

as have been seen and heard, in the papers and on the streets, since Baer's unguarded language, discussions which evidently rest upon a growing public perception of the rights of all to the enjoyment of the advantages of Nature's gifts to mankind, were formerly confined within the covers of Progress and Poverty and the walls of single tax clubrooms. The fact that they are now the common talk of "the man on the street" is the best possible evidence of the progress of the single tax movement.

"Well, gentlemen, what do you want? A change? Nominate your poison. State the remedy for a general condition of prosperity probably unexampled in this or any other country?" That is the comment of a cynical editorial writer of the Chicago Tribune upon recent bladder-blown business reports in Bradstreet's and Dun's. If it is workingmen the Tribune is addressing, the "poison" they might fairly "nominate" would be a share in this unexampled prosperity. With their living expenses increased 40 per cent., and their wages increased only slightly or not at all—in most cases not at all—they might be less timid about a change than the classes that are monopolizing all the prosperity in sight.

When President Roosevelt was in the South on his recent campaign tour, he complimented that section upon its increased prosperity as indicated by the Southern factories that have sprung up within the past few years. The essential character of this boasted prosperity may be inferred from the somewhat more minute observations of Irene Macfayden, published over her signature in the American Federationist. She says:

Only a few weeks ago I stood at half past ten at night in a mill in Columbia, S. C., controlled and owned by Northern capital, where children who did not know their own ages were working from six p. m. to six a. m., without a moment for rest or food or a single cessation of the maddening racket of the machinery, in an atmosphere insanitary and clouded with humidity

and lint. A horrible form of dropsy develops among the children. A doctor in a city mill, who has made a special study of the subject, tells me that ten per cent. of the children who go to work before 12 years of age, after five years, contract active consumption. The lint forms in their lungs a perfect cultivating medium for tuberculosis, while the change from the hot atmosphere of the mill to the chill night or morning air often brings on pneumonia, which frequently, if not the cause of death, is a forerunner of consumption. How sternly the "pound of flesh" is insisted on by the various employers is illustrated by the case of two little boys of nine and 11, who had to walk three miles to work on the night shift for 12 hours. One night they were five minutes late, and were shut out, having to tramp the whole three miles back again. The number of accidents to those poor little ones who do not know the dangers of machinery is appalling. In Huntsville, Ala., in January, just before I was there, a child of eight years who had been a few weeks in the mills lost the index and middle fingers of her right hand. A child of seven had lost her thumb a year previously. In one mill city in the South a doctor told a friend that he had personally amputated more than a hundred babies' fingers mangled in the mill. The average wage in North Carolina of the children under 14 is 22 cents a day, and in Georgia 25 cents is a liberal estimate. A correspondent gives a sample pay roll, showing an average of \$1.43 a week in a certain spinning room for all children employed. I know of babies working for five and six cents a day. A girl of nine, working at night, when six years old, received 12½ cents a night. The two boys who walked three miles to their work received 12 and 15 cents a night.

This is a side of the prosperity question that does not interest the prosperity "touters."

Socialists have an idea that political power is in process of yielding to industrial power; and that the time is not far off, if indeed it is not already at hand, when the political magnate will bow meekly before the industrial magnate. Of the plausibility of this theory of social evolution the people of the United States had an impressive exhibition last week. The political magnate of one of the greatest States of the Union, Gov. Stone of Pennsylvania, approached a private citizen, the industrial magnate of the greatest combination of industries in the world, J. Pierpont Morgan,—ap-

proached him on public business with all the meekness of the king on his knees at Canossa. The fact cannot be blinked that our political system, from the President down, has become subservient to the industrial powers over which Morgan and men like Morgan preside. Whether this is due to the system, as socialists would have it, or to the incapable or worse than incapable political officials, remains to be tested.

John Moody, the publisher of Moody's manual for investors (35 Nassau st., New York), has issued a booklet on the "morganization" of industry, which makes an excellent pocket companion in these days of trust discussion. It appears from this handy little pamphlet, and the details are given, that the steam railroad interests controlled by the Morgan crowd aggregate 55,555 in mileage and \$3,002,949,571 in capitalized value; while the industrial trusts controlled by the same crowd are capitalized at \$1,734,330,956—a total for this Morgan combination alone of \$4,737,280,527. It is an interesting fact that the word "morganize," recently invented to designate J. Pierpont Morgan's methods when he "organizes business," and adopted by Mr. Moody as the title of his booklet, "The 'Morganization' of Industry," has long been used in another sense—"to murder secretly." This amounts almost to a coincidence, when it is considered how "morganization" really affects legitimate industry.

In describing "morganization" Mr. Moody calls attention to the real secret of its success, without which no possible degree of organizing ability could avail. "Mr. Morgan," he says, "is at the head of no industry which does not have some special element of security and strength, outside of mere ability in management. In other words, his corporations all have an element of positive advantage or strength which prevents them from ever becoming subject to the