

old Radical farmer was asked how he intended to vote. "I've allers voted Radical," he replied; "but I'm told the Blues are going in for Traffic Reform, and so I shall vote for them. I can't abear them motors."

\* \* \*

### A CANDID MILLIONAIRE.

Report in the Chicago Tribune of March 10, 1910 of a Startling Speech by Joseph Fels.\*

"Carnegie, Rockefeller, Morgan and other captains of industry are robbers and their millions are ill-gotten gains. We cannot get rich fast enough nowadays without robbing the public. I admit that I, too, have robbed the public and I am still doing it, but I propose to spend the accursed money in wiping out the system by which I made it."

Joseph Fels, who became a millionaire by making an extremely "sudsy" soap, made this statement last night in talking to fellow diners at the University of Chicago settlement, Gross avenue, near Ashland. As suds is to soap so is public speaking to Great Malefactor Fels.

He was the guest of honor, the hostesses being Mrs. W. F. Dummer and Miss Mary McDowell. His remarks were in amplification of a briefer statement that startled members of the City club, whom he had addressed at luncheon earlier in the day.

Under a fire of questions, Mr. Fels, who had fled from the LaSalle hotel to escape the appeals of fortune hunters, excited by reports that he intended to divide \$5,000,000 among "the worthy," explained his plans to "quiet his conscience" by heavy expenditures of his "robber wealth."

"I do not believe in charities," he said. "They are agents of pauperization. Neither am I a philanthropist. I have in mind no plan to aid institutions of mercy, however worthy they may be generally esteemed."

Neither, said Mr. Fels, did he mean that he and Rockefeller and Morgan and Carnegie had been personally dishonest in the accumulations of their fortunes. He did not mean that he had advertised his soap as containing a certain thing when in fact there was none in it.

"Nor do I have any intention," he added in reply to a query, "of reducing the price of soap."

"John D. Rockefeller," he continued, "is a mild, harmless man with a mistaken ideal, but personally honest. None the less, he is a robber."

"Rockefeller and other millionaires have accumulated their wealth through unjust laws, especially under the tariff's protection, and because of these laws I, too, have robbed the public, and

\*The statement in this report that Mr. Fels delivered this speech at the University Settlement is an error. At the Settlement he was a private dinner guest and made no speech. He had spoken at the City Club (228 Clark street, Chicago), which has printed his speech in full.

am stilling robbing it. I am not responsible for these laws, but am doing and intend to do what I can to change them."

"How are you getting rid of your 'robber wealth'?" Mr. Fels was asked.

"For one thing," he replied, "I am interested in spreading the Single Tax propaganda throughout the world. The movement is active in the United States, England, Canada, South Australia, New Zealand, New South Wales, Denmark, Sweden and other nations."

One of the diners who knew volunteered the information that this work was costing Mr. Fels \$150,000 a year, as he duplicated, dollar for dollar, every contribution made to the cause. A host of public speakers, trained in the arguments against "land monopoly," are kept in the field.

"If we had an educational fund of \$1,000,000 a year," said Mr. Fels, "we'd upset the world in twenty years as to economic conditions. I will be one of twelve to supply the funds."

Mayland, a "model town" fifty miles from London, also has been the recipient of about \$150,000 of Mr. Fels' "conscience fund," or "swag," as he calls his wealth.

"I intend to use my money," explained Mr. Fels, "to force into use land that is being held for the increment. I do not believe in speculating in land values. It is an enormous swindle. As a business man and land owner I have taken advantage of monopolies which private ownership of lands gives me, lands which rightfully belong to the many instead of the few."

"The tariff is a further pauperization of the toiler for the benefit of the monopolist. Perhaps I would have made a fortune despite these laws, but I want to bring into operation conditions of equal manhood, conditions under which all will have an equal chance."

\* \* \*

### ON THE ROAD TO JERICHO.

From an Address on High Prices by Herbert S. Bigelow.

That unnamed person who was recipient of the charity of the Good Samaritan discovered, if he ever got to Jericho, that his purchasing power in that city was not what it had been in Jerusalem. In Jerusalem he could command the necessaries and perhaps some of the luxuries of life. In Jericho he could not pay his board bill. This, of course, was because he had been robbed on the way.

But if, while going from one city to the other, the United Steal Corporation of Jerusalem and Jericho, with the High Priest, head of the Meat Trust of Jerusalem, as president, had been organized, and had doubled the price of the necessaries of life, the condition of this man on reaching Jericho would have been much the same as though he had

been robbed. As it was, the robbers reduced his purchasing power one hundred per cent. Those who could have doubled the price of what he had to buy, would have reduced his purchasing power at least fifty per cent. They would have left him something and he would have suffered no personal violence. But if he was a thoughtful man he would probably have come to the conclusion that he had been robbed nevertheless.

Were this parable of the Good Samaritan to be translated into the terms and conditions of modern experience, our Good Samaritan would not be spending his time rescuing the victims of bandits. The police would see that such thieving was reduced to a minimum. Even the priests and the Levites are against that kind of robbery.

But there are robbers who are still held in much esteem by priests and Levites and whose crimes are beyond the reach of the police. They do not rob an occasional victim of all his wealth. They half rob whole communities all the time.

Our Good Samaritan would try to teach the people by what subtle means this systematic legalized robbery is accomplished, knowing full well that if the people could only see through it they would put a stop to it.

But even a modern Samaritan would find the priests and Levites preaching to the people the blessedness of robbery. They call it poverty, of course, but its the same thing. They have taught them a weary long while that if they will be good and tamely submit to being robbed on earth, they may themselves live like robbers in heaven.

---

## BOOKS

---

### THE PEOPLE'S LAW.

**The People's Law; or Popular Participation in Law Making, from Ancient Folk-Moot to Modern Referendum. A Study in the Evolution of Democracy and Direct Legislation.** By Charles Sumner Lobngier, Ph.D., LL. M.; Judge of the Court of First Instance, Philippine Islands; Commissioner to Revise and Edit Philippine Codes; Member of National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform Laws; Member of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court; Sometime Member Nebraska Supreme Court (Commission); Professor of Law in the University of Nebraska. With an Introduction by George Elliott Howard, Professor of Political Science and Sociology in the University of Nebraska. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York. 1909. Price, \$4, net.

A book so fully described in the title calls for no elaborate description in a review, nor do the author's qualifications for the work need any further voucher than the bare statement on the title page of his experience in public service. It is enough

to say that the work is a comprehensive compilation and logical classification of facts regarding law-making by the people. It is especially timely now in view of the strong tendency toward the initiative, and the referendum. Although the author appears to write in the spirit of the Federalists, his devotion to the historical school of jurisprudence holds him so close to the line of the law as it has developed historically that he may be regarded as almost non-partisan—as nearly non-partisan perhaps, as a man can be if he says anything. The book may be unhesitatingly recommended for reference and study in preparation for debates with regard in general to the relation of the people to Constitution making, and in particular to the very live subject of direct legislation.

\* \* \*

### EDUCATION DEMOCRATIZED.

**Education for Efficiency.** By E. Davenport. Published by D. C. Heath & Co., Boston. 1909.

Educational doctrine from the Dean of the Agricultural College and the Director of the Experiment Station at the Illinois University is most welcome to anyone who knows the recent progress of our State University. The chapters in Prof. Davenport's book are several of them made-over addresses, and in a volume so put together, there is naturally repetition. So very valuable, however, and so clearly expressed are the ideas repeated, that criticism of style melts at once into admiration for thought.

Part I is a general discussion of the demand for a universal education and how the educator and the citizen can most wisely make answer. Part II, far briefer, is specific technical suggestions about the incorporation into the secondary schools of agricultural courses, these to be taken as a type of what might be offered in other industrial subjects.

The author not only acknowledges but most heartily welcomes the widespread demand for industrial education. But just as heartily does he disapprove of meeting that demand by the establishment of separate vocational schools of any kind, anywhere. This tendency, pedagogically bad, socially pernicious, Prof. Davenport as educator and citizen utterly condemns.

We are now engaged in the most stupendous educational, social and economic experiment the world has ever undertaken—the experiment of universal education; . . . and if it is all to result in further development of the race and not retrogression, then a few fundamentals must soon be clearly recognized:

First, universal education must contain a large element of the vocational, because all the needful activities must be maintained in the educated state as heretofore. The efficiency of the mass must be increased and not decreased by education.

Second, within the limits of needful activities one