

He tells me he recognizes the magnitude of this undertaking, and sees very clearly the divine wisdom in this whole social arrangement, and he assures me that every time he prays he will thank God I live and that he has the opportunity afforded him of engaging in such a noble undertaking, namely, to minister to the spiritual and moral welfare of these people, and to work for me.

After fully assuring myself that he was onto his job, I had him installed as the Ambassador from Heaven. The people received him, praised him, and passed favorably upon my choice of a pastor.

(To be Continued)

ANDREW CARNEGIE'S PLEA FOR HIS PLEA.

(For the Review.)

By EDMUND CORKILL.

A multi-millionaire who has written a book on "Democracy" in which he made the admission that he had lived long enough to discover that the men who earned the wealth did not get it, must command the attention of all earnest social reformers when he essays to expound and explain "The Problems of To-day."

Mr. Andrew Carnegie, by adding another to the already numerous attempts to solve these questions in volumes which occupy many shelves in his public libraries, evidently regards those previous efforts as unsatisfactory and his present work as the one thing needful to brush the cobwebs of error out of our brainial cavities and so make room for his own infallible remedies; more than that, Mr. Carnegie claims that he can truthfully say "I told you so," about "some of the doctrines which are now promulgated so freely"—that he "held and expressed advanced views upon 'Labor' and 'Land' before he could be ranked as one of the multi-millionaires" and that he is not "only a recent convert to such views."

After a careful reading of his book it is not easy to see how far he has "advanced," for he has the habit of presenting a part of a truth that he neutralizes later by discordant conclusions or qualifications. But through all is seen the shrewd Scotch intellect, so far commercialized as to enable it to reduce even the highest moral and altruistic elements of social life to the primary unit of money making. This is strikingly shown in his use of the parable of the talent hid in a field, obviously intended by the Nazarene teacher to point a spiritual truth, but which is adduced by the Ironmaster in support of his favorite virtue, thrift. It did not occur to his acute intellect, warped by commercialistic habit, that his own career as a monopolist might aptly find illustration in that impressive parable, but true it is that time was when *his* talent lay hidden in the ground in the shape of iron ore—for surely that must count as

the greatest of all the opportunities in his business life. Time was when his Scotch shrewdness saw the possibilities which untold ages had developed, doubtless for the benefit of—whom? Is it possible that this canny Scotchman did not know for whose use and benefit that iron ore was hid and prepared in the dark silence of nature's secret laboratory during all the centuries of the illimitable past? Did he for a moment conceive that it was for the use and benefit of Andrew Carnegie and his partners?

Far too shrewd was the Ironmaster to repeat the blunder of the coal-baron Baer. He has never claimed to be a divinely appointed custodian of iron ore stored in the earth for the special purpose of being doled out to the rest of mankind at his own price. His more scientific thought and his faith in evolution would save him from so egotistical an assumption, yet he assumes that which comes dangerously near that of his unscientific fellow monopolist. A few selections from his book will make this apparent. "Let us go to the root of the matter and inquire how fortunes are created, whence and how they arise," writes Mr. Carnegie, on page 18, and then gives an interesting illustration of the process in the imaginary career (doubtless founded on fact) of two farmers to each of whom their father had given a farm of their own selection. "One in the centre of Manhattan Island, the other beyond the Harlem." "A few hundreds buy the farms, and the brothers set up for themselves." "They are equally industrious, cultivate their farms equally well, and in every respect are equally good citizens of the State." "The growth of New York City northward soon makes the children of the younger millionaires, while those of the elder remain simple farmers in comfortable circumstances, but fortunate in this beyond their cousins, still of the class who have to perform some service to their fellows and thus earn a livelihood. Now who or what made this difference in wealth? Not labor, not skill, no, nor superior ability, sagacity, nor enterprise, nor greater public service: The *community* created the millionaire's wealth; while he slept it grew as fast as when he was awake. It would have arisen exactly as it did had he been on the Harlem and his brother on the Manhattan farm.

The younger farmer, now a great property holder, dies, and his children in due time pass away, each leaving millions, since the farm has become part of a great city, and immense buildings upon it produce annual rents of hundreds of thousands of dollars. When these children die, who have neither toiled nor spun, what canon of justice would be violated were the nation to step in and say that, since the aggregation of their fellow men, called "the community," created the decedent's wealth, it is entitled to a large portion of it as they pass away?

"The community has refrained from exacting any part during their lives. The heirs have been allowed to enjoy it all, because although in their case the wealth was a purely communal growth, yet in other cases wealth often comes largely from individual effort and ability, and hence it is better for the community to allow such ability to remain in charge of fortune-making, because more likely to succeed, and in so doing develop our country's resources. It

would be unwise to interfere with the working bees; better allow them to continue gathering honey during their lives; when they die, the nation should have a large portion of the honey remaining in the hives; it is immaterial at what date collection is made, so that it comes to the national treasury at last."

The foregoing quotations may be taken as fairly representing Mr. Carnegie's views upon the land and its relation to the acquisition and use of great wealth. At the outset the reader may be alarmed at what appears to be a sudden attack of Single Tax, but later he finds it to be a false alarm, and is somewhat puzzled by contradictory symptoms that seriously affect the diagnosis, the final outcome being that the millionaire retains his millions as long as he lives. Note how careful Mr. Carnegie is not to suggest a course that would violate any "canon of justice" in the disposition of the millionaire's wealth *when he can no longer hold it*, and how his (Mr. Carnegie's) public spirit would keep the fortune-making in charge of the family or group of fortune-makers altho' he concedes that the "community" *created* the wealth in question and notes the fact that said "community" had "refrained from exacting any part during their (the millionaires') lives."

We have but to add the consideration that the lucky fortune-makers in the first move they made in their career by taking possession of the source of all wealth, the land, unjustly appropriated that which naturally belonged to the whole people of the United States—if it belonged to any one at all—and thus diverted from the Public Treasury and into their own pockets, all the wealth subsequently produced therefrom—to see as illogical a jumble of economic ideas as it is possible to conceive. Well may we ask—by what rule of logic or common sense should the creators of great wealth wait for their share—"a large portion"—until it drop from the trembling hand of the dying millionaire? Many members of "The community" must be in dire need of their share if, as Mr. Carnegie daringly admits, that "most men and women are born to poverty." Why must these needy ones wait while the fortune-makers are making more fortunes? If another fatal admission be true that "where wealth accrues honorably, the people are always silent partners," why should some of them suffer and starve while a few of their partners are enjoying monkey dinners at ten or perhaps a hundred dollars a plate? To donate labelled libraries or any other substitutes for a prompt restitution to these shareholders of their just share, would be to tantalize them and could in no equitable sense satisfy the claims of common sense justice. By what law, divine, natural or human, is the tenure of any monopoly of a natural opportunity fixed? Mr. Carnegie limits it to a life time because "It would be unwise to interfere with the working bees," better allow them to continue gathering honey during their lives. When they die the nation should have a large portion of the honey remaining in the hives; it is immaterial at what date collection is made; so that it comes to the National Treasury at last."

Again that fatal admission that "Most men and women are born to poverty rises like an avenging ghost—possibly from a Homestead graveyard—and asks, "Is the date immaterial when the first of the month comes round and rent day

finds the purse empty—when Tommy's shoes no longer keep out the rain or snow, and there is no money to buy new ones; when Bessie's clothes have become too ragged to mend and a new frock a Utopian dream? Is it immaterial when and in what form, such shareholders as these get their dividends?

But the very principle of the Ironmaster's proposition to postpone righteous restitution is false and unjust on the face of it, and would not only rob the people of their undisputed right, but would give to the successful monopolist a perpetual license to monopolize any natural opportunity that he may have been bold and shrewd enough to seize and develop. "Because they are likely to succeed" is considered a sufficient reason why the fortune-makers should retain their monopoly—never a thought of the *moral* quality of monopoly itself. Not once in his book does the Ironmaster look the land question fairly in the face. He invites us to go with him to the root of the matter and then skillfully skims the surface without disturbing the deeper and, to him, the more disagreeable truth below. All through he assumes that the land in America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Denmark is *free*. "Land in these countries," writes Mr. Carnegie, "is free as other property is." This is a good example of the loose way in which he handles the land question, and he disposes of Henry George's "proposed exclusive taxation of land" in one brief paragraph without attempting to deal with it. "Progress and Poverty" with its splendid diction (besides which the "Problems of To-day" read like a school boys' maiden effort) and its clear, honest and logical argument against land monopoly and its kindred wrongs, is ignored on the false plea that the people of Canada and America denounced it! Of all books on economic subjects, Mr. Carnegie could least afford so to treat "Progress and Poverty," and the most charitable construction that can be put upon his course is that he had never read it. To assume that he had, is to charge him with conscious inability to successfully meet its arguments. If he had conscientiously considered that invaluable work he could never have written the incoherent medley of superficialities of which his book is largely made up. He makes the cardinal mistake of beginning his history of fortune-making, *after the foundation had been laid* in the seizure of natural opportunities *in the land*, thus ignoring the fundamental and most essential element in political and social economy. By leaving this out of his book Mr. Carnegie has vitiated all his arguments upon wealth and the land. Undeniable facts compel him to concede—consciously or unconsciously—important points in favor of Henry George's land doctrines, as for instance, that the land originally belonged to the people—see page 24, where he admits, in alluding to the purchase of certain mineral lands, that "much of the wealth of the concern came from these minerals, *which were once* the public property of the community, and were easily secured by this fortunate son and his partners upon trifling royalties." But he fails to draw from these facts the logical conclusion that no individual or group of individuals had any natural right to appropriate any part of this "public property" for their exclusive benefit without rendering to the excluded "public" a just equivalent for the benefit taken. Over and over again does Mr. Carnegie describe the

seizure of natural opportunities as "fortunate" or "lucky," implying that there is no natural law governing their use, and that therefore it is entirely a matter of "First come, first served." But this "go as you please" method of using the earth—this private appropriation of natural opportunities has been tried in older countries for centuries with disastrous results to human freedom, and has seriously hindered the growth and industrial development of the American nation. It has made a few multi-millionaires and many tramps. With the aid of special legislation it has created trusts and burdened the masses with high rents and exorbitant prices for the necessaries and comforts of life. These are but a few of the evils which have sprung from the one great, fundamental wrong that the Ironmaster has not deigned to consider. The interested reader will find the subject discussed at length with unequalled clearness and power in Henry George's "Progress and Poverty."

Mr. Carnegie's anxiety to escape the odium attaching to monopoly, leads him to present some arguments which, while apparently plausible, are really suicidal. Godwin truly wrote, "The human mind is incredibly subtle in inventing an apology for that to which its inclination leads." While this seems to fit the present case, in some instances the Scotchman's well known shrewdness seems at fault, as, for instance, in his defence of the millionaire's retention of his monopoly. What more plausible than his proposition that "*the working bees*" should be allowed to continue gathering honey (money) during their lives? But it is only when we define the terms "working bees" that we get at the true inwardness of the proposition. It is already admitted that "*The community* created the millionaire's wealth. While he slept it grew as fast as when he was awake." But the community was to get its share of the wealth *after* the working bees had done with it, who then were these "working bees?" On the face of it unquestionably it is taken for granted that the term describes those who had all along been receiving the product of the labor and natural advantages which had made them millionaires. But what about the *laborer's*—the men of muscle and brawn, were not these truly "working bees," or were the only "working bees" those who went buzzing about in automobiles and drawing dividends? There can be but one reasonable answer to this question, and therefore, on his own terms, the Ironmaster is bound to grant to all working bees the full product of their labor. Is he prepared to admit this conclusion? He stands here in the position of the rich man who is said in the Gospels to have asked Jesus the momentous question—"Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life," claiming to have kept the entire moral law including the epitome of all social obligations "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The reader will remember that the enquirer "went away sorrowful because he had great possessions;" the Master's lesson was too much for him. He had not yet learned what the law meant when it said "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which was only another way of putting the golden rule. The great possessions made for him by the "*working bees*" barred his way to the "eternal life" he was anxious to inherit.

The case of the millionaire and his working bees as put by Mr. Carnegie,

can be satisfactorily arranged by no other rule than that laid down by the Nazarene teacher in his impressive interview with the rich man who wanted to buy eternal life at his own price. If the honey making determined the right to a share of the honey—a full share—a share commensurate with the labor expended in the production of the wealth, then the rule “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” demands the payment by Mr. Carnegie of the enormous arrears of dividends owing to his old employees who failed to secure an adequate share of the “honey” in addition to their daily wages. Is Mr. Carnegie prepared to love his neighbor as himself to that extent? If he believes in the simple equity of the Golden Rule, this is what he is bound in all consistency to do. But, alas! this rule makes no allowance for the unjustly discriminating apportionment of the shares in favor of the millionaire employers of working bees—this consideration and the general tenor of his book force the inference that he, too, will go away sorrowful because of his great possessions.

It is true that he strongly urges the adoption of profit sharing and gives instances in his own career in which, by this means, he actually started several of his subordinates on the road to affluence. This was no new method and it would have been surprising had the Ironmaster overlooked it. William the Conqueror adopted this method a thousand years ago, when he took possession of Britain. Some of the heirs of the men who helped him steal the land, still enjoy the fat estates given as a reward for valuable aid. To conquer, the aggressor must share the spoils with those who help, and the political Boss appreciates the value of the method. Boss Croker openly justified it, and almost every public office, from the highest executive to the lowest rank and file position, is filled with due regard to that principle, so it is not specially to the Ironmaster's credit that he made use of it to further his avaricious schemes.

Perhaps one of the strongest impressions left upon the mind after a perusal of “Problems of To-day” is that the writer seems to be solely concerned with *palliatives* for poverty. It would be strange indeed if even a multi-millionaire should not at times realize the vastness of the gulf that yawns between his own social condition and those which oppress the hungry wretch without a place to lay his head. “The writer has no desire to minimise this sad contrast, nor to say one word in its defense” writes Mr. Carnegie on page 30. “It is one of the saddest and most indefensible of all contrasts presented in life.” Taken in corroboration of the shocking statement of fact already quoted, viz, “most men and women are born to poverty,” this contrast is enough to stagger any mind at all susceptible to human pity. But having ignored the first false step, the fundamental wrong, that Henry George and many thoughtful men and women beside, regard as the most potent cause of poverty, Mr. Carnegie looks around for other causes more consonant with his own thought and experience, and pounces upon the *intemperate* and *unthrift*y workingman. “When one asks himself what would most benefit the worker,” again writes Mr. Carnegie, “there is no hesitation in the reply—to avoid liquor and gambling. The workingman who indulges in either, is, to the extent he does so the architect of his own poverty. Here is the issue of greatest moment

to the workingman." Again the irrepressible assertion that "most men and women are born to poverty" looms up to harass the Ironmaster. Are these the architects of their own poverty? Unless we admit the transmigration of souls this were impossible unless the pitiable degenerates who enter life with the inherited depravity of their progenitors may be regarded as cases of reincarnation.

But do these assertions of Mr. Carnegie agree with the known facts of social life? Here is the testimony of the New York Society for Improving the Conditions of the Poor in their annual report as summarised by a New York newspaper. "The fact is gradually becoming impressed upon those having charity work in hand that the causes producing dependence are more generally beyond the control of the sufferer than has generally been supposed. In fact, judging from recent experience, it is estimated that fully 90 per cent. of those that apply to the Society for aid are brought to it through no fault of their own.

The demoralizing effect of the drink habit is too well known to be disputed, and any effort to check the evil is worthy of commendation, but that effort can never take the place of the radical reform that aims to open up natural opportunities so that increased demand for labor would make it easier for all to earn a living and so save the laborer from the poverty that so often disheartens and then debases. Altho' there are exceptions, it is when men are idle that they are more liable to drink. With good opportunities men are more likely to be sober and industrious than otherwise. As with a tree that depends largely upon the nature of the soil and the intellegent care of the gardener for its development, man's heredity and environments, as a rule, determine the character of his career through life. Nor may we ignore the fatal *Parasite* that insidiously absorbs the vitality drawn from the life giving soil, until it droops or dies in helpless poverty. The monopolist grows rich by making the wealth producers poor and he is never so dangerous as when he poses as the *friend* of the workingman. They aspire to be *benefactors*. "Is it not evident to all" writes Mr. Carnegie, "that the first and indispensable work of the Socialist is the elevation of humanity to that standard of conduct which would ensure the wise and sober use of benefactions?" What a standard is this to aspire to! Sheer pauperism! The condition of mind that naturally results from *dependence* upon *charity*. One would think that the American people would indignantly repudiate the degrading insinuation that it implies, but no, the insidious poison in the example of these captains of industry has done its work among many of the poor and ignorant. "We have 26 splendid millionaires," proudly exclaimed an enthusiastic admirer of "*Success*," to a group of interested listeners in one of our Brooklyn parks lately, and he only expressed the admiration that commercialized society generally has for the man who acquires enormous wealth quickly without being necessarily too fastidious about the means employed to secure it. The trouble 'is that the difficulties which an ordinary business man encounters in his efforts to succeed are apt to blind him to the real causes that contribute to the evolution of the millionaire. "If the obstacle to success be so generally difficult and so often insur-

mountable"—he reasons—"how admirable is the courage and extraordinary the ability which enabled maiden effort to overcome all obstacles so quickly."

But the splendid millionaires lose their glamour when their boasted success is seen to be based upon monopoly and special privilege, a success that would be easy to hundreds of thousands of their fellowmen *under the same conditions*. Under *fair* competition a multi-millionaire would be impossible, and but for the private ownership of land, would never have appeared upon the earth.

But his blind or self interested defenders find an excuse for his existence in the business opportunities which he creates and the work that he finds for the unemployed. That he has provided employment for a large number of his fellowmen is very true—so has the grafter, the incendiary, the train wrecker, and all others who rob and destroy. If the mere finding of work for the poor man justifies the operations of the monopolist then surely ought we to erect a monument to Boss Tweed, whose coloseal schemes for graft found employment for many needy workingmen. Who still remember him with genuine feelings of gratitude.

This paper does no more than glance at the Ironmaster's plea for his pelf. The book will not harm the Single Tax movement, but the Socialists will have all they can do to dispose of some of the difficulties the shrewd Scotchman puts in their way.

EXTRACTS FROM CONTEMPORARY PERIODICALS, SHOWING THE WONDERFUL GROWTH OF PUBLIC OPINION IN OUR DIRECTION

ONE OF THE SAVIORS OF THE WORLD.

Lincoln Steffens said recently: "No matter what the world may decide to do about Single Tax, some day it will have to acknowledge that Henry George brought into the service of man more men of more different kinds than any other man of his day."

Personally I believe that the mission of Henry George on earth was that of one of the saviors of the world. I believe his "Progress and Poverty" is one of the books of Holy Writ.

I believe that in the "Single Tax" lies the solution of every problem which agitates our industrial world to-day.—ELLA WHEELER WILCOX in N. Y. *Evening Journal*.

CONCISE.

Don't increase a man's taxes because he builds a house or a factory. It discourages.—Youngstown (Ohio) *Daily Vindicator*.