society continues to commit upon individuals.

✣

Whoever reaches this conclusion will be driven by his own good sense to the further one, that the mother institution of all is planet monopoly, and will look seriously for the remedy. If he does look for the remedy—really look for it—he will find it even if he has to read Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" before he sees it clearly.

VI.

Our object here is not to suggest remedies for crime or antidotes for any of its causes. It is only to help awaken those who may be studying crime without regard to its social causes. We would awaken them if we could, to the necessity of looking for social causes. We would also awaken them to the realization that those causes must be removed before any really valuable diagnosis of other causes, if others independently exist—can be made. Our function in other words, recalls the remark of his servant to that absent-minded philosopher who had dropped into an easy chair for reflection and was interrupted by the squalling of a cat. "Throw that cat out," said the philosopher to the servant. "Why, sir," replied the servant, "you are sitting on the cat." So long as the social institution of planet monopoly allows idle appropriators of property produced by labor, to sit upon its laborious producers, just so long will the serenity of society be disturbed, and the disturbance take the form of crime.

✣ ✣ ✣

**Here's freedom to him that wad read,**
**Here's freedom to him that wad write;**
**There's nane ever feared that the truth should be heard**
**But them what the truth wad indict.**
**—Robert Burns.**

✣ ✣ ✣

**There is nothing good or evil save in the will.—Epictetus.**

# NEWS NARRATIVE

**To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:**

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, April 7, 1908.

**Presidential Politics.**

The latest Democratic State convention to take action regarding Presidential politics (p. 9) is that of Iowa, which met at Cedar Rapids on the 26th. This convention instructed the national delegates to support Bryan's nomination, and began reforming the State committee in the direction of placing it under the control of democratic Democrats. The State convention of Indiana had met on the 25th, and on the 26th instructed the Indiana delegates for Bryan. The present definite situation with reference to Bryan's strength at the national convention is as follows:

| | Instructed for Bryan | For Bryan without Instructions | Opposed to Bryan |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nebraska | 16 | .. | .. |
| Oklahoma | 14 | .. | .. |
| Indiana | 30 | .. | .. |
| Kansas | 20 | .. | .. |
| North Dakota | 8 | .. | .. |
| South Dakota | 8 | .. | .. |
| Rhode Island | .. | 7 | 1 |
| Iowa | 26 | .. | .. |
| Wisconsin | 26 | .. | .. |
| Philippine Islands | 6 | .. | .. |
| | 154 | 7 | 1 |

—Necessary for nomination, 673 out of a total of 1,008.

✣

Governor Johnson's supporters have begun a general campaign to secure his nomination for President at the Democratic convention. Headquarters were opened for him at Chicago last week, under the management of Richard T. O'Connor, who is described in a friendly special article in the Chicago Record-Herald of the 3rd as a man who for many years "has continued in his quiet way to exercise a directing influence upon the policy of the Democratic party in Minnesota," and as having from his sixteenth year until three years ago, "when there was an open rupture" over a street railway deal, been associated "with the railroad wizard of the Northwest"—James J. Hill. The same article describes him as a millionaire to whom "politics is largely his sport." In his first circular in behalf of Governor Johnson, Mr. O'Connor puts his candidate forward as hostile to Bryan's nomination.

✣

On the 25th the North Dakota Democratic convention met at Grand Forks. Up to the hour of its meeting, supporters of Governor Johnson as the Presidential candidate made extravagant claims of strength. But while there were many friendly expressions of commendation among the delegates, he had no strength at all when the convention acted. The convention refused him instructions even for second choice when his supporters asked for that, lest it might be exploited by Bryan's enemies in the East. The national delegates were instructed to vote as a unit for Bryan's nomination.

✣

The Republican convention of Indiana on the 2nd instructed for Fairbanks as the Presidential candidate. The Massachusetts Republican primaries are reported to have elected Taft delegates.

✣

At the People's party convention at St. Louis on the 3rd (vol. x, p. 856) Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, was nominated for President, and Samuel Williams, of Indiana, for Vice-President. The Nebraska delegation moved to postpone nominations until after the Democratic and the Republican conventions, in order that the People's party might act in the light of the action of the two principal parties, as that should prove to be progressive or reactionary. Their motion being voted down, the Nebraska delegation withdrew from the convention. James H. Ferriss, of Illinois, was re-elected chairman of the national committee. The platform declares—

**for the issuing of money by the government without the intervention of banks; for government ownership of railroads and all public utilities which in their nature are monopolies; for the abolition of sweatshops, child labor and the importation of pauper labor; for work on public improvements to give employment in times of depression, and for a law prohibiting courts from declaring unconstitutional any law passed by Congress and approved by the President.**

✣ ✣

**Ohio Street Car Legislation.**

The Stockwell bill for regulating Ohio street car interests after expiration of franchises, which was indefinitely postponed in February in the lower house of the Ohio legislature (vol. x, p. 1113) was taken up on the 1st by reconsideration of that vote and finally defeated by a vote of 52 to 42. The vote was almost a strict party vote, the Republicans being responsible for the defeat of the bill. One of them, Hill of East Liverpool, warned his party associates on the floor that in defeating the bill they were committing

political suicide. It was the fact that Mayor Johnson's name is identified with this bill that led the Republicans to combine in opposing it. Their action is regarded as having added materially to Johnson's strength in State politics.

✣ ✣

**Investigating Hard Times.**

A representative committee of Brooklyn (New York) convened on the 3rd to promote measures for alleviating the suffering of disemployed workingmen, and presided over by Judge Frederick E. Crane, adopted a resolution urging "the State and city authorities, as a measure of partial relief, to immediately plan and pass such legislation as will allow all public improvements that have been authorized and held up for any cause to be quickly begun." It also adopted the following resolution proposed by ex-Congressman Robert Baker:

**Whereas, At this time of extreme industrial depression the first consideration must be the taking of such steps as will afford the largest measure of immediate relief for the unemployed, yet it is equally necessary to discover the cause of these industrial paroxysms so as to obviate the possibility of their recurrence, and whereas, this conference is sincerely desirous not only of alleviating existing distress, but of preventing a repetition of present lamentable conditions; therefore, be it resolved, that while urging the hastening of all public improvements which will afford the largest employment of the unemployed, and while rendering every aid in our power to mitigate the widespread suffering, yet we demand an exhaustive legislative investigation into the causes of industrial depression to the end that legislation may be enacted which will prevent their recurrence.**

✣ ✣

**The Union Square Crime.**

According to the New York Times of the 3rd, the New York police have confessed their inability to connect any one with Silverstein's bomb-throwing at Union square (p. 6), and are of the opinion that Silverstein's act "was not the outcome of a deliberate plot, but the impulsive action of a lone, sickly fanatic."

✣

An immense meeting of Socialists was held at Grand Central Palace, New York, on the 4th to denounce the action of the police in dispersing the Union square meeting of unemployed workingmen. Over 100 uniformed police were in attendance and 30 in plain clothes. Algernon Lee presided. The newspapers naively report that "the speeches were tame."

✣ ✣

**Suppression of Meetings in Paterson.**

A meeting called at Paterson, N. J., to protest against the arbitrary suppression by the Postoffice Department, under orders from President Roosevelt, of La Questione Sociale (p. 11) was dispersed by the Paterson police on the 3rd. The meeting had been called for Turner Hall, but the Mayor notified the proprietor that his saloonkeeper's license would be cancelled if he permitted the meeting there. Consequently the editor of the suppressed paper opened its office for the meeting, and while the meeting was there in progress the police entered and clubbed the attendants into the street. The speech that the editor, Ludovico Caminita, was making at the time of this police assault upon the meeting was, in substance, as reported by the New York Herald, as follows:

**He denounced the action of the President, the postal authorities and the Paterson municipal authorities. He declared that in barring the paper from the mails and in preventing the meeting the Federal and city officials had been more anarchistic than the anarchists themselves. These actions were denounced as an outrage and a plain violation of the Constitution. He advised that if his hearers did not want to see ideals of Washington, Jefferson and Paine "trampled in the mud of slavery" they should raise their voice against the enemies of a free press.**

From this point the Herald's report proceeds:

**Caminita was booming along under oratorial full sail, when Captain Taylor entered the hall. The speaker stopped and perfect silence fell on the anarchist group. Advancing, until he faced Caminita, Captain Taylor said:**

**"It is my order and I command you to disperse this meeting."**

**"But we are violating no law," protested Caminita.**

**"Everyone in this room get out of here at once," shouted Captain Taylor.**

**The same instant the reserves rushed in from the street, the doors were flung open, clubs were drawn and the work of clearing the room accomplished in two minutes.**

**Outside the anarchists refused to move away from the building and had to be helped on their way by the convincing night sticks.**

**Before the meeting was called in the printing office, Caminita was asked what he would do if the police invaded the office.**

**"They will not come here," he declared defiantly. "They dare not. This place is ours. They dare not enter it without permission. They may keep us from meeting in Turner Hall by threatening to take away the license of the proprietor if he allows us to meet there, but here we are safe."**

**After the dispersal of the meeting Caminita said: "This is worse than Russia or Italy. There the officers attend the anarchist meetings, and if the speaker uses language that they think improper they stop him and make him change his tone. But they do not prevent peaceable assemblage. And yet you call this a free country."**

✣ ✣

**Riots and Labor Strikes in European Cities.**

Anti-clerical demonstrations in Rome on the 2nd brought on clashes between street crowds and the police, in which two of the alleged rioters were killed by soldiers, and three fatally wounded.

As a protest against the violence of the authorities a general labor strike was proclaimed on the following day. Fifty anarchists were arrested, but no open disorders occurred. The mayor ordered the city's flag half masted and suspended the day's sitting of the municipal council, as signs of mourning for the dead. On the 4th a procession of 50,000 of the working classes proceeded to the cemetery where were the graves of the dead rioters, while thousands of persons watched the line of march from balconies, windows and roofs. Wreaths were deposited and speeches delivered, but there was no outbreak nor any disorder. The authorities had troops present in large numbers.

✣

In Paris a gigantic lockout, affecting 150,000 masons, bricklayers and allied workmen in the building trades, went into effect on the 4th. The men demand a maximum day of nine hours, and an application of the weekly day of rest law. On the 6th rioting in connection with the strike occurred in the Place de la Bastille.

✣ ✣

**Election Riots in Portugal.**

The elections to the new Portuguese Cortes, promised by Premier Franco, after long delay, in the days shortly preceding the assassination of King Carlos and the Crown Prince (vol. x, pp. 1068, 1091), came off on the 5th. Disorders and rioting broke out in the evening in Lisbon and in a few smaller towns. The principal rioting in Lisbon is reported to have arisen from disputes between the Monarchists and the Republicans over the counting of votes. The Republicans had been fearing fraud at the various Lisbon polling places, and made a determined stand for their rights at St. Dominique's Church. As the voters were following the ancient custom of voting in the churches, they filed steadily but slowly into historic St. Dominique's and deposited their ballots in the official voting boxes. When the polls closed the Monarchist election officers declared that it was too late to count the votes and proposed to keep the list in the church and count them the next day. The Republican tellers refused to do this, insisting upon an immediate count, followed by the sealing of the boxes. The dispute was taken up by the crowds and a general fight followed. The municipal guard cleared the church at the point of the bayonet, and the fighting continued into the streets. The people wrenched paving stones from the streets to hurl at the troops. In the confusion the guards fired into a body of infantry with fatal effect. In all seven persons were killed and over a hundred wounded. According to the dispatches, in a general way the elections turned out as planned by the parties in control. The Republicans, who had only two seats in the Cortes dissolved last Spring, increased their representation to possibly twenty. In Lisbon they swept the populous sections, but gerrymanders including the outside districts offset in a measure this advantage. Republican leaders are raising the cry of "fraud." They say that while government pressure seemingly was relaxed, the old electoral machinery was in full operation because of the fear on the part of the government of a great Republican movement, and therefore the elections do not represent in any way the sentiment of the country. As the suffrage is limited to those who can read and write, or who pay certain direct taxes, Republicans contend that it was an easy matter for the authorities to manipulate the registry list against the Republican partisans among the masses, 80 per cent of whom are illiterate. Nevertheless, leaders like Machado, Almeida, and Cunha, say that the seats they won give them sufficient strength to wage open war against the old regime so soon as Parliament reassembles. The Monarchists apparently are satisfied with the result of the election, saying that the extravagant claims of the Republicans are utterly disproved.

✣ ✣

**Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman Retires as British Prime Minister.**

On account of continued and very serious ill-health Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman sent to King Edward, who is at Biarritz, a French watering-place, his resignation as Prime Minister on the 5th. The King immediately sent for Herbert H. Asquith, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and acting leader of the government during his chief's illness. Mr. Asquith has no rival for the leadership of his party, and it is not supposed that he will have any difficulty in forming a cabinet. Parliament went into recess on the 6th until the 14th.

## NEWS NOTES

—The Scottish Land Values Bill, rejected by the House of Lords (vol. x, p. 563) has again passed a second reading in the House of Commons by an immense majority.

—The injunction of the Federal Court at Detroit against the ordinance for 3-cent fares on expired street car franchises (vol. x, p. 1188) was made permanent on the 6th.

—An electric "weapon" which will throw a shell three hundred miles is announced in the April Contemporary Review, in an article on "Can Science Abolish War?" by Colonel F. N. Maude.

—The Massachusetts Supreme Court decided on the 4th, in the case of the Building Trades Council of Lynn, that under the laws of Massachusetts, in cases of persons under contract to work, a strike or combination not to work, in order to secure something not due them under their contract, is unlawful.

The strike at issue was against an "open shop." Chief Justice Knowlton dissented.

—Charles Zeublin, professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago, has undertaken the superintendence of establishing social centers in Boston under the liberal endowment of Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw.

—A call for a conference of prominent Negro Republicans of the United States to be held in Chicago June 15, has been issued. The chairman of the provisional committee is John G. Jones, 185 Dearborn street, Chicago.

—The President sent to the Senate on the 31st all the correspondence bearing on the claims of Americans against Venezuela (vol. x, p. 1214), which Venezuela has persistently refused to arbitrate (vol. x, p. 1163). The President's letter of transmittal contained no recommendation.

—The British cruiser Berwick ran down and cut in two the torpedo-boat destroyer Tiger while both boats were engaged in night maneuvers without lights off the Isle of Wight on the night of the 2nd. Thirty-six of the crew, including the commander, Lieutenant W. E. Middleton, lost their lives.

—A wages reduction averaging 10 per cent became effective on the 6th in cotton mills in the New England States employing 30,000 operatives. Last week the wages of 60,000 were reduced, and on the 13th the pay of about 35,000 additional mill hands, including those in New Bedford, will be cut, bringing the total affected by the present hard times movement (vol. x, p. 1234) to 125,000.

—The Finnish Diet, which assembled last May (vol. x, p. 203), is to be dissolved on the 8th by the Czar. Unless especially dissolved, the life of the Diet is three years. Finland has taken the announcement quietly. The Senate, which is an advisory body, not elective and not a constituent part of the Diet (vol. x, p. 203), is expected to be continued until shortly before the convocation of a new Diet.

—The Supreme Court of Massachusetts decided on the 4th that the Democratic ticket is entitled to second place on the official ballot as against that of the Independence League, because the votes for the two factions of the Democratic party at the last election are for this purpose to be counted together as the vote of the Democratic party. The vote last fall was, Democratic 70,842 and Democratic Citizenship 6,691, a total of 77,533; and Independence League 75,499.

—The monthly statement of the United States Treasury Department (p. 14) for March, 1908, shows the following for the fiscal year up to and including that month:

| | |
|---|---|
| Gold reserve fund | $150,000,000.00 |
| Available cash | 262,608,190.76 |
| Total | $412,608,190.76 |
| On hand at the close of the last fiscal year. June 30, 1907 | 418,581,437.51 |
| Decrease | $ 5,973,246.75 |

—The Manhattan Single Tax Club (8 West 125th street, New York) announces its 22d annual celebration of Jefferson's birthday at the Union Square Hotel on the 13th. The speakers are: Frederick Cyrus Leubuscher, ex-Gov. Lucius F. C. Garvin, Benjamin C. Marsh, Hon. T. M. Osborne, Rev. Leighton Williams, William C. de Mille, Henry George, Jr., John J. Murphy. Tickets are $2.00 each, payable to George R. Macey, 33 Warren street. The presence of ladies is especially desired.

—Boundary disputes between Colombia and Panama have brought about talk of war between the two nations. A dispatch from Washington thus states the responsibilities of the United States as to Panama: "While the United States has guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Panama, it has not guaranteed her independence of all obligations as a sovereign nation to her dealings with other nations. The invasion of Colombia by the frontier town of Jurado is looked upon as not being in itself a 'casus belli,' but more as a warning to Panama to awaken to the necessity of becoming an active party to diplomatic negotiations for the amicable adjustment of numerous open questions pending between herself and Colombia and Costa Rica."

—The monthly Treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (p. 14) for March, 1908, shows the following for the fiscal year up to and including that month:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Receipts. | | |
| Tariff | $222,871,972.31 | |
| Internal revenue | 190,185,955.69 | |
| Miscellaneous | 46,731,848.43 | |
| | | $459,789,776.43 |
| Expenses. | | |
| Civil and miscellaneous | $108,505,863.15 | |
| War | 84,123,722.48 | |
| Navy | 87,852,181.01 | |
| Indians | 10,938,552.36 | |
| Pensions | 116,819,302.32 | |
| Public works | 71,430,838.04 | |
| Interest | 15,794,468.42 | |
| | | 495,464,927.78 |
| Deficit | | $ 35,675,151.35 |

# PRESS OPINIONS

**Anti-Bryanism.**

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (dem. Dem.), Mar. 27.—There is really not an atom of good faith or of sound purpose in the campaign being urged for Gov. Johnson or for Judge Gray. There was no good faith in the campaign which was pressed for Lewis Stuyvesant Chanler and which has disappeared from the face of the political earth. . . . The one thing that animates the newspapers and the politicians who are opposing the well-known and the notorious desire of an overwhelming majority of the Democratic voters of the country for Mr. Bryan's nomination, is a desire to defeat that nomination. They do not want him nominated because they fear, indeed, they know, that he will be elected. And with soft words and fine promises they are saying that they admire him greatly, but that he should step aside and turn over his strength to some other candidate.

✣

The (Minneapolis) Irish Standard (Dem.), Mar. 28.—We believe there is still time for Governor Johnson to save himself from his misguided friends. He is altogether too good a man to be sacrificed as the tool of interests and elements that are not demo-

cratic. . . . The newspaper and the interests which are urging him at this time as a candidate, are doing so, not because they favor Johnson, but because they favor any scheme or plan which offers even a slight hope of winning one-third of the delegates at the Denver convention away from Mr. Bryan. . . . If Governor Johnson received no favorable mention at the hands of the Democrats of North Dakota, either for second choice for the Presidency or for Vice President, it is because the Democrats of North Dakota refuse to encourage a scheme started by the newspapers of Wall street and not because they have an unfriendly feeling for the Governor of Minnesota. . . . Governor Johnson should go to Denver at the head of a Minnesota delegation made up of the best Democrats in the State; a delegation in a position to join with the national Democracy in presenting to the common enemy a united front. It should be a delegation of Minnesota Democrats able to speak for the Democracy of Minnesota and to say to the political schemers and tricksters that Democrats of Minnesota do not take political dictation from Interests calling themselves Democratic.

✠ ✠

**Free Press and Free Speech.**

Marion (Iowa) Sentinel (dem. Dem.), Mar. 26.—The enemies of liberty are found in this country as well as in all other countries. In the past few years the development of the spirit of the old "sedition laws" of early Federal government has become alarming to persons who sense the dangers of gradual and insidious usurpation through one pretext or another. At the present session of Congress three separate bills have been introduced which are suspiciously near infringement upon the freedom of the press. These bills are so drawn that the ostensible purpose is made to appear as simply a desire of the authors to restrict the use of the mails to publications which deal in obscene matter, or in matter intended to inspire murder. In fact, however, the bills are intended to lodge additional powers in the hands of the postoffice department to forbid the mails to publications within the discretion of an assistant in the department. . . . The President recently instructed the postmaster general to proceed against [an anarchist] newspaper in New Jersey. Several months ago a Chicago publication was put out of business. Perhaps these publications deserved the treatment accorded them. But there are laws for the prosecution of persons who use the mails for the dissemination of obscene matter, and for teaching and counselling murder. Is it not enough that we have laws for the punishment of such persons, without lodging a dangerous power of discrimination in the hands of one bureaucrat? . . . Along with this frenzy of postal Russianization, naturally comes interference with freedom of speech. And within the past few weeks peaceable assembly has been denied and persons have been forcibly dragged from lecture platforms. . . . The police, under the orders of some bullet-headed superior, simply entered the meetings and when they were opened proceeded to drag the leaders out. The man who does not see danger in these exhibitions of unwonted official power is a fool. It will not do to say persons ought not teach this doctrine or that doctrine. The man who preaches murder and incendiarism can be dealt with under existing laws. Is not this enough, without tolerating these brutal infringements upon the freedom of the press and of speech?

✠ ✠

**Suppression of Free Speech at Union Square.**

New York Evening Post (ind.), Mar. 30.—We are by no means sure that the refusal of the authorities to permit the public meeting was well advised. . . . To suppress such a gathering, to forbid men to air their grievances and propose their panaceas, will not in the least abate the discontent or allay the irritation. Men who are out of work, who have a grudge against the existing order, are easily provoked to violence; but there is no surer provocative than to deny them free speech. An incendiary orator may set them off; forcible repression by the clubs of the police is almost sure to do so. If you want an explosion, hang the monkey-wrench on the safety-valve and crowd on full steam; if you want to avoid an explosion, open some vent and blow off steam. Hence the authorities should adopt the policy of suppression only as a last desperate resort in an extraordinary crisis. This advice is not doctrinaire; it is the fruit of experience. Of the great cities of the world, London is the one which suffers least from the agitation of anarchists and the outbreaks of the mob. And the reason, we are convinced, is that the police there interfere as little as possible with public gatherings. In Trafalgar Square, Hyde Park, and other great open spaces large crowds gather to listen to agitators of all sorts. Plenty of police are on hand to exercise restraint in case of need. The law in England, as in this country, is clear and explicit with regard to incitements to disorder and to murder; and the speakers who cross the line may be arrested and brought to account. But the authorities exercise a large and indeed generous tolerance. . . . Force is a feeble weapon in dealing with unrest and agitation. . . .If we cannot marshal arguments to destroy the fallacies and the half-truths upon which the structure of socialistic and anarchistic theory rests, our case is hopeless. Argument with ignorant, hungry, and excited men is, obviously, a formidable undertaking; but still it is the only method in a free country like this. Certainly, the clubs of the police will never put sound ideas into people's heads. Reason, coolness, and forbearance on the part of men of intelligence are what the hour calls for.

✠

Nashville Tennessean (dem. Dem.), Apr. 2.—The transgression of justice by the instruments of law and government will keep anarchism alive in this country, and if continued, will make this soil a breeding place for the poisonous germ. Let us apply the laws of the land to the anarchists as rigidly and severely as possible. Let us give the social order here the utmost protection and vigilance. But let there be no resort to Russian methods of popular suppression and promiscuous brutality. In these things, the germ of anarchism was born. In our democracy it will die if our laws are rigidly and carefully enforced and our institutions and conditions are kept pure and intact.

✠

Wall Street Journal (finan'l), Mar. 31.—It was a mistake not to have permitted this meeting to be held.

The withholding of a permit for the meeting was worse than anything that could have happened at the meeting. The withholding of the permit did not prevent the throwing of a bomb. It is more dangerous to deny free speech than to permit license of speech.

✣

Charities and The Commons (philanthropic), Apr. 4.—Whether, under present conditions, public meetings in the interests of the unemployed are advisable is a fairly debatable question. That they should be suppressed by the police, however, and permits to hold them refused, seems to us contrary to sound public policy. The rights of free assemblage and free speech are of considerable importance in a democracy and should be guarded with jealous care. If public squares and parks are not to be available in the cities for such meetings, other public meeting places should be provided. . . . Assuming that the right to hold public meetings and to discuss freely any real or imaginary grievances is of fundamental importance, it is difficult to think of any subject in regard to which it should be asserted more vigorously, or acknowledged more freely, than the subject of unemployment. There is no other misfortune comparable to widespread and long continued unemployment. . . . Reasonable persons may advise against such meetings and personally refuse to take part in them. It is one thing, however, to oppose the holding of public meetings and quite another to uphold the park and police authorities in refusing to permit them, and to justify drastic methods of preventing them. . . . Under the apprehension of anarchism, we have come to entrust our police departments with a degree of arbitrary power in the matter of breaking up assemblages of citizens which is greater than is found necessary in other civilized countries, and we are strangely indifferent to the manner in which they are exercising it. . . . The details of the tragedy with which the events of the afternoon came to an end we need not here discuss. It gives no more justification for abridging the rights of free assemblage and free speech than the shocking murder of the Denver priest a few weeks ago gives for abridging the freedom of worship.

✣ ✣

**Public Funds in Private Hands.**

The Peoria (Ill.) Star (ind.), March 8.—Why should we allow William Waldorf Astor to collect every year $9,000,000 in rents for real estate in New York City and spend the same in London in catering to the old aristocracy? Why should we allow the Goelets and the Bradley-Martins to do the same thing? The Goelets are the descendants of an old French Huguenot who located on Manhattan Island and started a truck farm. He left his real estate to his descendants. One of his sons for many years kept the old cow pasture intact, except that he pastured the Goelet cow on it. The city grew up around it until it was worth $2,000,000, but as long as Robert Goelet lived it remained a cow pasture. People in other parts of the city are crowded into unhealthy tenements until New York City is the most populous place on the globe, and their united efforts enriched the Goelets. Why should they be allowed to collect money arising from a condition of things that is not due in any measure to their industry or foresight?

# RELATED THINGS
## CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

### DEMOCRACY TRIUMPHANT!

**For The Public.**

Behold where ascending, resplendent in beauty,
The star of the people bids Tyranny quail!
Let courage still mount to the level of duty;
God reigns, and the right shall prevail.

The cause that is just, tho' repulsed for a season,
Shall rise from the dust of defeat and sweep on,
Surviving contumely, falsehood and treason
Till the last foe falls and the vict'ry is won.

Hark! the voices that cry through the night's desolation;
The sobbing of babes in their prisons of toil;
The groans of the dying, whose blood, a libation
To Mammon, ensanguines his illgotten spoil.

Hark! the shrieks of despair in the slums of the city
Where, baffled, the victims of greed are at bay,
With hearts unresponsive to love or to pity,
Where Riot commands and grim Death leads the way.

Who can hear and keep silence, or behold unappalled?
To him be the high name of Manhood denied!
Till the last slave of Mammon arise disenthralled,
The battle shall rage round his castles of pride.

With courage unfailing and hope that ne'er sleeps,
And a purpose as holy as Heaven can hold,
Democracy's vanguard resistlessly sweeps
To its goal—the Earth-Heaven, promised of old.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

✣ ✣ ✣

### LABOR AND NEIGHBOR:

**An Appeal to First Principles.**

**A Posthumous Work**

**By ERNEST CROSBY.**



✣

**CHAPTER XI. Part 2.**

**Remedies—4. Justice, Freedom and Co-operation.**

The abolition of monopoly in land by a site tax would dispose of several derivative monopolies—all of those in fact whose franchises depend on right of way for rails, pipes, wires or any other means of transportation, conduit or communication; for a franchise value is really a site value and can be taxed in the same way as ordinary land. The ownership of a lot of land is really a franchise—the franchise to build upon it or

cultivate it; and the franchise to lay pipes or rails or wires is one of the same character. It is really a right of way, and rights of way have always been classified as real estate. The State of New York has already begun to tax such franchises in its streets as real estate, and the principle is correct. There is nothing, then, to prevent the taxation of such franchises to their full value, thus neutralizing their monopoly; and this would abolish altogether the railway monopoly, including street surface and elevated railways, and such monopolies as those of the telegraph, telephone and electric light and power companies, and of gas and steam heating companies, and also that of the express companies which grows out of the railways.

The same principle could be applied to mines as well. Their monopoly value can be controlled by taxation.

The internal revenue tax would disappear if a tax on site values were adopted in place of all other taxes, and the brewing and distilling monopoly would be broken up.

There remains the patent monopoly, with its comparatively unimportant sister, the monopoly of copyright. Wherever necessary some other way can be found to reward inventors, or their royalties can be limited. As a matter of history, the inventor rarely reaps the benefit, but it usually goes to an assignee. Hence we need feel no extraordinary scruples in dealing with this, the most plausible of monopolies.

While a rational mode of taxation thus promises to dispose of all the above monopolies, it is possible that with respect to some of them the public will prefer the more cumbersome method of public ownership. I have already indicated the undesirability of increasing the functions of bureaucracy, but it is still true that it is better to have the government own the various monopoly companies than to have them own the government, which is practically the case to-day. Unless the people can be persuaded to take immediate steps to absorb monopoly privileges by taxation, it would be wise for them to own and operate such public utilities as experience shows us can well be managed by States and cities. Railways, telegraphs, telephones, express service, gas and electric lighting—all of these have been successfully operated by states and municipalities in many parts of Europe and America. By all means, then, rather than leave these instruments of monopolistic tribute in private hands, let us take them over; but it would be far better to begin a campaign of taxation against them until the "water" is squeezed out of their shares.

We have still to consider the difficult question of the banking and currency monopoly, and we must try to apply to it the same remedy of natural law to which we have already had recourse in other cases. There should be no monopoly in this field. There is no reason why the government should not allow individuals to compete with it and its national banks in the matter of issuing notes and in any other way facilitating exchange. There is undoubtedly some better way of conducting exchanges than that in vogue, but how will it ever be discovered if no one but the nation is allowed to experiment? The government might as well forbid every one but itself to keep a bank account, as to put a prohibition upon the issue of credit notes, for all credits should be liberated and made effectual. To remove this prohibition would not prevent the government from continuing to coin money and issue currency as it now does, and it might well insist that other currency should be made altogether different in form, so that no one could be misled; but it has no moral right to interfere with individual experiments in mutual banking, the mutual insurance of credits, and the issuance of labor-cheques or other currency. We must add free banking to free land and free trade before we have exhausted the remedies afforded by natural law. If after that has been done society is still imperfectly organized, it will be time to consider the new and artificial changes which may be required.

The gains of banking usually take the form of interest, and interest is money paid for the use of money.*

*Mr. Crosby left with his manuscript the following notes which he related to the manuscript page in which the above sentence appears:

"Ready exchangeability of money the reason for interest."

"Interest is a premium on the difference between present and future satisfactions"

"Part of interest is insurance against loss."

"Under single tax people pay rent to themselves, and under mutual banking system they would pay interest to themselves (like a mutual insurance company)."

"Under co-operative system profit would go to themselves."

He further noted that he was to "change" this page "to show that under co-operation advantage of interest would go to wealth-producers;" and that he was to "quote points on co-operation in Briggs's booklet."

"Briggs's booklet" is evidently an allusion to "The Single Tax," by George A. Briggs (an address delivered before the New Church Society of Elkhart, Ind.), the last part of which is devoted to the subject of co-operation under the single tax. The points referred to by Mr. Crosby seem to be covered in the following quotation:

"Under our plan, the fear of want will be eliminated, but so also will be the ability to make monopolistic investments. What, then, will become of that surplus wealth?

"Plainly, it will seek investment in competitive enterprises. But since such enterprises depend for their success upon the character and ability of the management, the first thing necessary will be to find men of desirable character and ability. Many such men will be found at the head of businesses already in operation. Some of these, needing more capital, will be willing to sell stock in their enterprises. But to do this, is to divide the profits and no stock will be for sale unless such increased capital will increase returns.

"When, therefore, surplus wealth has exhausted this method of investment, it will seek for men to establish

Money has no power of increase in itself, but its power to draw interest depends upon the fact that it can be exchanged for sites, which produce rent, or for capital (that is, machinery, etc.), which produces profit. If site values are taxed out of private hands, money will no longer be convertible into rent-bearing land and that element of interest will disappear. There remains, however, the element of profit from the use of capital, and this does not include monopoly profits. There is a natural law of profit similar to the natural law of rent, namely, that profit rises from the difference in productivity between the poorest capital (that is, machinery, etc.) in use, and better capital, just as rent is the difference in productivity between the poorest sites in use and better sites.*

The wages of the workers in the poorest factory in use would fix the natural standard of wages. But if the workers in the better factories are paid according to this standard, as is just, there will remain a surplus above this, due to the superiority of their machinery. This surplus, however, arises from no "unearned increment" or monopoly value, as is the case with land, but is a reward for the use of better machinery, properly earned by its owners. In a perfect civilization where all men used the best machinery, this profit would disappear, but every new invention, as it was gradually introduced, would revive it again. So long as this profit continues and is free from all taint of monopoly, it forms a proper fund for the renewal of capital. In our present conditions it is impossible to separate this true profit from monopoly profit, but we may reasonably suppose that it is comparatively insignificant in amount, and that it is bound to grow less as the means of production are brought nearer to the highest standard of efficiency. The profit source of interest thus promises to vanish, just as the rent source will vanish—in the former case by unassisted natural laws, in the latter by the refusal of the community to allow individuals to retain a source of income to which they have no claim.

It may seem strange to the thinker that natural laws are insufficient to make way with both rent and interest, both of them seeming to be signs of friction and imperfection; but I see no tendency to the disappearance of rent—on the contrary it increases. Perfect means of transportation might be expected to dissipate and equalize site values, but they have the opposite effect, and every new railway from New York increases the value of land on Broadway. Some of the advocates of banking and currency reform have supposed that the abolition of interest would diminish or even abolish rents. But here again, as in the case of improved transportation, the result would be to increase rents, for capital would be plentiful and land would be in greater demand than ever. The abolition of interest will tend to fluidity in business affairs, just as improved transportation does; but this very fluidity, strange to say, conduces to concentration and not to dispersion, and it is sure to add to the value of valuable sites. The material progress of a community may therefore be measured by the rise of rents and the fall of interest. Interest will have a tendency to pass away by natural laws, but rent will remain to be dealt with—a giant, forever growing in strength and stature.

And it is curious to note that interest has always been looked at askance in all ages, forbidden by religion after religion, denounced by teacher after teacher, and that it is limited to-day by usury laws which cast a slur upon its character. Compound interest is the legitimate daughter of interest, but if ten per cent interest were allowed upon one cent for 1893 years, it has been computed that it would take seventy-eight figures to write down the result of the "investment." The single cent would have swallowed up the world. This calculation throws suspicion upon the principle of interest, and it seems as if mankind had

---

new industries. These will be found among the salaried foremen, superintendents and managers of established enterprises. These men will have the technical and practical experience necessary for the purpose.

"On being approached, some of them will be glad to accept an opportunity to become share holders in new enterprises rather than continue on salaries in old ones. Others, more timid perhaps, will talk the matter over with their employers. If their timidity be not too pronounced, they will present the offer as being attractive. If also they are valuable men, employers will endeavor to keep them. Such employers will point out the vicissitudes of business, the many capacities needed successfully to manage an enterprise, the keenness of competition, and the patience necessary to establish a new industry in any field.

"If these arguments prove futile, they will endeavor to tempt such employees by raise in salary. Some will fall under this temptation, but others more obdurate and perhaps more valuable will not. The employers, then, facing not only the loss of a valuable man, but also the dangers of competition from him, will search for a plan that will bind him to them. In many cases they will be forced to offer him stock in their enterprise either as a gift or as a purchase, and, happily, the increased wages which our plan has produced will enable the employee to accept the proposition.

"In some such way many new enterprises will be started and many valuable men will become stockholders in enterprises where formerly they were salaried employees only.

"As a further step in this direction, the search of jobs after men will continue until the cost of labor reaches a point where, all things considered, it will be impossible to raise it further. Some other inducement will then be necessary to secure or retain men, even in the humblest capacities. No other offer will be possible except to sell them stock, and thus step by step, all industry will become co-operative, not forcibly from without, but by interior development in a continuously ascending series."

—Editors of The Public.

*See the able and suggestive paper of Wm. G. Sawin on "The Profits and Volume of Capital." Publications of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 320, Philadelphia, 1901.

always had an inkling that in a perfect state it would have no justification. The fact that it enables so many people to lead a life of permanent idleness, supported by the labor of others, is another reason for criticising interest. If I do two days' work in one, no one would challenge my right to a holiday of one day; but as soon as that one day is transformed into a certain period of time every year, not only during my life, but forever, you at once lay the foundation of injustice. If I save ten thousand dollars from my earnings, by all means let me spend it; but to tell me that I and my heirs are thereby entitled to six hundred dollars a year for a million years, and then for another million years thereafter, is pure moonshine upon its face.

But is the allowance of interest necessary to the saving of sufficient capital to keep our industries in a state of efficiency and provide for their expansion? The fact is that as interest falls, our savings banks become fuller and fuller. There is no reason why a man should not save a thousand dollars for the purpose of spending it in his old age, or of providing for his children, or to assist in establishing some industrial enterprise whose products he needs. Squirrels and bees save without receiving any bonus upon their savings, and men can doubtless acquire the same wisdom if they try. It is sometimes stated that the essence of interest consists in the fact that men prefer to enjoy a thing now to postponing the enjoyment of it to the future, and hence that they will always pay a bonus for anticipating the use of it. But may we not expect the advent of a more philosophical frame of mind, which will allow the trouble of preserving the desired thing, to offset the annoyance of waiting for it? The fact that a man wishes to lend, shows that he has more money than he wants, and hence that it is a favor to him to keep it for him; in other words, that it is worth more to him in the future than in the present. Time does not belong to the lender alone. At any rate it is a fact that as civilization advances, interest falls, and that there is every reason to expect it to sink to the cost of providing capital. And the abolition of monopoly would gently facilitate this descent, for much of the interest of to-day is monopoly interest, derived from the banking monopoly, the land monopoly and the other monopolies. To sum up, it would seem to be the natural use of wages to support the worker and his family; the natural use of rent to pay for the communal enterprises now grouped under the activities of the government; and the natural use of profit to renew and extend capital. Of the three, profit is the only one which lacks elements of permanence and which would be likely to disappear in a perfect society, but it would take away with it its twin sister, interest. The incentive to save, supplied by interest, will at first yield place to a less speculative prudence, but eventually the world will perhaps find a new energy in the spirit of active co-operation.

# BOOKS

## ONE OF THE FEDERALISTS.

**Life and Times of Stephen Higginson—Member of the Continental Congress and Author of the "Laco" Letters. By Thomas Wentworth Higginson. With illustrations. Published at Boston and New York by Houghton, Mifflin & Company. Price $2 net; postage 13 cents.**

Stephen Higginson was an old Salemite, and, of course, a sailor man. Almost, of course, too, he was a sea captain while still in his twenties. In his riper years he stood among the leaders of the aristocratic merchants of Boston.

Among Federalists he was unique for his sense of humor, one rare specimen of which his grandson and biographer treats us to. When a group of Federalists in defeat were considering how they should behave toward their triumphant political enemies, Higginson brought the acrid consultation to a close with this remark—the "only jocose word," observes his biographer, "that I ever heard attributed to any Federalist in defeat": "After all, gentlemen, if a man has to live in the house with a cat, he cannot always address her as 'cat'; sometimes he must call her 'Pussy.'" This remark, as wise as it was jocose, has in it some of the qualities of immortality.

Mr. Higginson had the spirit of the present day plutocrat. Not only did he oppose Shay's rebellion, but he seems to have been without sympathy for the sense of wrong which the impoverished and rebellious people felt. Although he appears to have understood the situation unusually well, he looked for safety not to a redress of grievances but to a strong central government. "The people of the interior parts of these States," he writes in 1787, "have by far too much political knowledge and too strong a relish for unrestrained freedom to be governed by our feeble system, and too little acquaintance with real sound policy or rational freedom and too little virtue to govern themselves; they have become too well acquainted with their own weight in the political scale, under such governments as ours, and have too high a taste for luxury and dissipation to sit down contented in their proper line, when they see others possessed of much more property than themselves. With these feelings and sentiments, they will not be quiet while such distinctions exist as to rank and property; and sensible of their own force, they will not rest easy till they possess the reins of government, and have divided property with their betters, or they shall be compelled by force to submit to their proper stations and mode of living."

That was the true Federalist spirit. As the

book before us suggests, it is perhaps the clearest statement of the precise point at issue in connection with the making of the Constitution to be found in any correspondence of the time.

✣ ✣ ✣

## A BOYS' BOOK.

**The Boy Geologist, at School and in Camp. By Edwin J. Houston, Ph. D. With illustrations by Herbert Pullinger, Philadelphia. Henry Altemus Company. Price, $1.00.**

Prof. Houston, well-known among scientific students the world over, has, in this interesting volume, followed the school life of a group of healthy boys with a tendency to take an interest in the things which may form their life work in the world. The principal actors in the story are two boys, one with a passion for geology and the other with an equal fondness for chemistry. A sort of Damon and Pythias friendship exists between these boys, giving a genuine human interest to their boarding school and camp life. There is a pleasing record of scientific experiments and a fund of information running through the book which cannot fail to interest the reader seeking knowledge in an easy, entertaining way. The emeritus professor of physical geography and natural philosophy in the Central High School of Philadelphia and the Franklin Institute, and president of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, has served a very acceptable use to the youth who may be given the pure pleasure of reading "The Boy Geologist." The story is cordially commended to buyers of genuinely good juvenile literature.

A. L. M.

✣ ✣ ✣

## A CHILD STORY MAKING FOR HEALTH.

**Delight. The story of a little Christian Scientist. By Gertrude Smith. With illustrations by Curtis Wager-Smith, Philadelphia. Henry Altemus Company. Price, 50 cents.**

The author of "Baby Bible Stories," etc., gives us the "Gratitude Book" of a charming little girl, taken as a helpless cripple from the Children's Home by Mrs. Allen, who instructs and trains the child by the methods of "Christian Science" until she is free from all infirmity, with a healthy love of all strenuous physical games and exercises. In a natural child-like way Delight (who left her former name behind her in the Children's Home) becomes a little gospel of love and faith to her neighbors and small friends. Even her peacock playfellow, "Arnold Berkley," the cow, "Lady Whitefoot," and the minister's spirited pony "Robin," are subject to her law of love.

While the author may occasionally handle "Delight" in too manifestly a "teaching" manner, she makes none the less a sweet little story, with no morbid taint to mar its use for the small readers for whom it is designed.

A. L. M.

# BOOKS RECEIVED

—Goethe's Faust. By Marcus Hitch. Published by Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. 1908.

—Karl Marx. Biographical Memoirs. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Fourth Thousand. Published by Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. 1908.

# PERIODICALS

McClure's (New York) for April is distinguished for its resumption of Carl Schurz's personal narrative, the present installment being of exceptional interest to Americans of a generation or so back, because it deals with the South at the close of the Civil War.

✣

In Everybody's (New York) for April we have a spiritistic story by Hamlin Garland—a story of actual experiences, vouched for by the author and adjusted to a fiction setting. More of the same startling phenomena are promised through the same magazine and from the same pen.

✣

The second number of The International, a review of the world's progress (London: T. Fisher Unwin), which is edited by Dr. Rodolphe Broda, exhibits a decidedly socialistic animus, but is much broader in spirit than socialistic organs usually are. Walter Crane leads with a paper on "The Socialist Ideal in Art."

✣

The American (New York) for April offers at least three contributions that will especially interest serious readers of magazines. Ray Stannard Baker describes the tragedy of the mulatto, and tragedy it is to be sure; while Lincoln Steffens tells the story of the San Francisco disclosures, a still hunt for big game; and Bishop Williams of Michigan explains in his robust way how our pagan bible has given way to "a living and eternal Word of God." It is difficult to mention the American without a reference to "Mr. Dooley," who has got back his old vigor and talks this month of the prohibition wave.

✣

If one would appreciate the weakness of the other side of the Standard Oil controversy, let him read the defense of its counsel, Virgil P. Kline, in the Ohio Magazine (Cleveland) for March. Mr. Kline thinks, for instance, that the objection to the Standard's ownership of the stock of other companies, when there would be no objection to its ownership direct of the properties of the other companies, is a distinction without a difference; but, with bat-like blindness, he himself discloses a serious difference

when he explains that the Standard owns the stock of other companies instead of their property, because the States in which the property lies are drastic in their legislation against the Standard. In the same issue of this magazine, Charles P. Salen reviews the politics of Ohio in an article entitled "The Democratic Opportunity."

She: "So if you put a shilling on a horse at 20 to 1, and it wins, you win 20 shillings?"

He: "Yes."

She: "And if you put a shilling on at 5 to 1?"

He: "You win 5 shillings."

She: "And what do you win if you put it on at 1 o'clock exactly?"—Ally Sloper.




# The Public

is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second-class matter.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

| | |
|---|---|
| Yearly | $1.00 |
| Half yearly | .50 |
| Quarterly | .25 |
| Single copies | .05 |
| Trial subscription—4 weeks | .10 |

Extra copies in quantity, $2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, $3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

**All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders or Chicago or New York Drafts are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.**

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper.

The date on wrapper shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due.

## TERMS OF ADVERTISING

| | |
|---|---|
| One page (240 lines), each insertion | $20.00 |
| Half-page (120 lines), each insertion | 10.00 |
| Quarter-page (60 lines), each insertion | 5.00 |
| One inch (14 lines), each insertion | 1.20 |
| One line (agate), each insertion | .09 |

Two columns (240 lines) to the page. Length of column, 120 lines. Width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.