

went to the convention with their husbands and voted on the nominations. They selected for their leading candidate a reformed member of the old Missouri Quantrell gang, who was not afraid of man or devil. Having made their nominations, they and their daughters solicited campaign funds and made a great success of it. He would have been a bold man who refused to contribute.

When the campaign began there was but one paper in the town and that was a saloon advocate. The women started another and they made it so warm for that editor that he made personal threats against the female editorial staff. They simply dared him to carry them out, and then called him perfectly awful names. They managed to secure the baseball club, the pride of San Jacinto, by their blandishments. They gave suppers of home cooking where they would do the most good. On election day they did not go near the polls, but sent their husbands to look after things while they remained in consultation. They had red hot frijoles and tamales set out on the lawns and walks for the voters. The young and pretty ones had some confidential talks with these voters. The husbands were instructed to keep their wives informed by telephone how things were going, and whenever a report came that things looked squally the reply would be, "Get busy! Have something doing," and immediately something was done.

When the result was announced, as already said, they caused the whistles to be blown, but did no more gloating over the defeated. They were satisfied with quiet congratulations among themselves and "told you sos" to their husbands, and then went back to their bridge whist as if nothing had happened. They did not cut their kindling wood with razors. It is a lesson to women's clubs of what may be done when women concentrate their energies upon a single object.

* * *

IS IT WABBLING, OR WHAT?

For The Public.

My second best friend Dobbs and I had a serious misunderstanding last week. The public may not care to know that my left eye is but little darker than its companion, and that Dobbs' nose has resumed its normal shape, but the cause of the rupture will no doubt merit attention and stand as a warning to those who care to read. It is worth while to remark here that I found hot water a good remedy for black eyes and face contusions, and Dobbs will probably never ask me to pay for his lunch again. So uncertain and transitory are our relations to our second best friends.

The trouble started when Dobbs said Roosevelt wobbled. I was inclined to let the matter rest until I looked into the dictionary and saw the iniquity that might be involved in the charge of wobbling, and then my temper got very warm.

The idea of charging a man with wobbling who never abandoned a friend, and who has consistently stood in the front ranks of every reform, from race suicide clear down to free trade in Standard Oil, was so repugnant to my notion of fair play that I called Dobbs to account at once.

"What do you mean by saying that Roosevelt is a wabblor?" I asked Dobbs in as gentle a tone as I could command.

"I didn't say he was a wabblor," replied Dobbs. "I merely remarked that he wobbled."

"Which is a distinction without any difference," said I.

"Have it as you will," said Dobbs; "I'll prove my point before I get through with you. Didn't Roosevelt say he wanted the Interstate Commerce Commission empowered to fix railroad rates at a reasonable figure whenever they were found to be unreasonable; and that he wanted the law made so the rates so fixed should remain in force until the decision of the Commission should be set aside or reversed by some court of competent jurisdiction?"

"I think he did say it, or words to that effect," said I.

"Does he now endorse a measure that leaves the power remaining in the courts to hold up the Interstate Commerce Commission indefinitely whenever the railroads desire to take it into court, or does he not?" queried Dobbs with a sneer spreading all over his countenance.

"Well! Suppose he does endorse such a measure? What of it?" I asked.

"Well, that's wobbling," asserted Dobbs.

"And I say it's not wobbling," I replied, with a good deal of heat. "It's just common ordinary good judgment. When a man has tackled a job and finds it's too big for him, and quits before he's beaten, you have no business to call it wobbling. A wise man knows when he's got enough."

And then Dobbs laughed, and laughed in such a manner that a policeman had to separate us.

It may be truthfully said that my opinion is unchanged, and Dobbs is stubborn, too.

JACKSON BIGGLES.

* * *

A PREACHER'S REPLY TO AN EDITOR.

Tom Watson's Magazine bears the motto: "Equal rights to all—special privileges to none."

His April number contains two editorials, one on the race and the other on the land question. These editorials strongly suggest the propriety of amending Mr. Watson's motto to read: Equal rights to all except Negroes—special privileges to none except landlords.

Nothing was to be expected of Mr. Watson on the race question. But we were not prepared to find from his pen a freshman's essay on the land question.

Mr. Watson says he sees no distinction "in principle between the private ownership of a cow and private ownership of a cow-lot."

Suppose the owner abandons both the cow and the cow-lot. Suppose he pays his taxes in order to retain his title, but decides to expend not another hour's labor on either the cow or the cow-lot. What happens? In a few days the cow dies; the lot remains. That is one point of distinction between cows and cow-lots which vitally affects the principle of ownership.

Now, suppose a prospector discovers coal on the adjoining lot, or suppose enterprising men build a great city on the surrounding land. In either case the owner can sell the lot for more than a man could make caring for a herd of cattle.

Coal mines are not discovered in cows. Neither

does it ever happen that beefsteak can be sold for ten thousand dollars a front foot. Yet Mr. Watson sees no distinction in principle between the private ownership of cows and cow-lots.

But Mr. Watson does say this: "As to the abuse of land ownership, that is an entirely different question. I agree that there should be no monopoly of land for speculative purposes."

Why not, Mr. Watson? Do you ever speak about the abuse of cow ownership? Suppose you have a cow, and do not choose to milk her. Are you under any obligation to let me milk her? If I were to insist upon any such right, would you not tell me to go raise my own cows? But when the United States Steel Trust says to its competitors: "Go, make another Connelsville coal field; these sixty thousand acres are all mine," you talk about the abuse of land ownership. Yet the Trust is simply applying to that coal field the same unqualified right of private ownership which you apply to your cow. How can you complain of that if, as you say, there is no distinction in principle between the ownership of cows and coal mines?

Would it not be well for Mr. Watson to get together with himself on this land question? For instance, he says: "Undoubtedly Nature teaches that the earth belongs in common to the entire human race." In the same breath he says: "Property in land differs in no wise from property in horses and cows." Then it must be the undoubted teaching of Nature that Mr. Watson's horses and cows belong in common to the entire human race.

In Pittsburg there is a lot which cost \$2,000 sixty years ago. It has increased in value 100 per cent every year. It is now worth \$120,000. This is just for the land, and it is twenty-four feet one way by one hundred the other. Mr. Watson, was that value added by the labor of the owner, or by the growth of Pittsburg? If the city made the value, why should not the city take the value?

HERBERT S. BIGELOW,
Pastor Vine Street Congregational Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

May 6, 1906.

* * *

SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM?

For The Public.

The destruction of monopoly does not mean the establishment of socialism. It does mean state and municipal ownership and control of the people's property. The people's property is every form of wealth which man has not created by his own labor. It includes every part of the land and water and air except what man by his labor has contributed. It includes coal, gas, oil and all other mineral deposits, and it includes all the benefits of location and natural fertility. Ultimately the land like the roadways will be the subject of private possession only to the extent necessary for individual labor and actual use. No man or corporation will be permitted to possess a road or a mine or a field or a city lot except so far as it may be necessary for his actual use. He will not be permitted to hoard or monopolize it. The proper use of a road is for passage only, and private right therein can extend no farther; but the proper use of a mine or a farm or a water power may extend to exclusive possession for generations if the pos-

essor and his heirs will continue to pay the rent therefor. But in either case the property is the people's, and will always be subject to the people's will and right of control.

It will be seen that franchises to use such public property as roadways or water power are the sources of all artificial monopoly, and the private ownership of land is the source of all natural monopoly. Practically all the monopolies in modern life arise from the private ownership of mines, oil fields, gas wells or franchises to run railroads through private and public property at will; or the right to lay pipes or conduits, or to place poles or rails in public streets for gas, electricity, water, telegraph or telephone or electric railways. Abolish these sources of monopoly and you have abolished monopoly. For monopoly has no other source of life than the power to exclusively enjoy some natural or artificial special privilege. We have not yet noticed in this country the baneful influence of unrestricted private ownership of land in general because land is so abundant, but particular forms of land monopolization as coal, oil, gas and other mineral deposits have become very apparent sources of evil. These and every other form of land monopoly will ultimately be abolished. The coal baron will be recognized to have just such a property in his mine as his labor entitles him to, and the unearned increment above this labor investment will be recognized as the people's, to whom he must pay tribute. This tribute in the form of rent or tax will be so heavy that he cannot afford to hold his property except in so far as he can profitably use it, and the monopolistic feature will thereby perish. The recent enormous Liberal victory in England upon the issue of taxation of land values was an indication of how the people are beginning to feel upon this proposition in places where the land has already been cornered.

It may be that the public will at times find it desirable to lease for a short term and under severe restrictions certain governmental rights of way for steam railroads, or in public streets for electric railroads or telephones or other public use; but the recognition of the impossibility of an exclusive private use in any one of these public rights or to land generally will become universal. We shall have an age when the right of each individual to use the earth and everything therein and thereon will be limited only by the like right of every other person to so use it. Then shall we have equality of opportunity—equal rights. But private ownership of property and the individual right to labor and to engage in a private enterprise will not be lost, but rather infinitely enlarged. This will not be socialism or anything like socialism. It will be an increase of individualism. It will be the restoration of competition in its fullness, and the establishment of a complete democracy in industry.

It is true that up to a certain point more capital will be required to conduct any business as industry advances. Factories and the expense of maintaining them will grow larger up to a certain point, but it is not true that the amount of capital necessary to conduct a competitive business in the future will be indefinitely increased. When these natural monopolies which arise from the exclusive private ownership of the land, and the artificial monopolies which arise