

must accept the terms that are offered him or starve. He cannot "higgle" for a price. That being so, common fairness demands that it should be considered when the union question is discussed. The point is not whether labor union methods are justifiable in the abstract; it is whether they are excusable when institutions and laws have produced conditions that deprive individual laborers of freedom of contract.

There is an evident reaction in the courts against the recent tendency to abrogate legislative powers, in favor of public service corporations. A recent decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois has completely baffled the street railroad ring of Chicago. It sustains the rights of the city council to compel street car companies to give transfers over the whole length of their lines. It also decides that the city council may regulate fares in its own discretion, the only limitation being that it shall not make them so low as to amount to confiscation. To the same effect is the decision of the Supreme Court of Iowa, made within a few days, in the case of the Cedar Rapids water company. The most important feature of both decisions is the point that the courts, while they will prevent confiscation, will not guarantee profits on watered stock. A quotation from the conclusion of the opinion in the Iowa case shows the significance of this judicial reaction:

The court cannot undertake to guarantee the company any fixed or certain return upon its investment. The exercise of such a power would work an utter destruction of the legislative right to regulate rates of water companies and other corporations operating works of public utility. We think the decisions have already gone to the verge of safety in nullifying legislative acts of this character—and to go farther and say that the courts will not only preserve property from confiscation and destruction by legislative power but will also assure to its owners a definite and fixed rate of profit upon their investment, would be an act of judicial usurpation.

Germany is beginning now fairly to experience the inevitable result of

her protection policy. Since the early '80s she has been building up "home industries" by means of the protective tariff, and now her people are suffering the agonies that our protective tariff brought upon us in the '90s and will soon bring upon us again. Trade in Germany has never been at so low an ebb as now. Bankruptcies are increasing. The towns are crowded with workingmen out of work and wages are falling. Meat is so dear that it has vanished from the tables of the poorer households. Misery haunts the empire and the future looms up darker even than the present. Protection is doing the same deadly work in Germany that it does wherever it gains a foothold.

APROPOS OF COAL.

There is an old adage about the disastrous effect of giving a dog a bad name. It is strikingly illustrated in the case of Political Economy, which somebody—who manifestly knew little of the subject—called "the Dismal Science." The world in general seems to have accepted the description as reliable, and as a consequence the average man, even the average newspaper writer, considers this branch of the tree of knowledge a negligible thing, if not, indeed, a very good thing to avoid.

Now, if the epithet is strictly understood to apply only to Political Economy as that subject is set forth in a good many books, it is accurate enough, for the writers of not a few "authoritative" works on the subject have certainly made a dismal affair of it. They have accomplished this by divesting it of all human interest; and so long as it remains true that "the most interesting thing to man is man" such writers must fail of popularity. "Economic man," as depicted by Dryasdust, is a creature as fabulous as the Phoenix or the Dodo—for he is an alleged human being who exercises but two functions—those of producing and consuming. He is destitute of all the faculties, affections and passions which characterize man in actual life, and it is little wonder that the casual reader feels no interest in

him, or in the alleged world in which he lives—a place made up entirely of percentages, increases, decreases, and other statistical properties, but utterly without blue skies, smiling landscapes, and the other familiar surroundings that real people love.

It is not astonishing, then, I say, that the average man knows little of Political Economy, but it is unfortunate, because in truth there is no subject in the whole realm of knowledge that, properly understood, comes closer to mankind, or is more worthy of his study. There is scarcely a great question before the people of any civilized country to-day that does not involve principles which it is the function of the political economist to elucidate, and the elucidation of which, if intelligently done, could fail to be of the deepest interest at least to all thinking men.

The widespread discussion which has been forced upon the inhabitants of this continent by reason of the coal strike is nothing more nor less than a discussion of Political Economy, and it has certainly served to show that most people are innocent of a knowledge of that science, or, at all events, that very many of those who have felt called upon to take part in the discussion through the newspapers and magazines, are in the least careful in the use of terms. We find, for example, that the trouble in the coal regions is almost universally referred to as a dispute between Capital and Labor. Without affirming that there could not, under any circumstances, be a conflict between opponents so named, I am quite certain that the Pennsylvania case—or any ordinary case—cannot be correctly so described. This will be manifest at once when the meaning of the words is considered.

The term Labor is, of course, sufficiently understood; but what is Capital? To confine oneself to this interesting "modern instance," what is the capital of the coal operators of the anthracite regions? Their capital consists of shafts, engines, wheelbarrows, sheds, tanks, cars, rails, and a number of other things, necessary to the business of producing and hauling coal. Every item of this property is man-made, and shares the quality of perishability with the product

of human hands in general. Capital is defined by the economists as "stored up labor"—that is, labor products which are devoted, not to consumption, as products ordinarily are, but to the production of other forms of wealth. It is clear that there does not and could not reside in this capital of the mine operators any power of tyranny; and hence, as capitalists, those gentlemen would not be able, however despotic their disposition, to dictate to the miners' union, much less to the people of the United States and Canada. The miners, with the assistance of their fellow artisans of other callings, could almost have reproduced the entire capital of the coal trust during the period devoted to the strike, in so far as that capital consists in the paraphernalia of coal production; and this, with certain pieces of paper called bonds, stocks and moneys, is all the capital the trust does possess.

But if Capital can thus be produced by Labor, how comes it that there is a conflict between them? and especially, how can there possibly be the "irrepressible conflict" that we are constantly hearing of?

The explanation of this apparent paradox is simple. The conflict in Pennsylvania—like similar troubles in general—was not between Labor and Capital, but between Labor and Monopoly—a very different thing. The power in the hands of the trust was not and is not that involved in the ownership of the tools and materials of the coal mining and coal carrying industries, but in the legal possession of the mines themselves, and of the exclusive rights-of-way of the railroads running from the mines, reinforced by the further legal ownership of the coal deposits as yet unworked. Under these circumstances, to reproduce the capital of the trust could have done no good as a measure of relief, for that capital could not have been employed. The key to the situation is the ownership of the land; and this the trust holds, not as a capitalistic, but as a monopolistic corporation.

It is a mere abuse of terms to call a monopolist a capitalist, for the raw material of nature is not in the same category as the products of human

toil. Though so clear and simple, this distinction is rarely made by writers of the day, who have apparently fallen into the fashion set by the socialists of ignoring the difference between two things which are utterly unlike.

J. W. BENGOUGH.

NEWS

Reports from the elections of last week (p. 485) are still far from complete, and no returns from the official count are yet available.

Unofficial returns, however, are full from Rhode Island. This state has not had a Democratic governor since 1900, but for governor, Dr. L. F. C. Garvin (Henry George Democrat) defeats Gov. Kimball by 6,358 plurality; for lieutenant governor, Archambault (Dem.) defeats Shepley (Rep.) by 1,273 votes; Bennett (Rep.) was elected secretary of state by 4,200 majority; Stearns (Rep.) was elected attorney general by 611 plurality, and Read (Rep.) was elected general treasurer by 1,644 plurality. In the general assembly the Democrats made great gains, the lower house being a tie; but in the senate the Republicans have 27 and the Democrats 11 members. In the First congressional district Mayor D. L. D. Granger (Dem.), of Providence, defeats Bull (Rep.) for reelection by about 600 plurality. Capron (Rep.) was reelected in the Second district by about 1,000 plurality. Augustus S. Miller (Dem.) was elected mayor of Providence by 2,000 plurality. The other cities of the state elected Democratic mayors with the exception of Woonsocket, where a Republican defeated the chairman of the Democratic state central committee for reelection.

In Illinois the vote for state treasurer, the highest officer balloted for, appears to have been 849,416 with a Republican plurality of 86,771. In 1900 the Republican candidate for governor had 580,198 and the Democratic 518,966, a total of 1,099,164, with a Republican plurality of 61,232. It would appear, therefore, that the Republicans of Illinois have increased their plurality by more than 25,000 in a vote reduced by over 250,000.

The Iowa pluralities by counties are in the aggregate approximately

78,744 for the Republican candidate for secretary of state, the highest office voted for, and 4,372 for the Democratic, a net plurality in the whole State of 74,372. This reduces the Republican plurality at the gubernatorial election of 1901 by no more than about 8,782.

Full unofficial returns from Cuyahoga county, Ohio, the home county of Mayor Tom L. Johnson and Senator M. A. Hanna, are as follows:

	Dem.	Rep.	Plu.	
Sec'y of State.....	36,449	33,947	2,502	Dem.
Cong. (20th Dist.).....	14,839	15,498	659	Rep.
Cong. (21st Dist.).....	16,791	24,423	7,632	Rep.
Circuit Judge.....	35,682	34,011	1,671	Dem.
	32,279	36,846	4,567	Rep.
Other Judges.....	36,628	35,698	930	Dem.
	36,477	33,663	2,814	Dem.
	36,429	32,279	3,150	Dem.
Probate Judge.....	30,393	40,394	9,941	Rep.
Clerk of Courts.....	36,124	35,248	776	Dem.
Sheriff.....	32,296	39,621	7,326	Rep.
County Clerk.....	36,510	33,488	3,022	Dem.
County Prosecutor.....	33,996	36,697	1,671	Rep.
County Solicitor.....	36,804	34,471	2,333	Dem.
Coroner.....	35,796	34,668	1,128	Dem.
Surveyor.....	32,821	37,410	4,589	Rep.

In the city of Cleveland the plurality for Bigelow was 4,608. The heavy plurality against the Democratic candidate for probate judge is attributed to his having been identified with the "gold" Democracy of 1896.

By the election of the Democratic candidate for county commissioner of Cuyahoga county, noted above, the Democrats acquire a majority of the county board and thus come into control of the county government. Mayor Johnson has therefore begun extending his tax crusade to county affairs. The first step in this direction consisted in the abrogation of the contract with what is known as the tax inquisitor. Under a law of Ohio, counties are empowered to make contracts for the ferreting out of unreturned personal taxes. The contractor for Cuyahoga county has long been a man of the name of Morganthaler. His contract did not expire until next August, but in anticipation of a change in the county government the outgoing Republican authorities made a new one with him for three years. It is this new contract that the new county board has abrogated. They did so upon the authority of an opinion of the Republican attorney general, Mr. Sheets, given recently in a similar case under the same law. Mr. Sheets's opinion on this subject advised that—

as the law does not provide for the employment of a tax inquisitor for any particular time, he could be discharged at the pleasure of the appointing power; also that one set of county officials could not employ a tax inquisitor