

question fundamentally. It grows out of the satanic spirit that regards some men as having inferior natural rights to other men. This is not a race spirit. When it breaks out against races that is only a local or temporary manifestation. Leisure classes everywhere have the same feeling and resort to the same arguments with reference to the disinherited toilers of their own race. The incident regarding Negroes referred to at the beginning of this paragraph is the neglect of the grand jury at Springfield, Ohio, to indict any of the lynching mob (vol. vi, p. 810) for the murder they committed in connection with their hanging of a Negro prisoner and their savage assault upon the Negro quarter of Springfield. Thus the lynching is officially approved. The Mayor of Springfield is reported as saying of the work of the grand jury that it—

was a farce from beginning to end. The country was put to a great expense and nothing accomplished. To my mind the jury did not want to accomplish anything. There were some men of prominent connections in the mob. They were seen in the jail by the police. They are known by the county officials, including the prosecuting attorney. It seemed that nearly everybody was filled with the spirit of the mob. Why, a prominent county official said in the mayor's office on the night of the fire that, but for his position, he would in all probability have been down to help in the lynching.

Chicago newspapers tell of a personal property assessor who has been detected as a hold-up man. That seems quite consistent. The vocation of assessing personal property for taxation must be extremely well calculated to develop larcenous instincts. Personal property taxation is itself nothing but a hold-up.

An interesting tax exhibit was made by the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, in its issue of April 20. It compared the assessments of railroad property in Spokane with those of other property, showing that enormous discriminations are made in favor of the Northern Pacific Railroad company. The extent of these discrim-

inations may be inferred from the following table, in which the first and third perpendicular columns represent building sites and the middle column represents the railroad right-of-way between them. The lines across the column state the assessed values between streets:

	Building Sites Owned by Individual Owners.....	Railroad Right of Way.....	Building Sites Owned by Railroad.....
	Per sq. ft.	Per sq. ft.	Per sq. ft.
First square.....	23c	1½c	15c
Second square.....	23c	1½c	17c
Third square.....	28c	14-10c	20c
Fourth square.....	44c	2c	23c
Fifth square.....	55c	2c	24c

This discrimination in the State of Washington is about like that which Mayor Johnson exposed in Ohio; but in Ohio Messrs. Hanna, Herrick and the other "business" politicians appear to have convinced the voters that it is generous and righteous.

Another protest against the police "sweat box" (vol. v, pp. 308, 312, 322, 434; vol. vi, p. 20) comes to our attention. It appears in American Medicine, a Philadelphia publication. "What have judges and lawyers been about to permit such barbaric anachronisms in the twentieth century?" asks the writer. Well may he ask it. The "sweat box" is a brutal and lawless device of detectives. Every policeman who uses it is a conscious criminal who ought to be indicted. Yet judges slyly wink at it and then gravely wonder at the growing disregard for law and contempt of courts.

THE FICTITIOUS CENSUS INCREASE OF SMALL FARMS.

According to the United States census there was, during the last decade, not only a stupendous increase in farm acreage, but also in the number of farms. As was shown by my editorial in the Public of April 16th (p. 21), this increase in farm acreage is chiefly due to the enumeration in 1900 of vast tracts of unimproved land that were excluded from enumeration at previous censuses as not properly constituting a part of the farming area of the country.

These unimproved tracts, though embracing an enormous area, are so comparatively few in number that their enumeration fails to explain the remarkable increase in the number of farms. Remarks regarding the number and the average size of farms found in the text of the census lead to the conclusion that the great increase in the number of farms in the older settled sections of the country is due to a decrease in the size of farms resulting from a subdivision of large farms. While it is likely that this is true to some extent in certain sections, it is not true to the extent that census figures seem to indicate and appears to have been more than offset by a general tendency toward larger farms.

That this tendency exists is admitted in the text of the census, where, after noting the decrease in the average size of farms in sections devoted to the cultivation of cotton the agricultural statistician remarks:

"Nowhere in the Northern States has there been a like decrease in the average size of farms. The average in Maine has increased from 97.2 acres in 1850 to 106.2 acres in 1900; in New Hampshire from 116.0 acres to 123.1 acres; and in Vermont from 138.6 acres to 142.7 acres. In most counties of these States the leading agricultural pursuit is dairying, and, owing to the fact that in this industry very small farms can not properly support a family, the farms are being sold and the land absorbed into larger holdings. This movement can be traced in all the dairy sections of the North Atlantic division. In such States as Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Connecticut this increase in the size of farms in the dairy sections has been more than counterbalanced by the subdivision of old farms near cities for use in the growing of fruits and vegetables, which accounts for the decrease in the average area of the farms of these States. The same conditions have been operative in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, diminishing the average size of all farms for those States, although not materially affecting that of farms devoted to diversified agriculture."

The trouble with this explanation of the increase in number of small farms is that it does not appear to be true.

It is reasonable to suppose that the causes which have resulted in the consolidation of dairy farms would lead to a like consolidation of fruit and vegetable farms.

An increase in the number of small farms in the neighborhood of large cities resulting from a subdivision of larger ones would not result in an increase in the total farm acreage, and it is noticeable that census figures show an increase in farm area in these localities closely corresponding to the increase in the number of farms. It is also noticeable that census figures indicate an increase in farming area in cotton growing sections, which appears to account for a large proportion of the increase in the number of small farms in those sections.

The true explanation of the great increase in the number of small farms appears to be, first: a deficient enumeration in 1890, and, second: the enumeration at the present census of hundreds of thousands of small tracts of land that were excluded from enumeration at previous censuses as not properly constituting farms. Some of these are the suburban homes of professional and business men cultivated for pleasure and not for profit, and others are mere cabbage or potato patches on city and village lots like the Pingree potato patches in the south division of Chicago, which the writer knows to have been enumerated as farms at the present census.

Evidence of this is found in the increased acreage shown for localities where it is impossible that there could have occurred any considerable actual increase, but where, on the contrary, we should expect a decrease owing to the growth of cities, and the appropriation of territory for other than agricultural purposes. In Illinois, for instance, there appears an increase in farm acreage of 2,296,451 acres, and in Cook county, much the larger part of which is embraced within the limits of the city of Chicago, we find an increase in acreage of 19,178 acres, the increase in the number of farms being 1,383. This is 30 square miles of territory, and if in one tract would occupy an extent six miles long and five miles wide. In Ohio the increase shown amounts to 1,149,577 acres, and in Hamilton county of that state, which embraces Cincinnati, there appears an increase of 22,367 acres, which is very nearly 35 square miles of territory. In Cuyahoga county, embracing the city of Cleveland,

which during the decade increased its population by 120,325, there is shown an increase in farm acreage of 7,669 acres. In the counties embracing the rapidly growing cities of Detroit and Grand Rapids, Michigan, there are shown increases of 12,018 and 42,700 acres respectively, which is 18.7 square miles of territory for the former and 63.5 square miles for the latter city. Even in New York county, the seat of New York city, as constituted before the creation of Greater New York, we find that the number of farms increased from 12 to 184, and the number of acres from 413 to 2,599. This increase represents an extent of farm territory a mile wide and 3.1 miles long. For Erie county, the seat of Buffalo, there is shown an increase in farm acreage of 19,301 acres, or over 30 square miles; and for Henrico county, including Richmond City, Va., there appears an increase from 78,025 acres in 1890 to 120,861 acres in 1900, which is an increase of over 66 square miles of territory.

Of the stupendous increase in the number of farms in the last decade, the census shows considerably more than one-half as an increase in farms under 50 acres in area, which increase is more than four times the increase of such farms during the preceding decade. The increase in the number of farms of less than 20 acres is shown as nearly 12 times as great from 1890 to 1900, as from 1880 to 1890.

According to the census the increase in the number of farms of less than 50 acres was as follows:

Farms—	Increase.		Increase.	
	1890 to 1900.	p'c't	1880 to 1890.	p'c't
Under ten acres.....	118,252	78.7	10,953	7.8
Ten and under 20 acres.....	141,462	49.5	10,501	4.2
Twenty and under 50 acres.....	355,008	39.3	121,203	15.5

That there could have been during the last decade a tendency toward small farms so decidedly different from the tendency of the preceding decade cannot be supposed. That there was no such increase in the number of farms since 1890 as appears from the figures of the agricultural census is shown conclusively by census statistics of occupation compiled from the population schedules. According to these statistics the increase in the number of persons

reporting themselves as occupied in operating farms was for the decade 1880-1890 two and a half times the increase for the decade 1890-1900, in which, according to the agricultural census, there was so remarkable an increase in the number of farms.

The following table shows the number of farms as reported on the agricultural schedules, and also the number of farmers, including planters and overseers, together with dairymen, gardeners, vinegrowers and apiarists, as appears from the population schedules at the last three censuses:

Year.	No. of farms.	Increase during decade.	No. of farms.	Increase during decade.
1900.....	5,739,657	1,175,016	5,756,981	421,823
1890.....	4,564,641	555,734	5,334,158	1,090,503
1880.....	4,008,907	4,243,655

If we place any reliance whatever upon census statistics of occupation, we must conclude that the increase in the number of farms was much greater from 1880 to 1890 than from 1890 to 1900.

No satisfactory explanation has been offered by the census office of the wide discrepancy between census figures of the number of farms and the number of persons operating them, and no satisfactory explanation can be found except by a discovery of facts which the census office has sought to conceal.

In his introduction to the final reports, Mr. L. J. Powers, chief statistician for agriculture of the present census, remarks: "The statistics of agriculture here presented do not, therefore, include any data relating to mines or quarries, to animal products or crops raised by persons who pursue some calling other than agriculture, but incidentally care for a tract of land too small to be regarded as a farm." While this is true as to previous censuses, it does not appear to be the truth as to the present census. Regarding this matter we have statements of Statistician Powers found in preliminary census bulletins that flatly contradict this statement found in the final reports. In the preliminary bulletin for the state of New Jersey we find, for instance, this statement by way of explanation: "There are 259 farms varying in area from three to 1,000 acres which report no income. The comparatively high

average value of the land and buildings of these farms indicate that many of them are summer homes or country estates held for pleasure and not for profit. A considerable number of the farms with reported incomes of less than \$50 doubtless belong to the same class."

Another form of explanation we find in the Kentucky bulletin: "Other farms with small reported incomes are doubtless the suburban or summer homes of city merchants and professional men who derive their principal incomes from other than agricultural pursuits."

In the Michigan bulletin we find this statement regarding farms with little or no income: "This class of farms includes all farms opened for cultivation too late to produce a crop in 1899; all farms idle in the year; the numerous homes or country estates along the lakes which are not held for the profit to be derived from operation."

In view of these and other statements of the same tenor found in census bulletins over Mr. Powers' signature, it appears remarkable that he should declare in the final reports that the statistics of agriculture "do not include any data relating to crops raised by persons pursuing some calling other than agriculture, but incidentally care for a tract of land too small to be regarded as a farm."

Further evidence of the inclusion as farms at the present census, of numerous tracts of land which must have been excluded from enumeration at the census of 1890 is found in a statement given to the press by Statistician Powers and published in the Chicago Record of March 11, 1901, in which that official gave approximately the figures that would be published by the census office, and asserted an unprecedented increase both of tenant farms and those operated by their owners.

Regarding the increase of farms in the "black belt" Mr. Powers then stated: "Many of these 200,000 additional farms in these States are unquestionably small places cultivated by members of families of wage earners and used by them as homes. Others are small tracts of land without buildings tilled by unmarried men and women." Thus we have an explanation

of the remarkable increase in the number of farms in cotton-growing sections which, as we have seen, is stated in the final reports to be the result of the dividing up of plantations into smaller farms, for most farms of this character would have been excluded from enumeration in 1890.

The instructions to enumerators at the census of 1890, which were substantially the same as the instructions in 1870 and 1880, were as follows:

Farms for the purposes of the agricultural schedules, include besides what are commonly known as farms, all considerable nurseries, orchards and market gardens, owned by separate parties, which are cultivated for pecuniary profit and employ as much as the labor of one able-bodied workman during the year. Mere cabbage and potato patches, family vegetable gardens and ornamental lawns, not constituting a portion of a farm for general agricultural purposes, will be excluded. No farm will be reported of less than three acres unless \$500.00 worth of produce has been actually sold from it during the year. The latter proviso will allow the inclusion of many market gardens in the neighborhood of large cities where, although the area is small, a high state of cultivation is maintained and considerable values are produced.

These instructions were plainly printed on the schedules on which census enumerators made their report. The instructions to enumerators appearing upon census schedules of the present census and which purported to be full instructions as to the enumeration of farms were as follows:

What Constitutes a Farm.—A farm for census purposes, is the land under one management, though consisting of different tracts, upon which agricultural products, including animals and fowls, are produced.

Following this are instructions as to reporting acreage, value of crops, etc., which may be found on page 758, Part I of the Agricultural Census, and need not be quoted here, as they have no bearing on the point at issue.

Following these instructions as to farms in general we find the following:

Market Gardens, Etc.—All considerable market truck and fruit gardens, nurseries, greenhouses, etc., should be reported as farms, but family gardens on city and village lots the product of which are used exclusively for home

consumption are not to be considered as farms.

By plain implication if any part of the product was sold the tract of land was to be reported as a farm.

It is true that there were other instructions, but these were buried in a mass of general instructions as to enumeration of population, manufactures, etc. These instructions are quoted in the text of the census and are as follows:

For census purposes market, truck and fruit gardens, orchards, nurseries and cranberry marshes, greenhouses and city dairies are "farms." Provided, the entire time of at least one individual is devoted to their care. This statement, however, does not refer to gardens in cities or towns which are maintained by persons for the use or enjoyment of their families and not for gain.

That census enumerators were generally guided by the instructions found upon census schedules, and paid no attention to the limitations of the instructions found in the pamphlet is evident not only from the statements of Statistician Powers found in census bulletins which have been quoted, but also by the facts shown in Table 4, from which we discover the number of farms of different classifications reporting no income and incomes less than \$50, \$100, and \$250.

It is absurd to suppose save in exceptional cases that farms with a product of less than \$100 in value could have required the constant services of one individual unless that individual were a woman, child or cripple. They certainly could not have required the constant services of one able-bodied workman, which was the requirement of the census of 1890.

It is noticeable that while the census statistician in the text of the census seeks to convey the impression that there was no difference in instruction to enumerators at the different censuses save as to farms of less than three acres, he takes no note of the wide difference between the labor of one individual and of one able-bodied man.

Referring to table 4, Part 1, Agricultural Census, which gives the number of farms with specified value of products, and table 51, showing the increase in the number of farms, we find that while there was an increase in the num-

ber of farms less than 10 acres during the last decade of 118,252, that the number of farms of less than 10 acres with a product of less than \$100 was 114,043. It appears also that the number of farms of this size with a product of less than \$250 was 214,326. Very few of these could have been reported according to the requirements of the census of 1890, for very few could have required the services of one able-bodied workman. The increase in the number of farms over 10 and under 20 acres was 141,462, and the number with a product of less than \$100 was 106,146. The number reporting a product of less than \$250 was 288,719. Of farms over 20 and under 50 acres we find the ten years' increase to have been 355,008, and the number with a product less than \$100, 147,784. The number with a product of less than \$250 was 602,688.

Considering that from this product must come not only the farmer's recompense for his labor, but also the return for investment, it appears that few farms with a product of less than \$250 could have met the requirements of the census schedules of 1890. Taking farms in the South Atlantic and South Central divisions with products of less than \$100, and those North Atlantic, North Central and Western divisions reporting a product of less than \$250, and we have a total number of farms under 50 acres of 650,659, which number exceeds the increase in the number of farms of less than 50 acres by 35,937.

To arrive at a correct conclusion as to the actual increase in the number of farms during the last decade, we must also consider, besides the foregoing facts, that the census enumeration of 1890 was notoriously deficient and unreliable. This was unquestionably due in large measure to the fact that the census office had been made a part of the political machine and that appointments of census enumerators were made with little regard to fitness. Another reason, and perhaps the most important one, was that stated by Congressman Hopkins, of Illinois, in introducing the bill for the present census. He is reported in the Congressional Record, vol. 32, p. 1,510, as saying:

"The only trouble was that such a mass of information was required from the enumerators that their returns were not accurate and in many cases had to be taken again. . . . Under such circumstances it will readily be seen that accurate and desirable information, such as should be embodied in a report of this character, could not be collected." In this debate Congressman Johnson, of Indiana, said: "Mr. Carroll D. Wright, who succeeded Mr. Porter in his office, declared positively, and I think that we all have reason to know his statement to be true, that the last census was an exceedingly unreliable one and was also a very expensive piece of work."

That there exists a "possibility" that all the farms of the nation were not enumerated in 1890 is admitted by Statistician Powers who, as supporting such conclusion, on p. lxxi, Part I, Agricultural Census, presents a table in which the number of farms as reported on the agricultural schedules in 1890 is compared with the number of farm families as shown in the report on Farms and Homes of that census. According to this comparative table the number of farm homes, as shown by the latter report, is 4,767,179, which is greater by 202,538 than the number of farms as given in the agricultural reports.

It is noticeable that while Mr. Powers quotes the figures of the report on Farms and Homes as having been compiled from the population schedules, he makes no mention of the fact that the statistics of occupation, also compiled from the population schedules, show the number of persons engaged in operating farms in 1890 as 5,354,158, which is more than three-quarters of a million greater than the number of farms reported on the agricultural schedules, and more than half a million greater than the number of farm homes as given in the report on farms and homes. It is evident that the farms most likely to be omitted by census enumerators would be the small and not the large ones.

Considering these facts, it appears that the great increase in small farms, like the great increase in farm acreage indicated by the census for the last decade, is fictitious.

HENRY L. BLISS.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

KANSAS.

Topeka, Kan., May 2.—Ever since the dismissal of Prof. James H. Canfield as professor of political economy in the University of Kansas by a Republican board of regents, some twenty years ago, because he taught political economy in a scientific and fearless manner, that study has been practically barred in that institution. In its stead is taught something called sociology. But everything relating to taxation, land tenure, tariffs, currency systems, public utilities, corporations, trusts, etc., is looked upon as dangerous and improper. Any student daring to ask a question upon these topics is silenced by an icy stare and an ominous shrug of the shoulders.

The students' time is employed in an aimless study of unrelated details of personal and family life, habits of tramps, routines of life and labor by different classes of workers, and life in asylums, jails, poorhouses, etc. As a sample of what the professor of political economy calls excellent original research by an advanced student I copy the following from the student's study of farm life:

The house is of stone, on a south hillside, near the center of the farm and contains fourteen rooms. Some of the rooms have carpets on the floors and in one is a bookcase, two rockers and several straight-backed wooden chairs. The sleeping rooms are upstairs and the dining-room, laundry and kitchen downstairs. The eight horses are of Perchon, Clydesdale, Hambletonian or mixed breeds. The cattle are Shorthorn, Hereford, Jersey and Galway breeds—about fifty in number. The hogs are Jersey Duroc breed, the poultry Plymouth Rocks, and the dog shepherd.

He does not give the cat's pedigree, but it was probably mixed.

And people are taxed to pay the professor \$2,500 a year. Moreover, he actually threatens to write a book on political economy and sociology for use in schools and colleges! Government by injunction might do some good in his case.

Not long ago I talked with a recent graduate of this department of our State university and found him profoundly ignorant of even the rudiments of the science. In place of any knowledge of economic principles or authors he had a mass of utterly useless details, totally unrelated. That satraps of plutocracy are very distrustful of this study is natural, but it is rare that one is so frank as one of our Kansas Congressmen when he said to me: "I don't believe there is really anything in this stuff they call political economy, but what some feller has got up in his own head to try to hurt the Republican party."

W. H. T. WAKEFIELD.

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, April 1.—The Federal parliament has now been