

O Bicyclades; for instance, how to drive a nail; yet the carpenter does not need to call his compass a kuklographonate in order to be employed. He doesn't even call himself a Professor of Lumber Surgery."

"No, for it requires more skill and longer training to be a doctor than to be a carpenter; therefore we give the doctor due honor by a title."

"Are all doctors, then, skilled and well trained, Bicyclades?"

"In truth, no; many of them know very little. Indeed, to be a watchmaker takes more skill than most doctors have."

"But does the watchmaker call himself a Horological Doctor, or a Professor of Tickbrontonomy?"

"No, Socrates, for the watchmaker, like the carpenter, depends for his success upon his skill, of which anyone can judge. Whereas no one can judge the skill of the physician."

"But if his patients get well, does it not show that the physician is skillful, Bicyclades?"

"By Hercules, no; for nature usually makes persons well, anyhow, in most cases—if we let them alone; and of course the patients of even the greatest physicians will die when they get diseases sufficiently severe."

"Then the man who called his tool a Dismorphostapalimklast was not a fool, Bicyclades; was he not rather a swindler?"

"No, Socrates, he was only a fakir, for he supplied what people wanted."

"What is it to fake, Bicyclades?"

"It is to sell to the simple at a wondrous price that which is simple in itself."

"Is not Medicine, then, the greatest of fakes?"

"It appears to be so, unless we except Theology—and Philosophy, Socrates."—Bolton Hall.

* * *

THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

One object of government is to build men. Men are built by responsibility. Rob a man of the right to do wrong, and you take away his chance to grow. Communities no more than men can be kept in leading strings without a loss of strength. Put the referendum in the city charter and let the citizens vote down good measures if they do not know any better. Let them swim. Let them work blunders. Let them learn by experience. Let them have a direct voice in their government. That will increase responsibility. That will stimulate the discussion of questions referred to the people. That will in time raise the level of intelligence, awaken public spirit, develop civic virtue and make better men.

In Los Angeles, Cal., when a city ordinance is passed, or a franchise granted, or a bridge voted for, in short, when any unpopular measure is passed, the citizens can, by a petition of five per cent. of the voters, compel the authorities to refer the measure to them at the next regular election. This is self-government. This is the veto power in the hands of the voters. It is the principle of the old New England town meeting applied to our more complex conditions.

The initiative and referendum would prevent changes to which the people have not been educated. The Socialists in Oregon failed to get the necessary eight per cent. of the voters to sign petitions to submit their proposals to a referendum. Professor John R. Commons, of the University of Wisconsin, while favoring the initiative and referendum, insists that it will be a disappointment to reformers. Under this provision changes must wait for a change in public opinion. But by assuring this, the interests not only of the conservatives are served, but also of the reformers; for if a reform cannot come until the people are ready for it, when it does come it will stay.

It is sometimes urged against the initiative and referendum that the people will take little interest in the referendum vote, and that questions would therefore be determined by a comparative few. This has not been the case where the referendum has been tried. But even if it were so, it is an argument for this proposal and not against it. We frequently hear the complaint that our suffrage is debased by our ignorant vote. This is a plan of eliminating the ignorant vote, not by complex machinery and arbitrary regulations, but naturally and automatically. This plan puts a premium upon intelligence. In the Chicago referendums the vote was lightest in the slum and river wards.

Government of the people by the rascals for the rich—that is Lincoln Steffens' statement of the case. In the large cities this is the exact situation. The rascally politicians make the laws, and they make them in the interests, not of the people whom they are supposed to represent, but in the interests of the corporations.

With the initiative and referendum we may realize the hope of a government of the people, by the people, for the people.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

* * *

THE ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

From "What Is the Liberal Policy?" by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Prime Minister of Great Britain, in *The World To-day*, for March, 1906.

It may accurately be said that there is practically but one great impediment in the way of a sweeping improvement which would elevate the physical and moral welfare of the people. This is the interest, and the overdue regard to the interest, of the landowner, and the political and social influence that he and his class can exercise. Let the value of land be assessed independently of the buildings upon it, and upon such valuation let contributions be made to those public services which create the value.

What is our rating system? It is a tax upon industry and labor, upon enterprise, upon improvement; it is a tax which is the direct cause of much of the suffering and overcrowding in the towns. Overcrowding is not a symptom only, but a cause of poverty, because it demoralizes its victims and forces them to find relief in excesses. By throwing the taxes on site values, communities which have created these values will be set free, free in the sense that they can expand, free to direct their own destinies.

Foremost among our domestic duties is the succor of the masses who are in poverty. If it can be shown that poverty, whether it be material poverty or poverty of physique and of energy, is associated with economic conditions which, though supported by the laws of the country, are nevertheless contrary to economic laws and considerations and to public policy, the State can intervene without fear of doing harm. Is there any lack of such conditions among us? I fear not. The country is still largely governed by castes, and it has to compete with nations which have shaken off feudal ways and privileges which we continue to tolerate.

It can not be too often repeated and enforced that the way to go to work to organize the home market is not the crude and unequal and exploded method of setting up tariffs. It is to raise the standard of living, abolishing those centers of stagnant misery which are a disgrace to our name, and when once the home market is so organized the demand for

labor will be larger and more sustained, and more capable of insuring itself against fluctuation.

The wisest course is to attack these bad conditions boldly and fearlessly, to abolish them, or, if we can not do that, to modify them; deal rigorously with vested interests and monopolies which cause public injury or stand in the way of improvement; enlarge the powers of local authorities, readjust our taxing system, and so alter our land laws as to increase the supply of houses and of available land in town and country alike; equalize burdens local as well as imperial; give—as far as laws and customs can give it—give a chance to every man.

Give every man a chance; those are the lines of progress and development. It is along those lines that lies the path of prosperity, happiness and strength. There lies the true wisdom, and not false, sham wisdom; true patriotism, and not tinsel patriotism; true imperialism, and not treacherous imperialism.

THE CLOSED SHOP.

Fred J. Miller of East Orange, N. J., in the *New York Evening Post*.

The statements put forward by and on behalf of the anthracite coal-mine operators—which are the anthracite coal roads and which again compose the anthracite coal monopoly—to the effect that they stand unalterably opposed to the closed-shop idea sound very well but will not bear examination. Whether they oppose or favor the closed-shop idea depends entirely upon whose closed shop it is. Undoubtedly they oppose the miners' closed shop, but how about the closed shop they themselves maintain? It is a matter of common knowledge, and no longer denied, that the coal roads own and control over 90 per cent of the anthracite coal lands and mines; that they allow only so much coal to be produced in any given period of time as they think will best serve their purpose of getting out of coal consumers the last penny possible to be extracted from them; that the State of Pennsylvania helps them to maintain this monopoly by assessing their unused coal lands at a nominal valuation as "unproductive farm lands"; that at meetings held periodically in New York the representatives of this trust get together and decide how much anthracite coal shall be mined and brought to market during the period under consideration and what proportion of the total each road shall be allowed to bring in; that here in the Oranges—and I suppose the same conditions prevail elsewhere—there is a retail coal dealers' association, and that unless a retailer belongs to this association he will not be able to buy anthracite coal ("it has all been contracted for by the association"), and finally that if one who proposes to engage in the business applies for membership in this association he is informed that "the membership is filled, there are no vacancies." If this is not the closed shop then what is it?

The retail coal dealer in this section is no more at liberty to exercise his own judgment as to what he will do or what he will not do in the conduct of his own business than is the individual union printer free to decide what he will or will not do with respect to wages, hours of labor, etc. The terms upon which he sells coal are dictated to him by the association to which he belongs, and that association is dominated and controlled by the anthracite Trust. In view of these facts of common knowledge, is it true that the "mine operators" are opposed to the closed shop? Is it not clear that whether they are opposed or in favor depends entirely upon which closed shop you talk about, theirs or the miners'?

I do not say that the operators ought to cease opposing the closed-shop idea, for I believe that idea is fundamentally wrong, but I do most emphatically believe that those who support the coal operators in their contention against the closed shop of the miners ought never to cease calling attention to the fact that the operators themselves maintain a closed shop which is at least equally wrong in principle and far more to be feared, not only on account of its effect upon our pocketbooks and upon the manner of life of our poorer people, but also because of its effect upon our legislatures and our public life generally. Closed shops are wrong because they are monopolies; but those who oppose them must, to be consistent and to escape the charge of being insincere, oppose all other monopolies, including that of the coal mines and the coal-carrying roads.

REAL-ESTATE REFORM IN EUROPE

From The Review of Reviews for March, 1905.

Socialism and capitalism will be reconciled only when land monopoly has been abolished. This is the opinion of Mr. Johan Hanson, a Swedish economist. Writing in the *Social Tidskrift* (Stockholm), Mr. Hanson reviews the land-ownership situation in both Europe and America.

As early as the middle of the eighteenth century, this writer reminds us, there were those who foresaw the evil results of private ownership of land. It was not until 1880, however, that an American, Henry George, first brought the problem of land-ownership forcibly to public notice. Mr. George's ideas have, in general, been accepted by real estate reformers. The practical application is the only point at which the views diverge.

After discussing the single tax theory as held in the United States, and complimenting Mayor "Tom" Johnson, of Cleveland, as the American Tolstoy, the Swedish economist turns to Canada. He says:

In Manitoba, farming land has been rented successfully on a system based on the principles of Henry George, which should dispel any doubts as to their advantages. The Single Tax Association of Toronto, where enormous rents prevailed, has also won a victory. Their programme, higher taxes on the value of property and less on the buildings, conquered at the last elections, in spite of the opposition of the authorities. In Australia and New Zealand the movement for real estate reform is making great strides of progress, because laboring men are less prejudiced by the socialists than in Europe. The single-tax associations are better organized than those in America.

Mr. Hanson asserts that British real estate taxation is the "most abnormal in the world."

In spite of reforms during the last decade, practical results are yet to be expected, though probably near at hand. There are two reform associations,—the Land Nationalization Society and the League for the Taxation of Land Values. Under the leadership of Dr. A. R. Wallace, the former organization contends for the appropriation of private land by degrees, its organ being *Land and Labor*, of London. The latter organization advocates the Henry George system. The organ for single tax is the *Land Values*, of London and Glasgow.

In Germany, real estate reformers have organized the *Bund der Deutschen Bodenreformer*.

For thirty years German writers have contended for the same principles as are advocated to-day. In 1872, the physician, Dr. Th. Stamm, issued a work in which almost the same views as those of Henry George were held forth. The present association was founded in 1888, and for some time advocated the principles of Henry George with a radical platform. Yet single tax, as well as the nationalization principle, met with insurmountable obstacles in Germany, and the above association was therefore reorganized in 1898. The platform, briefly summarized, states that land shall be controlled so that the