

eternity he could not create the tiniest mote that floats.

In regard to the trusts, the way to make them harmless is to take the special privileges that they enjoy from them. Those special privileges consist of the private ownership of land and a protective tariff. To take away the tariff and leave the land system as it is would do but very little good, for some of them are not buttressed by a protective tariff at all. No matter how great a combination of capital we might have it could do no harm if the land monopoly element was absent. We contend their feet must rest, "Antaeus like," on the ground for them to be able to do any harm; for instance, suppose a number of capitalists owned all the steel mills in the country and then suppose your humble servant owned all the coal and iron mines available. Who do you suppose would be the master of the situation? The truth is that factories can be multiplied indefinitely, but it would be a pretty big contract for a man to undertake to multiply coal and iron mines, would it not? The truth is, there is no comparison between property in land and property in the products of labor, and when these people write their essays on the struggle between capital and labor and either ignore the land altogether or else classify it with capital, treating both factors as capital, it is of no more benefit than a refrigerator would be at the North Pole. If we attempt to solve any problem, we must take all factors into consideration and we must keep them in their proper order.

In regard to our practical proposition, we propose to leave the land in the hands of its present owners, but they will be required to pay the yearly rental value of the land over to the government. I have had some men intimate to me that they would not care to own quite all of God's creation under such a system.

In regard to the opinions of laboring men generally on these questions, I often think on Labor Day, when I see the hosts of labor marching, if you could only use your brains as well as you can your legs how easy this problem would be of solution. I often wish I could have been present when the first man sold another man a piece of land. Certainly the one who sold the land must have seen something green in the other man's eye, or he would not have made such a proposition to him. I should have thought he would then have offered to sell him the right to breathe the air and enjoy the

sunlight. It certainly would have been no greater outrage on natural rights. The vision of some people is obscured in regard to the truth on account of the division of labor, and so many occupations in a highly developed state seem to have no direct connection with the land, but first principles have never been changed or abrogated.

The same thing is true of the industrial structure that is true of a very tall building, that no matter how high the super-structure may be reared, the foundation must rest on the ground; for it is as true to-day, as it was in primitive times, that in the last analysis all wealth is produced by the application of human labor to natural resources. We harbor no delusions; again and again will the truth be overborne, but, although the friends of privilege may turn back the hands on the dial, they cannot stay the sun in its course, and, in spite of all discouragements, we keep bravely hoping for the dawning of the day when the right of all God's children to the use of the earth will be no longer the mere dream of the enthusiast, but the realized and accomplished fact.

SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Speech of Louis F. Post in a symposium on "Social Progress" at the commencement exercises at Ruskin College, Glen Ellyn, Ill., Monday, June 27, 1904.

Men who are in the whirlpool of social disturbance at any time in the world's history, cannot know whether the world is at that time progressing or not. Living generations never know whether their social disturbances are carrying them forward or turning them backward. All they are positively aware of is the disturbance. They cannot be sure of its tendency; they can only infer.

And their inferences are not always rational. When social motion lifts one's own interests to the top, he naturally fancies that the disturbance implies social progress. But if the social motion jostles him "out of the swim," he as naturally fancies that it implies social decadence. It is the same with one's pet reforms. If our own theories of reform happen to be tossed up into popularity, we think the world is progressing because our cause seems to be winning. But if our theories happen to be submerged, our cause seems to be losing and we think there is no God in Israel.

Let us not be deceived by appearances. A sailing yacht is none the less truly moving forward though it turns from its course to beat against the

wind. Driftwood floating down the Mississippi is just as surely on its way to the great southern gulf when it follows the river's current around a bend and toward the north as when it turns another bend and floats toward the south. The piston rod of a locomotive drives the iron horse forward as truly by its backward as by its forward stroke. And so with social phenomena. We must never be swift to infer from any backward social motion that the social movement is backward. Rational inferences depend upon further circumstances, upon wider observation, upon clearer thought.

Considered simply in themselves, most of the social phenomena of our day discourage inferences of social progress. Do you doubt it? Bear with me then while I sketch in broad outline a picture of our social life. Don't be quick to exclaim "Pessimist!" if the picture irritates you. He is not the dangerous pessimist who reminds you of bad social conditions in order to urge you to change them. The dangerous pessimist is he who falsely tells you there are no such conditions or that they are passing away. And it will make little difference to you in the end, whether he tells you this because he is a lighthearted fool who doesn't know any better, or because he is a designing confidence man to whom those conditions are useful as a trap. I am no pessimist. What I am about to describe, disheartening as it may seem, makes my heart throb with optimistic pulsations; for I see in it something of that reactionary social motion from which I think experience justifies us in inferring a forward social movement.

I cannot better indicate social conditions than by recalling a curious novel which I read several years ago. I do not remember its name and I have forgotten its story. All I recall about it is its picture of reaction in this country from a condition of virtual equality of rights and opportunity to one in which a few were masters and the many had to serve or be shot.

This picture as I remember it portrayed a gradual spread of involuntary poverty, and a concurrent acquisition of power by a few designing men. These tendencies grew until the whole country had been divided into great dukedoms whose owners ruled the inhabitants with arbitrary will and a rod of iron.

Yet our political institutions had not been overthrown. There were still

presidents and congresses and governors and legislatures; and the people voted with the same nominal freedom as before. But voters dared not vote against the interests of the great land-owning dukes of Ohio and Illinois and New York. Through ownership of most of the land of the country, those monopolists owned everything upon it—including the citizens themselves and their citizenship. As to presidents and congresses and governors and legislatures, these obsequious functionaries were as obedient to the impudent commands of the unofficial dukes of our country as ever was French parliament when summoned by absolute king to bed of justice.

That novel seemed fanciful to me in my younger days. But it seems so no longer. And I do myself the justice of believing that it is not I that have changed, except that I know a little more, but that the conditions which that novelist saw then and logically worked out in his imagination have gone far toward working themselves out in actual experience.

Think of the degrading poverty of our great cities, and see how it is invading our smaller towns. Consider how the tramp has become a type within 30 years, and is more of a problem instead of less as time passes on. Remember that 40 years ago the beggars of New York city were foreign born, and that native poverty of the degrading sort was hardly known. Our criminal prisons then were filled for the most part with foreigners, and most of our degrading poverty and crime was accounted for by reference to the unthrift of our immigrants. All this is changed, and not for the better. If poverty and crime were really due to immigration and could be checked by restrictive laws, we should have more need now for immigration detectives between here and heaven than between here and Europe.

During the period of this change which that novel portrayed, there has been the correlative change. The darkening shadow of monopoly millionairism has brought on an eclipse, at least a partial eclipse, of our free institutions. With fearful poverty on the one hand and unbridled power on the other, there has come a regime of servility and despotism.

Reflection upon the political and economic changes in this country for the past two decades will convince any impartial intelligence that the novel I have referred to was far from fanciful. Even the dukedoms, though

not here in name, are now here in fact. Who governs Pennsylvania? Who governs California? Who governs West Virginia? Who governs Colorado? Who governs any of the States in which Providence has created great natural opportunities? Not the civil officials, not the voters, not even the politicians; but a few men who have secured control of the ownership of these natural opportunities and of the railway franchises that command their utilization. At first the monopolists were timid and sly. That was so when the novel I have recalled was written. They have now become bold and domineering. This signals the progress of their power.

Would you see a small working model of this regime in full operation? Turn your eyes, then, to Colorado. There you behold a country on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains richly endowed by nature with mineral deposits. Nature neglected to affix to these deposits the business card of any man or combination, but what nature thus neglected the law has wrongfully supplied. I say wrongfully, because if it be true that the only excuse for civil law is to preserve equality of rights, then was civil law without excuse when it disinherited the people of Colorado. It was thereby wrested from its legitimate purpose to serve the interests of monopoly; and now nearly all these rich deposits, and the railway franchises that control their connection with the markets of the world, belong to a few corporations—over which a few men are dictators. Without their permission no one can extract ore from these natural deposits and swap it for bread. They thus command the natural sources of livelihood of Colorado miners. And through this ownership has come despotism. Law has been overthrown by its sworn administrators, and the owners of the mines of the State of Colorado are the State of Colorado.

The officials tell us that they have acted dictatorially only to put down lawlessness on the part of some members of a trade union. That is the Governor's apology when he comes upon a visit to our own Illinois, a State which has not yet fallen wholly into the power of supra-legal corporations. But it makes no difference what apology they have to offer for subverting law in the name of law; the vital question is whether or not they have done it.

That they have done it admits of no denial, and none is made. If you want a circumstantial account from the pen of an impartial investigator, go to McClure's Magazine for May, 1904,

and read Ray Stannard Baker's report. But let me tell you the story briefly.

When the mine owners became autocratic, the miners organized unions to meet organization with organization, power with power. A fight followed—carried on by the miners, at first at any rate, with the ballot. But it was an unequal fight. The mine owners were able to say among themselves: "Let us own the mines of Colorado and we care not who does the voting nor how he votes."

At first the miners secured an eight-hour law from the legislature. But the Supreme Court nullified it as unconstitutional. Then the miners appealed to the people for a constitutional amendment, and the people granted it by an overwhelming majority. But the new legislature, bribed by the mine owners, violated both their official oaths and their campaign pledges by neglecting to execute this mandate of the people; and the Governor refused to call them in special session to perform that official duty. The miners then went on strike.

There was violence on both sides, but there was no violence with which the local civil authorities could not and did not cope. It was no greater in lawlessness than the crimes that are common in any community, no worse in character than those which are familiar to frontier communities. But at the behest of the mine owners the Governor declared the strike regions in a state of insurrection and placed the military in absolute control.

The State was without funds for this purpose, but the mine owners' organization supplied the funds. The military, instead of attempting to suppress disorder impartially, took its orders from the mine owners' association. One of the captains, put in military charge of a whole strike district, was also the manager of one of the associated mines in that district.

Among other things, this mine-owners' militia captain arrested the president of the Western Federation of Miners. He preferred no charge against this labor union official, but held him in custody by sheer force of his military authority. When the courts ordered his release under that time-honored implement of liberty, the writ of habeas corpus, the military defied the courts. Then the matter was carried to the highest court of the State, on the bench of which there sat men whose affiliations raise against them at least a reasonable shadow of suspicion. Two of these judges overruled the third and refused to release the prisoner. It would

have been the same if he had been under sentence of death, for the judges said so. They decided in substance that the mere declaration by the governor that insurrection exists anywhere in the State, whether the declaration be true or false, makes him an absolute dictator in that locality—a dictator so absolute that he may destroy property without cause, deprive citizens of their liberty without charges, execute innocent prisoners without trial; and yet that the courts cannot interfere.

This is a dictatorial prerogative, which it is doubtful if the emperor of Germany would be allowed to exercise, and which the king of England certainly does not possess. It makes any mine-owners' governor of Colorado a czar. Even a popular election could not displace him. Only a popular revolution could avail.

Having received that astounding authority from two of the three Supreme Court judges, this mine-owners' governor of Colorado gave the troops carte blanche in the strike region, and right royally did they exercise their dictatorial power. Professing to preserve order, they merely obeyed the commands of the mine-owners' organization. In doing this they supported a mine-owners' mob in gutting the co-operative stores of the miners' union, and in destroying the printing plant of the union newspaper. They also supported the mine-owners' committee in forcing civil officials to resign. These officials had been duly elected by the ballots of the people and were charged with no offense known to the law, either of malfeasance, misfeasance or non-feasance, but they were forced by this mine-owners' committee to resign, on pain of instant death, and for no other purpose than to make vacancies into which the employes of the mine-owners' organization were thrust. Instead of preventing this most audacious disturbance of law and order, the military aided and abetted it and recognized the unlawful appointees as legitimate officials.

Though the military supported that manifest subversion of the law, making no arrests of its perpetrators, they arrested and deported miners by wholesale, and upon no other charge than that of being members of a union. More than this, they forced a peaceably conducted mine to shut down for no other alleged reason than that it employed union men. In this mine there had been no strike. Its business had been peaceably and lawfully conducted throughout the whole strike period.

But it was operating in competition with the mines of the mine-owners' organization. That organization wanted it closed and the obedient military officers in command therefore ordered it to close.

How do you like this Colorado model of monopoly despotism in active operation? You may be sure that the picture is not overdrawn. The regular newspaper reports bear it out in every particular, though editorial pages are silent; and nothing has been urged in refutation except the immaterial fact, immaterial even if it be a fact, that labor unionists were committing lawless acts. If they were, there were laws to reach them and these should have been enforced. Let it be even conceded that a military dictatorship was made necessary by lawlessness of unions in a controversy with their employers, and still it was incumbent upon the dictator to preserve order; to protect property, and to respect personal rights—in the interest of all. He stands condemned, even as a lawful dictator, of overriding the laws of property and liberty in the interest and at the command of the mine-owners' organization.

But can we concede the lawfulness of this Colorado dictatorship, can we concede even its necessity, when we find it acting under the control of the associated owners of the mineral deposits of Colorado,—can we concede this without trembling for the liberties not only of Colorado but of our common country? Colorado is but a pioneer State in monopolistic aggression. She has gone only a little farther in the direction in which all the other States and the Union itself are going. Though it happens that in no other State have the despotic purposes and methods of monopoly been so frankly unmasked and the extent of their power been so completely exposed, yet the advance of the monopolistic revolution is everywhere apparent. To point this out in detail would require too much time, but intelligent observers who look farther than their noses may easily see it.

Unless you belong to that class of deceived or deceitful optimists who though they have eyes see not and boast of it, you need no guide to show you the trend of things. You can see for yourselves that this "gem of the ocean," this "land of the free," this beloved country of ours, is fast becoming what the mining regions have already become—the absolute private property of a few persons. You can see for yourselves that its inhab-

itants, like those of Europe in feudal times, are fast dividing into two classes: a small but powerful landed class, and a large but weak and timid class of landless tenants and laborers. The principal difference is that our landed class own their land largely through corporations, and that our landless class have votes—which they don't know how to use. Were Colorado to adopt this warning motto to the other States, "As I am now you soon must be," there would be nothing misleading in the doleful sentiment.

And observe, I beg you, that this lawlessness in Colorado is no riotous struggle between parties or factions, in which one has enlisted the power of the State. It is no hot-blooded conflict between angry strikers and angry employers, in which the latter have gained an advantage through the militia. It has none of the characteristics of ephemeral popular passion. If it had, we might think of it as lovers think of their quarrels. But this overturning of law and order by the State officials themselves has been done at the command of the mining corporations. With premeditation and calculation, calmly, deliberately, coldly and relentlessly they have caused it, for the purpose, not of winning a strike merely, but of testing popular forbearance. Their unconcealed purpose is to overthrow the Republic and build a despotic government upon its ruins. Democratic government has failed in Colorado, so their agents openly say, and a stronger government must take its place. It is this revolutionary spirit of monopoly that makes the situation in Colorado so peculiarly alarming.

But make no pessimistic mistake. All this does not necessarily imply social decadence. The social motion is indeed backward, but the social movement of which it is part may nevertheless be forward. To me, at any rate, there is more to hope for in such great backward manifestations, discouraging and alarming though they be in themselves, than in all the little manifestations of progress which side-parties in politics and segregated reform associations are able to show. Notwithstanding that in themselves the great social phenomena of our time give little encouragement to infer social progress, those phenomena take on a different aspect when we consider them in the light of wider experience and closer observation.

The greatest of all allegories illustrates the truth that social progress may spring from victories against social progress. When the devil accomplished the expulsion of Adam, and Eve from Eden, it was a victory for him and a

seeming disaster to the human race. But without it there could have been no progress. Though man thereby lost the innocence of ignorance, he was set free to gain intelligent righteousness.

The Christian gospels give the same assurance. What could have seemed darker and more hopeless to the disciples of Jesus than treachery and crucifixion as the climax of his career? How that must have blasted their hopes and shocked their faith. Yet it was ancient paganism rather than the Nazarene that died on the cross at Calvary.

All history teaches the same lesson. Out of the most disheartening reactions against social progress have come its most notable advances. The accession of Charles II., for instance, was a return to absolutism, but it revived the spirit of British liberty and reacted in the establishment of the British constitution. Nor need we look abroad nor far back in history for instances of reactionary social motion promoting a forward social movement. When the British soldiery at Boston fired into a patriot mob, their fusillade killed more than the victims. It killed American love for the mother country, and thereby made Bunker Hill, Saratoga and Yorktown possible. Behold, too, the fugitive slave law of the '50's leading on to the emancipation proclamation and the thirteenth amendment of the '60's.

So out of the very magnitude and boldness of such episodes as the Colorado reaction there may flash a light that will lighten all the dense darkness of American thought. The contest in this country is not between lawless mobs and law-abiding citizens and officials; it is not between employers and hired men; it is not between organized and unorganized workers; it is not between labor and capital in any fundamental sense of those terms. The great contest in this country, the contest that is now on and of which the Colorado usurpation is a startling episode, is a struggle for mastery by legal privilege over equality of legal rights. Let this truth be once grasped by our people, and American monopoly is doomed. Let them once grasp this truth, and we shall no longer have a country fostering conditions that make for monopoly and serfdom. We shall then have a country of equal legal protection as to person and property, of equal legal rights as to natural opportunities, and of order under law and law according to order.

In my judgment the most encouraging sign of progress in that direction

is this reaction in Colorado. It is better adapted than any other fact of which I know, to enlighten the public mind as to the revolutionary purpose and defiant methods of monopoly. It is like a flash of light in the face of an imperilled sleeper,—an imperilled sleeper who needs not so much to be told what to do as to be awakened and told what to look at. In the very excesses of social reaction I see some of the strongest assurances of social progress.

A PROCLAMATION.

O, citizens of Lhassa, for about a thousand years

We have had to let you go it all alone,
With your bossy lot of prophets and your
lazy lot of seers

And your tubby little idols made of stone.
We were busy in the basement while you
idled on the roof,

But we've tidled up the intervening floors.
And you'll have to drop the notion you
can hold yourselves aloof,

For across the Himalayas something
roars: "Get busy!"

You will have to try the trolley, and the
auto on the way.

And we like the looks of Lhassa for some
links;

So you'd better get some golf clubs and be
learning how to play,

And be smoothing out your antiquated
kinks.

You must get the latest fashions, and be
civilized in dress,

We will show you how to form a trust
as well;

And you'd better read the papers on "The
Way to Win Success,"

For across the Himalayas comes the
yell: "Get busy!"

There's a clinking in the valley, there's a
clatter on the hill,

There's a racket on the mountain and
plateau—

It's your Modern Progress coming, and you
have to pay the bill,

And expense accounts for that are never
low.

You must drop your ancient customs,
though you say you like them best,

You must cut adrift from prayer wheels
and all—

You must quit this thing of living in a
constant state of rest,

For across the Himalayas comes the call:
"Get busy!"

O, citizens of Lhassa, a thousand years
or so

We have let your little llama live alone
With his curious delusion he was running
all the show,

With his tubby little idols made of stone.
But we've finally arranged it so that we
could take your case,

And we've downed your ancient wall and
heavy gate.

So you'll please to get in training—we are
here to set the pace,

And we want to civilize you while you
wait. Got busy!

—W. D. Nesbit, in Chicago Tribune, of
Aug. 19.

Some Scotchmen were dining, and
after the toasts each contributed some-

thing to the entertainment. Dr. McDonald was pressed to sing, but protested that he could not. "My voice is altogether unmusical," he explained. "I never sing." The company thought the doctor very modest, and insisted. "Very well," he said at last. Long before he had finished his audience was uneasy. There was a painful silence as the doctor sat down, broken at length by the voice of a braw Scot at the end of the table. "Mon," he exclaimed, "your singin's no up to much, but your veracity's just fine!"—Woman's Journal.

"Jessie, I have told you again and again not to speak when older persons are talking, but wait until they stop."

"I've tried that already, mamma. They never do stop."—Woman's Journal.

"The musical critic is kicking because he has two big concerts in addition to the grand opera."

"But I didn't expect him to do the opera—the fashion editor will cover that."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"A man expects to be illected prisidint iv th' United States, Hinnessy, f'r th' fine qualities that th' r-rest iv us use only to keep out iv th' pinitinchry."—F. P. Dunne.

BOOKS

THE NEW EDITION OF BUCKLE'S GREAT WORK.

The mere fact that a new edition of Henry Thomas Buckle's "Introduction to the History of Civilization in England" has appeared is a welcome announcement, showing an abiding appreciation of a work that is destined to be, as Thucydides said of his own history, "a possession forever."

No matter whether Buckle's main contentions be accepted or not, there is more than enough of insight and genius in this learned and brilliant fragment to make it for all time a book that will live. When most of what passes for literature is gone, this book will continue to enlighten the minds of those who ponder the ways of men and value truth. If there were nothing else in it but the exposition of the "protective spirit," this alone would be enough to make it a great book.

To see clearly the conception of the "protective spirit" in contrast with the conception of the "democratic spirit" is to see the one supreme irrepressible conflict of the ages. More and more in our day the contrast is becoming emphasized. It is the great fight: on the one side, oppression, privilege and aristocracy, more