

I have always been a strong friend of the trade union movement, but I cannot overlook the fact that it is only a temporary makeshift necessitated by intolerable conditions. So long as monopoly lasts it must last, but its final end should be the death of monopoly, and not an eternal series of bickering and coquetting with it.

I am not arguing for the introduction of politics into the unions, for I believe that the policy of Mr. Gompers in that respect has been altogether right, but I am arguing for the recognition by union men of the fact that there is no promise of finality in their campaign.

The one thing needful to enable labor to claim its own is the abolition of monopoly, and chiefly of the great underlying monopoly of land, including urban sites, rights of way of railways, the rights exercised in the use of streets by rails, pipes and wires, terminal facilities, etc.

And this land question must be settled first, or else all our other reform work will merely play into the hands of the landlords.

A great movement is on foot to secure municipal ownership of public utilities, an excellent thing as far as it goes, but if it is secured first, without also putting an end to all monopoly in land, it will simply help the landlords in the end and no one else.

If fares are reduced, up go the rents uptown and in Brooklyn. And it is so of every reform. If trades unionism succeeded in obtaining high wages for all workers (which it cannot do) it would merely increase the demand for better apartments and enable landlords to raise their rents, and thus collect the increase of wages received by the men.

The method of putting an end to land monopoly was pointed out with the greatest force and clearness by Henry George 25 years ago, and nothing need be added to what he said. His plan is simple, scientific and practicable, and can be introduced either immediately or as gradually as we please.

Nineteen years ago, in the election of 1886, it did seem as if organized labor understood the problem and was ready to tackle it. If they had followed up that brilliant skirmish, we should have been by this time well on the way to economic justice. But alas! the enthusiasm did not last, and to-day of those who try to look beyond the end of their noses, most are led away by the vague generalities and impracticable programmes of socialism.

The one thing that stands in the way of labor's prosperity to-day is its failure to follow the teachings of Henry George.

THE ROOT OF ALL GOOD.

Editorial in New York Nation of Oct. 5.

Our blood boiled when we read that a country clergyman had had the effrontery to offer at a religious meeting here in New York a resolution declaring that "no talent for high finance, no useful service to the community, no benefaction to the church or to objects of philanthropy, can excuse or atone for dereliction in trust, contempt for the rights of others, or disregard of the rules of common honesty." Bishop Potter, who was presiding, very properly frowned, and passed over the matter in a paternal manner. If he and the Episcopal church do not make stand against this reckless abuse of our best citizens and most devout worshipers, no one will; and the tongue of slander will run on unchecked. Just because a few officers and directors of insurance companies have been "caught with the goods on," there is a wild howl about a frantic and unscrupulous scramble for gain. A day or two ago the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst joined the chorus; William Allen White has an article about it in the *October Atlantic*; President Nicholas Murray Butler has been solemnly warning his boys at Columbia; and at a little social gathering in Cleveland, John D. Rockefeller has been lamenting that more of his dear friends do not choose the higher things of life in preference to filthy money. Of these four men only one is qualified to testify as an expert. Dr. Parkhurst is a minister, and of course wholly ignorant of business; Mr. White is a Kansas editor, who probably has not to-day a paltry half-million of unencumbered property; and Dr. Butler is nothing but a college president, pegging along on \$10,000 or so a year. Mr. Rockefeller ought to know whether it is worth while to get rich. Whatever he may say when speaking for publication, his real feelings are expressed by his actual choice of good things.

The intimation that he has not chosen wisely should be resented by every loyal New Yorker. What are we here for, if not for money? Is Wall street a health resort? Is Broadway a golf links? Are the roofs of our sky-scrapers breezy mountain tops? Are the corridors of the Waldorf-Astoria the echoing aisles of a primeval forest? Does Manhattan Island lift its fringed palms in air? Dr. Butler is no backwoods deacon that he should chatter about reputations melting like snow before the sun of publicity. Apparently, he alludes to such men as James W. Alexander, James Hazen Hyde, and Chauncey Mitchell Depew; but they are not making any

complaint. They got what they wanted, and they are not crying because they have lost what they didn't need. Your professional thief must reckon upon spending at least a quarter of his time behind prison bars, at hard labor, with poor food. But all three of the men we have mentioned made off with more than the most skillful cracksman could hope for; they are at large, with comfortable houses and well-cooked dinners; and one of them is a member of the United States Senate. They are not beggarly school-teachers and preachers whose stock in trade is reputation; they are not butlers or coachmen on \$50 a month that they must have letters from their last employers. They are high financiers; and if you don't admire them, you can do the other thing.

The people who work in the money mill have taken the job with their eyes open. Walk through Wall street and look at them. Listen to their talk at the bars and in the restaurants of the financial district. They are not fools, as Dr. Butler and Mr. White would have us believe. They are getting the objects that are worth having in this troubled and transitory life. They acquire power. When a man has piled up enough millions he can make existence a burden for his enemies on the Stock Exchange. John W. Gates and James R. Keene are as happy every day as a bulldog killing a cat; but Dr. Parkhurst doesn't enjoy a thrill like that once a decade. If you have enough money, you can always see your name and your picture in the papers. Your slightest cold in the head throws the yellow journals into hysterics of red and green ink. Your wife and children run a gantlet of photographers while daylight lasts. Your house is pointed out to the people who are seeing New York. The wages you pay your servants, the price of your cigars and of the underclothing of your whole family, the food you eat, and your last divorce suit are matters of public discussion. It's much better than being President or even a popular actress.

After all, however, these are only intellectual pleasures. It is to the real man, the physical, that money caters as nothing else can. We do not observe that Dr. Butler and other apocryphal moralists are living very high. They cannot afford private cars, private yachts, and automobiles. They have to work so hard that they cannot indulge in ten-course dinners, nervous prostration, and other things which the wealthy and well-bred now reckon among the bare necessities. William Allen White is not opening champagne every night at the club; his purse couldn't stand that pace for a single month. Let us free our minds,

then, from hypocrisy. Everybody can't be rich. Society could not exist without its submerged tenth of bootblacks, college professors, car conductors, artists, street-sweepers, musicians and small tradesmen. But these are occupations for the dull and unambitious. Any one who has red blood in his veins will get out and hustle for the stuff that will procure him the choicest viands, the richest wines and the most refined society.

BOOKS

ROMAN SOCIETY.

Modern thought has brought nothing better in the way of education than a revolution in the idea as to what is history. Nowhere else has the growth of the democratic spirit made itself more subtly felt. We are beginning to learn that history does not consist mainly of the glories of wars or the achievements of princes and statesmen. The people are beginning to count. The historian is beginning to inquire what the masses have thought, suffered and done. As yet there is only a beginning of the revolution, but it is a beginning that will grow. Many readers of Tolstoy's greatest novel, *War and Peace*, have probably wondered at, and some perhaps have hardly understood, the long essay at the close. This essay sounds the death-knell of the old conception of history. History can never again be the record of the ways and doings of the few, regardless of the many. It is too much to expect of conservatism that the change of view should be immediate and universal. Text-books and seats of learning are still infused with the old spirit, but it is certain that the new spirit is beginning to show itself even in the schools.

Prof. Samuel Dill, of Queens college, Belfast, has contributed greatly to the new movement in history. His latest work, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (Macmillan, 639 pp., 8vo., \$4.60), is a book of great learning, going behind the deeds of emperors and officials to the lives of the people of all classes. It is far more a history of the time it covers than the books that call themselves such. It tells, so far as meager records will permit, how people lived and made a living; how they thought and acted; what were their social ideals and religious beliefs.

Not even the poorest workers and slaves are overlooked. "The usual fashion," says Dill, "of writing Roman history has concentrated attention on the doings of the emperor, the life of the noble class in the capital, or on the stations of the legions and the political organization of the provinces. It is a stately and magnificent pano-

rama. But it is apt to throw the life of the masses into even deeper shadow than that in which time has generally enwrapped them. We are prone to forget that, behind all this stately life, there was a quiet yet extraordinarily busy industrial activity which was its necessary basis and which catered for all its caprices." In the third chapter of the second book the author attempts to give a view of the life of the industrial classes in the period covered. The chapter is entitled the *Colleges and Plebeian Life*, and it must be understood that the word colleges, which is the literal translation of the Latin word *collegia*, means, generally, labor unions. The author shows how these unions dated back to remotest times, how they persisted in spite of times of suppression, how they seemed to grow in importance as slave labor for various reasons declined, and how they may have added to the welfare of the masses and helped to lighten the dull routine of their existence.

"The plebeian crowd," says Prof. Dill, "recruited from the ranks of slavery, and ever growing in numbers and, in their higher ranks, in wealth, did not indeed dream of breaking down the barriers of exclusiveness; but they claimed, and quietly asserted, the right to organize a society of their own, for protection against oppression, for mutual sympathy and support, for relief from the deadly dullness of an obscure and sordid life."

It must not be forgotten that our means of knowing the life and thought of the masses, until very recent times, are exceedingly meager. "Roman literature," says Prof. Dill, "which was the product of the aristocratic class or of their dependents, generally pays but little attention to the despised mass engaged in menial services or petty trades." And he makes the gruesome statement that "the common people are now as a rule chiefly known to us from the inscriptions on their tombs." It seems, too, that at some periods the workingmen's only legitimate union was an association for the purpose of burying themselves. "Sepulture and religion," says the author, "being admitted by the government as legitimate objects for association, any college, however secular in its tone, might, and probably would, screen itself under sacred names."

From various sources, mainly inscriptions, we get glimpses of awful cruelty, of dire poverty, of "bloody riots at Nuceria and Pompeii," of "serious troubles in the reign of Aurelian, when 7,000 people were killed in the organized outbreak of the workmen," of "fierce conflicts with the higher orders, as at Puteoli in the reign of Nero, when the discord was so menacing as to call for the

presence of a praetorian cohort." Of all such events we get mere glimpses, and these from one point of view. Last Sunday the *New York Tribune*, in order to prepare public opinion for a possible renewal of conflict with Pennsylvania miners next Spring, devoted a page to telling the prosperity of these miners, and how the only poverty that existed was self-inflicted, for the sake of savings-bank deposits. To-day we are able to read the other side. In former times the miners' side was never told.

And yet, by putting together stray bits of information, and, in the light of modern thought, permitting ourselves to read between the lines, we may see that throughout Roman history there were not lacking constant efforts on the part of workingmen, more or less organized, to improve their social and economic condition. Did they accomplish very much? It seems not. Nor did many of them perhaps have any conception of a solid and permanent improvement. Like too many in the unions to-day, who, in the light of the present, have less excuse, the great majority probably had no thought beyond the immediate gain of some personal assistance, or of some occasional concession to their particular trade.

A large part of Prof. Dill's book is devoted to the religious movements under the empire. Nowhere else can the student find a clearer account of this most interesting period, during which Christianity was slowly making its way. The author brings out well how impossible it was that the coldness and negativeness of stoicism, even in its most humanitarian form in the writings of Seneca, or in its most gracious development in the teachings of Marcus Aurelius, could ever make an effective appeal to the heart of the world. He shows the rise of the worship of the Great Mother, and of Isis and Serapis, and last, not least, of Mithra. He shows how these Eastern cults, so inferior in some ways to the ethical purposes of stoicism, were able to spread far beyond the reach of stoic philosophy, just because they recognize, however imperfectly, the mystical and spiritual side of humanity. It was Mithraism, before Christianity, that came nearest to possessing the religious mind of Europe in the early centuries. Its spread was rapid and marvelous. It was, as Prof. Dill says, "perhaps the highest and most striking example of the last efforts of paganism to reconcile itself to the great moral and spiritual movement which was setting steadily, and with growing momentum, towards purer conceptions of God, of man's relations to Him, and of the life to come."

There is little in the present volume concerning the rise of Christian-