

welcome footnote to the Monroe Doctrine. The history of American diplomacy, to be sure, abounds in altruistic expressions for the republics to the south of us, but, in view of what followed the war with Spain, and, more especially, of the seizure of the "canal strip," an explicit statement of our attitude towards these sister nations is by no means superfluous. Mr. Root's assurances on this point are admirable, both in substance and in manner. "We wish for no victories except those of peace," he said. "We wish for no territory except our own, and no sovereignty except over ourselves." These words must have been eminently satisfactory to all delegations save the Colombian, and, indeed, waiving by-gones, it is difficult to see how Mr. Root could have acquitted himself of a somewhat difficult task with greater tact and frankness. The note of condescension, which is most trying to races representing an older civilization than our own, was entirely absent. It is the hope that Mr. Root will labor actively to bring about closer and better relations with the other American republics which gives his words significance.

* * *

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM.

The Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain (Ind.), August 14.—Without socialism, individualism remains; and individualism undiluted and unopposed is anarchy. Without individualism, socialism would become the state slavery against which Secretary Bonaparte utters such an energetic protest. But even Secretary Bonaparte, in opposing socialism declares himself an individualist, and in opposing anarchy he makes himself a socialist. It is only when one clearly understands and appreciates this primary relation of these two fundamental and opposing forces of socialism and individualism, that he is in a position to understand and to discuss intelligently the social problems of the day. . . . How utterly absurd it is in a society which is built up and continually modified by the workings of these two opposing principles of socialism and individualism to attempt to draw fixed lines of inclosure and to denounce all those whose desires would lead them across those lines, as destructive anarchists or destructive socialists. The history of civilization is the history of progressive socialism. It is no more socialistic in principle for the government to own the telegraph lines than to own the postoffice. It is no more socialistic for the city to own the street cars than to own the water works. Present day problems affecting the scope and the extent of governmental authority and operations are merely questions of the relations and the adjustments of the two principles of individualism and socialism. . . . No person who understands how individual initiative and liberty, as well as social co-operation and authority, are both necessary, can ever become an anarchist; and no person who has learned the same lesson is in any danger of supporting the state slavery plan of extreme socialism. But to stop social agitation, and thereby to stop social progress, by hanging or imprisoning all socialists and anarchists is at least three hundred years behind the present times.

* * *

CRITICISING JUDGES.

St. Louis Mirror (Ind.), July 26.—If we want the courts to be worse than they are, all we need do is clothe them in a sanctity that will silence criticism. We have come close to that in the past. Lawyers have always told us how sacred the courts are. The bench is filled from the ranks of lawyers. We have only recently found out that the tradition of the lawyers' turpitude is too well founded on fact. Judges chosen from lawyers carry some lawyers' qualities to the bench. Once on the bench, judges have lingering sympathies with their former associates, chief of which is an opinion that the rest of the world knows nothing about anything. They unite in a lot of flummery and flubdub to make the law a

mystery. Judges are human, and fallible. No one says such things about the venality of judges as lawyers say. Every lawyer can tell you who and what influences this or that judge. All through the profession it is recognized as good policy to get a lawyer in a case who has a pull with a judge. A lawyer who has been the office partner of a man now a judge is always brought into a big case by any lawyer who has such a case before that judge. Political lawyers, lawyers who have political place and power, are paid, on the advice of other lawyers, just to show up in appellate courts on hearing day. Judges do throw their influence and special commissionerships to their political and personal friends. Judges do loaf and lounge with railroad officials in private cars. Judges do borrow money from financiers who have cases in their courts. Judges do succumb to social attentions to their wives. Judges do give decisions to win popularity and gain re-election. Judges are "seen" deftly and delicately at their homes by personal friends about cases before them in their courts. Judges are partisans. Judges are sympathetic to the corporations. Other judges are sympathetic to the mob. Judges do color their decisions with their prejudices and interest.

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

A BIRTHDAY RETROSPECT.

For The Public.

This bunch of flesh, yclept a Man,
Is built on Nature's usual plan;
And acted on by Nature's laws
Will reach its proper end, because
"The Master of the Show" perforce
Subjects all things to Nature's course.
As points the needle to the pole
So must each creature reach its goal.
What is my goal? I do not know—
I trust "The Master of the Show."

W. W. CATLIN.

* * *

■ CHEAP DWELLINGS OF CONCRETE.

At the Recent Annual Convention at Cincinnati of the United States League of Local Building and Loan Associations, Charles O'Connor Hennessy, of New York, Delivered an Address Upon "Small Homes of Concrete," from Which This Extract Is Taken.

There are 231 manufacturers of cement machinery west of Cleveland, 90 per cent. of whom were not in business four years ago. These concerns have put into operation, chiefly in the Middle West, machinery that has cost more than thirty millions of dollars. This sum represents, however, only a small part of the capital now invested in the production of what may be called a new building material. An examination of the periodicals of the trade reveals not only a phenomenal production of Portland Cement, the largest plants in the country being literally unable to keep up with the demand; but shows a feverish activity in the manufacture of all kinds of machinery and devices for mixing, moulding, and reinforcing concrete according to the needs of the building business.

All this suggests that concrete may be the building material with which we are to help, at least, to solve

the small dwelling problem in this country. The very great increase during recent years in the cost of all kinds of lumber, due largely to trade combinations fostered behind the tariff wall that shuts out the products of the Canadian forests, is a large factor in the situation. At any rate, we have come upon a period wherein building construction, large and small, with cement as the chief factor, is being carried on to an extent undreamed of in the past.

+ + +

AN UNTAUGHT CHILD.

"Nobody allows their children to play with Katy Smith, mamma; she says none of the children round here will go to her house, though she has asked them ever so often; she cried when she told me, so I'm going to play with her, mamma."

"The Smiths are vulgar people, dear—"

"Why, mamma, they have a carriage, just like us, and a pony, too. Are they naughty, mamma?"

"No, dearie, they know no better; but Katy's the little girl that uses such bad grammar and eats with her knife."

"But I know better, and I could teach her, if she comes here."

"Sweetheart, if you play with her, none of the other children will play with you—that's the trouble about having bad manners. You must not play with her."

"But if nobody taught her, it isn't her fault; it isn't her fault, mamma, she cries, and it isn't her fault," the tears filled my little girl's eyes.

I am old and wise; I did not cry.—"The Game of Life," by Bolton Hall.

+ + +

A SINGLE TAX ARGUMENT.

An Editorial in *Farm, Stock and Home* for July 1, 1906.

Inadvertently, perhaps, a Le Sueur (Minn.) correspondent of the *St. Paul Pioneer-Press* made an excellent argument recently for the "single tax." He was replying to a former editorial in that paper advocating the selling by farmers of small tracts of their farms to immigrants and others, and thus give them opportunities to make homes on 10 to 20 acres, and therefore increase the population, production and business of the State.

To show that the Pioneer's dream was largely iridescent, the correspondent referred, among other things, to the impossibility of finding farmers who would sell such tracts of land, but rather would find farmers whom he describes thus:

Farmers who have been, for years, engaged in extending their borders in every possible way, and as their wealth has increased they have paid more and more every year to buy out the smaller 60 and 40-acre tracts adjoining them. Most of them have already passed the point where they look upon land as a part of the machinery by which to make a living, but regard it as a distinction and a pleasure to have it. Nine-tenths of them would pay for an adjoining 40-acre tract a good deal more than it is worth for farming just for the joy of owning it and shoving out the line fence a little farther. You could not buy your dreamed-of one-acre and ten-acre tracts for twice their actual value as farming land."

This picture a condition as broad and universal as our country, and that inspired Henry George to

write his "Progress and Poverty," and to advocate with an ability never before equaled the single tax, or tax on land values only, as a remedy for the conditions he discussed. In the holding of land for the "fun of it," or to profit by its prospective value, he saw an invasion of the natural rights of man and the cause of the conditions he deplored. Land grabbers or land lovers, while hating Henry George and his philosophy, are making converts to it every day, and are hastening the time when taxation will make the holding of land out of use too unprofitable to practice.

+ + +

"A PRIVATE MONOPOLY IS INDEFENSIBLE AND INTOLERABLE."

From Mr. Bryan's Speech at Madison Square Garden, New York City, Aug. 30, 1906.

Before any intelligent action can be taken against the trusts we must have a definition of a trust. Because no corporation has an absolute and complete monopoly of any important product, the apologists for the trusts sometimes insist that there are in reality no trusts. Others insist that it is impossible to legislate against such trusts as may exist without doing injury to legitimate business. For the purpose of this discussion it is sufficient to draw the line at the point where competition ceases to be effective, and to designate as a trust any corporation which controls so much of the product of any article that it can fix the terms and conditions of sale.

Legislation which prevents a monopoly not only does not injure legitimate business, but actually protects legitimate business from injury. We are indebted to the younger Rockefeller for an illustration which makes this distinction clear. In defending the trust system he is quoted as saying that, as the American Beauty cannot be brought to perfection without pinching off ninety-nine buds, so that the one-hundredth bud can receive the full strength of the bush, so great industrial organizations are impossible without the elimination of the smaller ones. It is a cruel illustration, but it puts a perfectly accurate picture of trust methods. The Democratic party champions the cause of the ninety-nine enterprises which are menaced; they must not be sacrificed that one great combination may flourish. And when the subject is understood we shall receive the cordial support of hundreds of thousands of business men who have themselves felt the oppression of the trusts, or who, having observed the effect of the trusts upon others, realize that their safety lies, not in futile attempts at the restraint of trusts, but in legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible.

There must be no mistaking of the issue, and no confusing of the line of battle. The trust, as an institution, will have few open defenders. The policy of the trust magnates will be to insist upon "reasonable legislation," and then they will rely upon their power to corrupt legislators and intimidate executives to prevent the application of any remedies which would interfere with the trusts. Our motto must be, "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable;" and our plan of attack must contemplate the total and complete overthrow of the monopoly principle in industry.