

and barn and crops and cattle, and the laying of the entire tax on the land—including in the term "land" all franchises and monopolistic uses of natural opportunities, like water power, etc. If the land speculator had to pay the same tax, on every uncultivated acre, that the farmer pays on the cultivated acre—the amount being increased by the abolition of the personal property tax—he would soon be compelled to "sell out" at such figures as would remove all temptation for the homeseeker to travel to Canada or elsewhere in search of cheap land. That the clear, shining virtue of Mr. George's proposition should have been obscured by its forced and unnecessary connection with the questions of individual land owning and "free trade" is one of the misfortunes of the century. Divested of this connection, it affords the most direct and equitable solution yet suggested for the multiform problems involved in the right adjustment of taxation.

CIVILIZATION NOT TEMPTING.

An incident of the visit of the Indian tribes in Chicago during the recent centennial celebrations, as reported in the *Chicago Examiner* of October 1.

Not all the millions in Chicago can tempt "Little Long Lashes," daughter of Chief Pokagon, of the Pottawatomie tribe, to give up her people.

Several women of wealth and social position, won by the beauty of the little princess, have tried to persuade her that she would be happier in a mansion than a tepee—but without avail.

One story has it that Mrs. J. Ogden Armour was one of those who wanted the little Indian girl to exchange her life of freedom for a life of luxury.

Lolita Armour is said to have seen the daughter of the great chief and to have fallen in love with her, and that meant, of course, that the Armours would offer any price to secure the little girl as a companion for their daughter.

Whoever made the proposition submitted it first to Chief Pokagon through an interpreter. He listened gravely as the life his daughter would lead was pictured—how she would be educated and be given all the advantages that would come to the millionaire's child. And he was assured he never would want for money.

"That all?" asked the chief when they had finished.

"How much do you want?" was the first thought of the interpreter. But he didn't put it into words, for the chief had risen.

"Long ago, many years ago, white man come to place where Indian live. He take little land, build house—all good.

"Pretty soon more pale face come, take little land—all good.

"All good friend. White man say so. We show him place to fish, place to hunt, place to trap.

"Many moon go by, more white man come. They say: 'You go little way—we need all land here.' He say we all good friend.

"We go, for white man say all good friend. Pretty soon he take more land. Pretty soon he have all. Pottawatomie have nothing. But white man say all right—we all good friend.

"Big chief and brave die. New chief, new brave come; they all dead. Many moon go by. Then white man say: 'You come back. We have dance—all good friend.'

"We come back. Heap people come see us; all make fun. Make hole in tepee, put stick in dinner; we say nothing, for white man all good friend.

"Now you want take Wan-don-skisgon, little girl. You take all land, now you want Indian, too. You say we all good friend. But you no take her, I tell you!"

Before he had finished speaking it was plain Chief Pokagon was in an angry mood. And as he uttered the last word he sent up a great hoarse cry that made those who heard it chill.

"Little Long Lashes," however, had a different sort of an answer. She laughed when she heard the tales of all that would be given her.

"Wear them?" she asked, pointing to one of the visitor's high-heeled slippers.

The woman, thinking the patent leather had caught her eye, nodded.

"Why, I couldn't run with my pet wolf at all in those," she said, for she speaks good English. "No, I couldn't sleep in a house. I tried it once. And I couldn't wear clothes like you do. No, I will stay with my people."

SINGLE TAX THE ANTITHESIS OF SOCIALISM.

A letter from Wm. Lloyd Garrison to the *Boston Evening Transcript*, published in the *Transcript* of October 3.

"The Issues in Ohio," which your valued correspondent, "Lincoln," treated at length in Wednesday's *Transcript*, are so exceptional and instructive that they deserve a more intelligent consideration than that accorded them in the columns of the daily press. The current confused and misleading reports indicate either a set purpose to disparage Tom L. Johnson

and cast suspicion on his character, or an ignorance of the principles which he advocates. Even "Lincoln," who, I am sure, aims to be fair, fails utterly to grasp the situation. His declaration that Johnson represents the "socialistic" tendencies of the two great parties while Foraker and Hanna represent the "capitalistic" trend will not bear a moment's examination. Using language soberly and with a due regard for its meaning, the reversal of the statement would match the fact.

For, if anyone should be exempt from the charge of socialism it is the leading disciple of Henry George. In truth the single tax theory is the antithesis of Socialism, and its advocates find their ever present and most persistent opponents in the socialistic ranks. Since Henry George's death his closest and most valued friend, Tom L. Johnson, has stood as the foremost representative of his enunciated principles. In the interest of clear thinking and fair play, Henry George's own statement of his belief deserves reproduction at this time.

In "The Condition of Labor," that masterly open letter to Pope Leo XIII., occurs this discriminating passage:

We differ from the Socialists in our diagnosis of the evil and we differ from them as to remedies. We have no fear of capital, regarding it as the natural hand-maiden of labor; we look on interest in itself as natural and just; we would set no limit to accumulation, nor impose on the rich any burden that is not equally placed on the poor; we see no evil in competition, but deem unrestricted competition to be as necessary to the health of the industrial and social organism as the free circulation of the blood is to the health of the bodily organism—to be the agency whereby the fullest cooperation is to be secured. We would simply take for the community what belongs to the community, the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community; leave sacredly to the individual all that belongs to the individual; and, treating necessary monopolies as functions of the State, abolish all restrictions and prohibitions save those required for public health, safety, morals and convenience.

This is the creed avowed by Tom L. Johnson, enforced and defended upon the stump, attempted to be put into practical operation in the government of the city of Cleveland and persistently fought and denounced by Foraker and Hanna. Johnson antagonizes protectionism, a strong plank in the socialistic scheme. Both Ohio senators support it. Johnson stands as the defender of capital. The senators attack it constantly through laws of special privilege. Yet Johnson is stigmatized as a "Socialist" and Foraker and Hanna pose as the champions of "capital." Was there ever a more flagrant misuse of terms?

"Believing that the rights of true property are sacred," said Henry George, "we would regard forcible communism as robbery that would bring destruction." And he further asserted of socialism that "its methods involve the idea that governments can more wisely direct the expenditure of labor and the expenditure of capital than can laborers and capitalists, and that men who control governments will use this power for the general good and not in their own interests. They tend to multiply officials, restrict liberty, invent crimes. They promote perjury, fraud and corruption. And they would, were the theory carried to its logical conclusion, destroy civilization and reduce mankind to savagery."

This strong and comprehensive statement is not only accepted by Tom L. Johnson, but it is the inspiration of his public life. The issues in Ohio center on the rights of labor and capital, against which organized privilege is massed. Privilege is paramount to both political parties and infects both. This makes the fight of Johnson for reform doubly onerous, as he has more to fear from the spoliemen of the Democratic party than from the Republican voters who furnish his substantial accessions.

At such a crisis, when every heart that beats for justice should welcome this uprising against commercial greed and rapacity, we have fair minded newspapers, which have consistently preached the gospel of equal rights, joining in the ignorant hue and cry to discredit the truest exemplar of Jeffersonian democracy known in the political history of the nation.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT'S STATISTICS.

When the Republicans get into a tight place, due to discontent from high prices, low wages or waning prosperity, they send for Col. Carroll D. Wright. They state their troubles to him and ask him to fix things up. He smiles suggestively and says he will try. If he is successful—and he usually is—the Republicans see that his reputation as a statistical authority does not suffer, no matter how devious and crooked his methods. He gets the required result, is promoted to the highest position, and is hailed as the statistical saviour of mankind. The Republicans understand their business as well as Col. Wright does his business.

A year or so ago the Republicans became desperate. The census statistics of manufactures, instead of showing a substantial advance from 1890 to 1900,

showed a decline in wages of one and one-half per cent. As Dingley bill trusts were multiplying and were raising prices rapidly and greatly increasing the cost of living, wise Republicans saw trouble ahead. They consulted with their old friend, Col. Wright, whose methods had juggled the 1890 census figures so that they showed a substantial rise in wages, and who supposed that he had the 1900 census fixed to show a similar advance. They told him that he must somehow make a better showing for the wage earner, either by raising wages or by reducing prices, or by both. "Get your labor bureau busy," they said, "and do your best for us. Discredit the census figures and ask the people to wait for the only statistics which will be worthy of consideration. We will boost you as an authority in the meantime, and, if the census wage statistics now being prepared by Prof. Dewey are not likely to prove satisfactory, we will try to hold them up until after the 1904 election."

Col. Wright agreed to do his best. In March, 1903, the department of labor issued a bulletin on the "Course of Wholesale Prices, 1890-1902," which showed that prices were exactly as high in 1902 as in 1890, and that they rose only 25½ per cent. from 1897 to 1902. This was about 15 per cent. less than the rise shown by the statistics of R. G. Dun & Co., which are more carefully "weighted." On September 30 it was announced from Washington:

The bureau of labor, under the direction of Carroll D. Wright, is about to issue the results of an exhaustive study of the increased cost of living during the last few years in relation to the increase of wages. The work will be presented in two volumes, one relating to expenditures and the other to earnings. The manuscript will go to the printer in two days. The results of this inquiry may show that there has been a striking similarity between the advance in wages and the increased cost of living, and that neither has gone forward as much as popularly supposed. The current report that commodities have advanced 27 per cent. is shown to be wide of the mark. It will be nearer 15 or 16 per cent. Wages have so fully kept pace with increased cost of living that it may safely be said that the condition of the laboring man is better to-day than ever before in the history of this country.

Of course these statistics, coming from such a high authority, will reassure the workingmen and make them contented and happy. The man whose wages have remained substantially the same as they were in 1897, and who is paying 35 per cent. more for what he has to buy, will now feel that he is at least as well off as he was at the beginning of Republican rule. This is all that he could expect and the most

that the Republicans claim. The prosperity that they talk about has all gone to the trusts.

Until these new statistics are published and the methods of reaching them are known, we cannot criticise them, except to say that they differ radically from any others now extant. But to show how worthless they will probably be, except from a political standpoint, we may mention some of Col. Wright's past methods of raising wages—on paper.

Col. Wright won his first statistical victory and ingratiated himself with the Republicans by falsifying and juggling the wage statistics of Massachusetts. One of his methods of raising wages, statistically, was to divide the total wages paid in 1885 by the "average" number of wage earners, instead of by the entire number employed, and between whom the wages were actually divided, as was done in 1875. In this way he showed a decline of only ten per cent., whereas the actual decline was nearly 20 per cent. His same methods, continued to 1895, showed an increase in wages when an actual decline had occurred.

Col. Wright's methods, adopted in the 1890 census, made a substantial rise in wages over those of 1880. In 1900 this method of "averages" was carried still farther. In 1890 the "average" number was computed for each establishment for the actual time the establishment was in operation. In the 1900 census the "average" number employed each month was taken, and the establishment was considered to have run the full 12 months. This system is bad in all cases, but it becomes positively absurd in industries which run only half the year. It frequently results in "averages" which are less than the least number considered. As Mr. H. L. Bliss, the non-partisan statistician, says:

It will be seen by census bulletin No. 200, giving statistics of the canning of fruits, vegetables and fish, that while the greatest number of wage earners employed at any one time during the year was 133,106, and the least number employed at any one time was 46,106, the average number is reported as but 36,401. In the manufacture of building glass we find the greatest number employed given as 19,943, the least number as 16,060, and the average number as 11,902. It would be supposed that the average number would be somewhere between the greatest and the least number employed at any one time, but the statistician in charge of the manufacturing statistics had discovered a method of computing average numbers which has the important merit, from a partisan standpoint, of obtaining for the present census a number often smaller than the minimum number considered as the average number of wage earners.