

labor will be larger and more sustained, and more capable of insuring itself against fluctuation.

The wisest course is to attack these bad conditions boldly and fearlessly, to abolish them, or, if we can not do that, to modify them; deal rigorously with vested interests and monopolies which cause public injury or stand in the way of improvement; enlarge the powers of local authorities, readjust our taxing system, and so alter our land laws as to increase the supply of houses and of available land in town and country alike; equalize burdens local as well as imperial; give—as far as laws and customs can give it—give a chance to every man.

Give every man a chance; those are the lines of progress and development. It is along those lines that lies the path of prosperity, happiness and strength. There lies the true wisdom, and not false, sham wisdom; true patriotism, and not tinsel patriotism; true imperialism, and not treacherous imperialism.

THE CLOSED SHOP.

Fred J. Miller of East Orange, N. J., in the *New York Evening Post*.

The statements put forward by and on behalf of the anthracite coal-mine operators—which are the anthracite coal roads and which again compose the anthracite coal monopoly—to the effect that they stand unalterably opposed to the closed-shop idea sound very well but will not bear examination. Whether they oppose or favor the closed-shop idea depends entirely upon whose closed shop it is. Undoubtedly they oppose the miners' closed shop, but how about the closed shop they themselves maintain? It is a matter of common knowledge, and no longer denied, that the coal roads own and control over 90 per cent of the anthracite coal lands and mines; that they allow only so much coal to be produced in any given period of time as they think will best serve their purpose of getting out of coal consumers the last penny possible to be extracted from them; that the State of Pennsylvania helps them to maintain this monopoly by assessing their unused coal lands at a nominal valuation as "unproductive farm lands"; that at meetings held periodically in New York the representatives of this trust get together and decide how much anthracite coal shall be mined and brought to market during the period under consideration and what proportion of the total each road shall be allowed to bring in; that here in the Oranges—and I suppose the same conditions prevail elsewhere—there is a retail coal dealers' association, and that unless a retailer belongs to this association he will not be able to buy anthracite coal ("it has all been contracted for by the association"), and finally that if one who proposes to engage in the business applies for membership in this association he is informed that "the membership is filled, there are no vacancies." If this is not the closed shop then what is it?

The retail coal dealer in this section is no more at liberty to exercise his own judgment as to what he will do or what he will not do in the conduct of his own business than is the individual union printer free to decide what he will or will not do with respect to wages, hours of labor, etc. The terms upon which he sells coal are dictated to him by the association to which he belongs, and that association is dominated and controlled by the anthracite Trust. In view of these facts of common knowledge, is it true that the "mine operators" are opposed to the closed shop? Is it not clear that whether they are opposed or in favor depends entirely upon which closed shop you talk about, theirs or the miners'?

I do not say that the operators ought to cease opposing the closed-shop idea, for I believe that idea is fundamentally wrong, but I do most emphatically believe that those who support the coal operators in their contention against the closed shop of the miners ought never to cease calling attention to the fact that the operators themselves maintain a closed shop which is at least equally wrong in principle and far more to be feared, not only on account of its effect upon our pocketbooks and upon the manner of life of our poorer people, but also because of its effect upon our legislatures and our public life generally. Closed shops are wrong because they are monopolies; but those who oppose them must, to be consistent and to escape the charge of being insincere, oppose all other monopolies, including that of the coal mines and the coal-carrying roads.

REAL-ESTATE REFORM IN EUROPE

From The Review of Reviews for March, 1905.

Socialism and capitalism will be reconciled only when land monopoly has been abolished. This is the opinion of Mr. Johan Hanson, a Swedish economist. Writing in the *Social Tidskrift* (Stockholm), Mr. Hanson reviews the land-ownership situation in both Europe and America.

As early as the middle of the eighteenth century, this writer reminds us, there were those who foresaw the evil results of private ownership of land. It was not until 1880, however, that an American, Henry George, first brought the problem of land-ownership forcibly to public notice. Mr. George's ideas have, in general, been accepted by real estate reformers. The practical application is the only point at which the views diverge.

After discussing the single tax theory as held in the United States, and complimenting Mayor "Tom" Johnson, of Cleveland, as the American Tolstoy, the Swedish economist turns to Canada. He says:

In Manitoba, farming land has been rented successfully on a system based on the principles of Henry George, which should dispel any doubts as to their advantages. The Single Tax Association of Toronto, where enormous rents prevailed, has also won a victory. Their programme, higher taxes on the value of property and less on the buildings, conquered at the last elections, in spite of the opposition of the authorities. In Australia and New Zealand the movement for real estate reform is making great strides of progress, because laboring men are less prejudiced by the socialists than in Europe. The single-tax associations are better organized than those in America.

Mr. Hanson asserts that British real estate taxation is the "most abnormal in the world."

In spite of reforms during the last decade, practical results are yet to be expected, though probably near at hand. There are two reform associations,—the Land Nationalization Society and the League for the Taxation of Land Values. Under the leadership of Dr. A. R. Wallace, the former organization contends for the appropriation of private land by degrees, its organ being *Land and Labor*, of London. The latter organization advocates the Henry George system. The organ for single tax is the *Land Values*, of London and Glasgow.

In Germany, real estate reformers have organized the *Bund der Deutschen Bodenreformer*.

For thirty years German writers have contended for the same principles as are advocated to-day. In 1872, the physician, Dr. Th. Stamm, issued a work in which almost the same views as those of Henry George were held forth. The present association was founded in 1888, and for some time advocated the principles of Henry George with a radical platform. Yet single tax, as well as the nationalization principle, met with insurmountable obstacles in Germany, and the above association was therefore reorganized in 1898. The platform, briefly summarized, states that land shall be controlled so that the