

which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

The vote on this resolution, taken February 14, stood 29 to 29. The vice president cast his vote in the negative, and the amendment was defeated. Be it noted that, of the ten democratic senators who voted in favor of the treaty ratification, only two—Senators Morgan and McEnery—voted against the Bacon amendment. This completely exonerates Mr. Bryan, so far as his influence extended, from the charge of selfishly desiring imperialism as an issue in this campaign. Had he fought the ratification of the treaty, he could very justly have been accused of being a narrow minded, rancorous, political obstructionist. He threw his whole influence in the direction of adopting a wise, humane, and noble American policy toward the Filipinos, thus rising above selfish partisan considerations in the plane of patriotic statesmanship.

#### ELEMENTS OF THE CAMPAIGN ISSUES.

For The Public.

Now that we have the declarations of both of the great political parties, some speculation ought not to be amiss as to the relative strength of their positions.

The two principal issues of the campaign, those of trusts and imperialism, are at bottom moral questions, which, in order to be intelligently decided, require an understanding of fundamental principles that are by no means generally understood.

It will, for example, become necessary for the citizen to decide whether it is right for one nation to make subjects of another nation, regardless of present day practices, and with seeming prospects of gain and glories of war to prejudice him in favor of an affirmative answer.

The element of gain will also enter the trust as well as the half dormant tariff issues, inasmuch as both of these are backed by powerful moneyed interests; and, in the case of the tariff, at least—the trust promoters not having had time as yet to confuse the public mind—a great many still regard it with superstitious reverence as a source of national prosperity.

Assuming—for the sake of argument, if it is not unreservedly granted—that the republican party stands sponsor for those issues; the democratic party, it is notorious, is their

avowed opponent. The position of the latter may be summed up as follows: On the expansion question, relinquishing of territory acquired; on the trust question, abolition of trusts; on the tariff question, abolition of its protecting features. These measures, all of them negations of those issues of republican creation, are urged by the democrats on grounds of equity.

So it will be seen that the prospects of material gain are seemingly almost entirely on the republican side, while the democrats have scarcely anything to offer except Righteous Indignation.

On one side we shall therefore, have all the appeals to the passion of gain, and all the forces inseparable therefrom; while on the other hand, we shall simply have appeals to Justice, seemingly irrespective of Material Gain. And the question of the success or failure of either party rests upon the question as to which has the strongest hold upon the majority of Americans, Sense of Justice, or Passion for Gain.

Those who have not already become blinded in the present intense struggle for wealth will have no difficulty in deciding for Justice. But, is there not enough of the "Gentleman of Fortune" in the American citizen for Gain to outweigh Justice with him? Time will tell!

Thus the question arises as to whether it is necessary that a clear separation be made between Justice and Gain; whether it is necessary to weaken the cause of Justice by implying that it must be accompanied by material loss—an implication seemingly involved in the negative answers of the democratic platform to the questions at issue.

So long has Justice been associated with self-sacrifice that it has become difficult to understand how material gain may be made by moral conduct.

Now, is that implication necessary for the reason that there are no positive moral answers to those questions? Or must it be admitted that present-day democrats are not sufficiently enlightened to answer those questions?

The latter seems to be the case. Present day democracy, radical as it is becoming, is not the elemental democracy of the days of Jefferson; nor is it possessed of the knowledge so highly developed in our day, and so much more essential on account of our more complex conditions—the elemental knowledge of man's relation to his environment.

In the light of that knowledge it would be well to inquire into the issues now before the nation.

To come directly to the point: What is the expansion question? In sober truth, laying aside the historical events which led up to the war, what is that public sentiment — for public sentiment it is—which has led up to this desire for territorial expansion, but a manifestation of that universal desire which has been aptly described as "land hunger?" On every hand we hear that "this country is getting too crowded." And, are not these two statements frequently made—contradictory as they are—that "we want new markets for our surplus products," and "new countries for our idle laborers to develop?"

Living in a country that is still in the pioneer stages and one of the most sparsely populated, why should our very laborers themselves express such sentiments, if it were not for the fact, that they do not know that their own country is still large enough to accommodate with comfort many times its present population, and, furthermore, that the use of this, their country, is withheld from them by our present land-tenure laws!

The expansion sentiment being simply a struggle for space on the earth, is but the old question of man's relation to the land of his country. So long as that question remains unanswered we will have expansion of the kind now being urged, the kind of expansion of which imperialism is a necessary complement; since, if we wish to add new territory to our domains by force we must prepare to hold it by force. Friendly relations, without any extension of our governmental authority over other countries, is the only expansion necessary!

Those are facts which ought to be patent to all those who wish to oppose successfully the present expansion movement. To be ignorant of them is to beg the whole question of territorial expansion, and to plead one's inability to cope with it. For it must be admitted that the expansion movement is the expression of a popular desire that is a real desire, a want that is a real want, and not mere fancy or fad of the present moment. It is repeated in history again and again; and the response has always been the same: subjugation of foreign territory and races.

Since the expansion movement is an expression of a want of land, it would

seem like a foregone conclusion that it should be accompanied or preceded by some domestic movement which made land at home difficult of access or artificially scarce. That there has been such a movement is becoming more and more apparent; and, the second important issue of the campaign, the trust issue, is an evidence of that fact. For the trust, instead of being of recent origin, is simply the latest development of the land speculation movement, the name of which is familiar to most people, but the real nature of which is less known—a movement the tendency of which is to arbitrarily diminish the land of the country.

A young country, rich in minerals, fertile in soil and favorable for the carrying on of commerce, it has been settled almost entirely with a view to material gain. In such a country a most superficial observer ought not to find it difficult to conclude that, while land could be had for a low price large portions of it fell into private hands, and these, when the land became more densely populated, rose to an enormous value.

It is this land speculation movement that has so rapidly developed a condition where one corporation owns almost all the iron-bearing land of the country; another, the coal deposits; a third, the oil fields; a fourth, such large portions of the agricultural land that the horizon becomes inadequate for its boundary. It is that condition which enables individuals to own large portions of the most valuable area of our cities, and corporations to hold their populations mercilessly by the throat. These are the real bases of the trusts.

So the concentration of land ownership in a few private hands goes on on one hand, while the cry goes up for more land on the other.

If these things are admitted and deemed wrong, what other right or rational way can there be to stop them but to abolish that system which makes the land at home unavailable to the masses of the people—the system of private land monopoly?

Now, private land monopoly is made possible in one and in only one way, and that is by the private appropriation of that value which attaches to land as a result of population and social advancement, known to political economists as economic rent.

This private appropriation of rent, sustained and protected by our present land-tenure laws, acts as a barrier against the use of land. By means of that barrier it is that by far the greatest part of the land of the United States

is kept vacant. That barrier we must remove if we wish to abolish private land monopoly.

How can it be removed? By stopping private appropriation of rent? Very well, but we cannot do away with rent. If it is prevented from going into private hands we must appropriate it for public use. That is the answer; that is the "simple yet sovereign remedy."

This answer, at the same time that it solves the expansion and the trust problems, also solves the question of public revenue, and as a result the tariff question will cease to exist.

This will be recognized as a rough outline of Henry George's single tax proposition; and further amplification of it may be dispensed with here by a reference to that most admirable of books, "Progress and Poverty."

Democrats ought to be interested to know that this proposition is in perfect alignment with the teachings of Jefferson. In a letter to President Madison, dated Fontainebleau, October 23, 1785, Mr. Jefferson uses these words:

The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on; if, for the encouragement of industry, we allow it to be appropriated, we must take care that other employment be furnished those excluded from the appropriation. If we do not, the fundamental right to labor the earth returns to the unemployed.

In the same letter he makes this suggestion:

Another means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation, below a certain point, and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression as they rise.

There are many hopeful signs in the present position of the democratic party. Its protests against the present evil tendency in national affairs embody the principles of true democracy. But let it not be forgotten that those evil tendencies are merely surface manifestations of an evil which lies at the roots of our social institutions, to merely suppress which would be like stopping the rot of a tree whose roots worms were eating out, by cutting off a withered branch. Let it not be forgotten that the popular desire for expansion is not merely an expression of corrupt human nature, but that it is the expression of a deep material need—the necessity of self-preservation. We neither can nor may in justice ascribe to our neighbors who uphold the present administration a purpose that is entirely corrupt. It may be "moral color blindness," as Henry George called it, which afflicts them; but in the last analysis it will be found to be lack of understanding of the true situation, rendered difficult to understand by im-

moral practices of the present day. To them the earth represents a raft, so inadequate to float all of its struggling occupants that some of them must be sacrificed in order that the rest may live. And, deeming themselves more entitled to live, from their superior position in the scale of being, the extermination of those whom they deem inferior seems to them the least sacrifice. This is their argument. What arguments can their opponents advance? Do they silently sanction the premises while they attack the unavoidable conclusions? When will men who call themselves democrats begin to reply to the assertion that "this country is getting too crowded" by declaring this to be false, and by showing that it is the holding out of use of the largest portion of the country that makes it seem "too crowded?" That is the real nature of the challenge which the republican party holds out to the democratic party. Will the democrats accept the challenge, with all that it implies? If they accept it they will simply be placing their party in the positive, aggressive position which it occupied under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, the departure from which caused its downfall. If they accept it they will have taken from their opponents their greatest stronghold, their promises of profit and gain, and adopted for themselves a method for attaining material prosperity which it is easy to demonstrate is both natural and efficient, to which reformers of almost all denominations now subscribe—financial reformers, prohibitionists, populists, trade-unionists and socialists of all descriptions, besides a large and enthusiastic number of out-and-out single tax men—a method which above all other methods has the highest sanctions of morality, to which all must agree who love liberty and desire justice. Let the democratic party go a step further in its denunciations of monopoly, and raise the standard of equal rights to land, and it will be sure to conquer.

P. M. CLEMENS.

Tommy—Papa, if Mr. Roosevelt had been born a Chinaman, do you think he would be a Boxer?

Papa—Hush, my son! Your question is a blow at the administration.

G. T. E.

#### BOOK NOTICES.

The fifth essay on "Eccentric Official Statistics," by H. L. Bliss, which appears in the July issue of the American Journal of Sociology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), deals especially with the article on wholesale prices from January, 1890, to July, 1899, which appeared in the March number of the United States depart-