

SPEECH OF LOUIS F. POST AT THE
DINNER OF THE ST. LOUIS SINGLE
TAX LEAGUE, MAY
16, 1903.

This dinner, given at Schrap's cafe, was brought to a successful conclusion by the untiring efforts of L. P. Custer, the president of the St. Louis Single Tax league. It was attended by more than 200 guests, and presided over with great good humor and sparkling wit by William Marlon Reedy, editor of the St. Louis Mirror. Stirring short speeches were made by the Rev. Frank G. Tyrrell, N. O. Nelson, Hon. Richard Dalton, the Rev. W. F. Peck, and the guest of the evening, Dr. William Preston Hill, of Tucson, Ariz. A letter from District Attorney Folk was read, and the ceremonies concluded with a bright and thoughtful little speech from Master Webb, of the East St. Louis high school. The subject of the following speech was "The Cause for Which We Labor."

It is peculiarly appropriate, my friends of St. Louis, that the cause we work for should be called to the attention of your community at this centennial time.

With an industrial and art exposition commanding world-wide interest, your delightful city is soon to celebrate the century-old purchase by the American people of a veritable empire in territory adjacent to what was once the western boundary of our Republic, an empire of which St. Louis has grown to be the metropolis. Extending from the Gulf of Mexico at the south, along the course of the Mississippi to the Canadian border on the north, and westward to the Rocky Mountains, this vast region of half a billion acres has been carved into eight States and part of four more, besides two Territories which ought to be States. With scarcely any population, either civilized or savage, at the time of its acquisition, it is now inhabited by nearly 15,000,000 people, all of whom possess or may easily obtain the prerogatives of American citizenship. Our solemn pledge of government by consent of the governed, which was inserted in that treaty of purchase, has been for the most part redeemed. Even the Territories as yet denied Statehood are accorded a degree of self-government not far below what the States themselves enjoy. Within this empire, of whose acquisition and development we are all proud, various nationalities and even races are being welded into political homogeneity. Magnificent industries have here been shaped in harmony with the marvelous revelations of our industrial era. Such progressive cities as New Orleans, Minneapolis, Omaha and Kansas City, not to mention St. Louis, the largest of them all, have risen into towering prominence. Their names have be-

come household words all over this land and wherever else the pulsing activities of trade are felt. This great wilderness of a hundred years ago, this waste of prairie and desert, washed on one side by the treacherous currents of the Father of Waters and guarded on the other by the rugged Rockies, snow capped and forbidding, this fertile feeding ground for wild buffalo and natural hunting park for beasts of prey, has now become a part, and an extremely important part, of what we call the region of civilization. Such a victory of progressive man over resisting nature, Americans may be pardoned for celebrating with effervescent enthusiasm.

In that celebration single tax men and women everywhere will heartily join. For single taxers feel the inspiration of it all, even if they are not the loudest shouters. They realize the glory of it with a greater keenness of appreciation, with a larger grasp of what has been done and what is yet to do, than any mere shouter can know.

It is because single tax men and women understand that the work of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase has only begun, and will not go on of its own momentum, that this single tax gathering is so peculiarly appropriate in point of time and place. In the splendid display which the St. Louis exposition is preparing to make, the American people will celebrate with enthusiastic pride what has been so far accomplished; at this modest dinner we single taxers suggest with thoughtful solicitude what must yet be achieved. This is the optimistic spirit which inspires all I have to say to-night.

It is the spirit, also, in which I hope you will consider every utterance that may sound like criticism. To criticize is farthest from my intention. It is, in fact the very opposite of my purpose. I would not reverse the past if I could. The work of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase is good—good as far as it has gone. What I am urging is not that we go backward, but that we go onward. If I could, I would shout it from your house tops—Go on! Go on! Go on! Not with new acquisitions, not with further territorial expansion, not with the colonial policy that destroyed Rome and is enervating England; but on, on, on, in the further development of the Louisiana country toward the highest ideals of civilization. What I shall attempt is to draw your minds away for a moment from the work behind us to a consideration of the work before us, this great work

of perfecting the civilization of the vast region that Napoleon relinquished to Jefferson.

And may I not speak with freedom, even if I do come from across your border? You need fear no comparisons. I assure you that I find quite as high a degree of civilization here in the old Louisiana Purchase as in the old Northwest territory where I live. I might be gracious enough to admit that Chicago is even less civilized than St. Louis, but I have to go home again. Yet this much is undeniable, that there is no lack of civilization in the old Louisiana Purchase—none to which I shall refer, at any rate—that does not exist in every other section of our common country and among all the civilized peoples of the earth. I have no invidious distinctions to make. If I refer to your section in particular, it is because it is a convenient example, a familiar object lesson, for the time and occasion. I ask the liberty merely of speaking in terms of intimate friendship, as one American to other Americans about a matter of common interest, as one of the English tongue to others whose native tongue is the same—aye, upon that broadest and best basis of all human intercourse, that platform where sectional and national prejudice are obliterated, where race lines are forgotten, where all men are kin and the tongue speaks the language of the heart.

Let me ask each of you, then, to survey with the impartial eye of your better self, this historic section of which your own city is the metropolis. Large as is its population, there is abundant room for millions more. The average is less than 15 people to the square mile. Even the Russian empire, with all its uninhabited wastes, has as large a population as that. The United States as a whole, including this territory and much more as sparsely settled, has over 20 to the mile, while Great Britain rises above 300 and Belgium to 550 or higher. In the light of those comparisons the population possibilities of this region challenge the liveliest imagination.

Do you recoil from the thought of a larger population? Do you think that, as most of the inhabitants already have a hard struggle to live, a larger population would make the struggle more intense by producing a greater pressure upon the natural sources of supply? That is the same economic quicksand in which Malthus floundered, but which Henry George turned into solid ground.

There is nothing of that kind to fear which cannot be easily prevented. The experience of a century has demonstrated what common sense would suggest in the first place, that the larger a population, the more wealth is it capable of producing per capita. Not only do large populations produce more wealth per capita than small ones, but they produce it less laboriously. When that seems not to be the case it is because abnormal conditions interfere; and the reason must be sought in bad human institutions and not in natural law.

He who imagines that increase of population does not mean increase of wealth per capita, fails to take all the facts into account. He does not consider the productive power that specialization of work generates. He forgets the phenomena of what is called division of labor.

Specialization, or division of labor, operates in two ways. We find in one of its manifestations that a large number of men may do together what a smaller number would be physically incapable of doing at all. In the other we find that many men cooperating may increase the capability of each when the work to be done consists of various details each requiring many repetitions but falling short of the capabilities of individual effort. For illustration: one man could not build a locomotive, nor utilize one if he had it; but many men can, by combining their efforts, both build and utilize locomotives. Conversely, one man, having many small packages to carry in different directions, would find his time occupied with less effect if he did all this work for himself than if he swapped work with other men having the same kind of work to do. By arranging with them to carry all but one of his packages to their various destinations on condition that he carry all their packages having the same destination as the one he carries for himself, a great gain for each is secured without the expenditure of any more time and without any additional drain upon their energies. This double aspect of industrial specialization is the secret of all progress. Not only does it in itself multiply industrial power, but by promoting special knowledge and special skill, it multiplies that power incalculably more. Put an end to division of labor and you put an end to society.

But you do put an end to division of labor if you put an end to trade. Without trade there can be no specialization. All specialization would disap-

pear and society along with it, if trade could be abolished and were abolished. Is it not plain, for instance, that no sane man would continue to make shoe soles he doesn't want, if he couldn't trade them for what he does want. This fact, that specialization could not go on if trade were stopped, ought to convince every rational mind that specialization is obstructed when trade is obstructed. Surely, then, one of the necessary conditions of social progress is freedom of trade—the more complete it is in character and the wider in area the better.

To a degree hardly realized, we have freedom of trade in this country. Many people suppose that our national policy is a policy of tariff protection. But in fact the United States enjoy the largest measure of exemption from this kind of protection in the history of the world. The older nations had their own systems of protection. The robber chiefs of the Rhine had theirs; so had the barbarians who pillaged trade at the Pillars of Hercules, and from whose stronghold at Tarifa comes the name of the modern tariff. At another period the merchant guilds had systems somewhat more subtle. For the boldness of the pirate they substituted the cunning of the sneak thief. Upon these old time systems we of the 19th and 20th centuries have made some improvement; but in the mechanism only, and not in point of public economy or common morals. That is to say, we have imitated them in their treatment of foreign trade. With reference, however, to our inter-State commerce, the volume of which is vastly greater than that of our international commerce, we have freedom of trade. Goods are transported across State lines as freely as they may be carried across the street. Between our States we have—and it is the only instance in the world's history on so large a scale—between those States we have the sensible, the moral, the beneficent, the civilizing and the prosperity-making system of absolute free trade.

And, mark you, if this system had not been firmly imbedded in our national Constitution, there would be within the old Louisiana Purchase, in this year of grace 1903, nothing whatever to celebrate. Such progress as you have made you owe to the specialization of your industries in the center of an area of absolute free trade,—a free trade area that extends in length across the continent and which in breadth spans all the varying climates of the temperate zone.

Let the workers in your industries be free to specialize without restriction, let the currents of your trade be free to flow without obstruction, and you need have no fears, my friends of the old Louisiana Purchase, of danger from overpopulation. Reflection indicates that the larger your population the more extensive and minute will your specializations of industry become. And long experience confirms that inference. It is not in sparsely settled countries that we find most wealth per capita. And I am speaking of wealth per capita, mind you, and not of wealth per pocket. Wealth, may, in fact, be better distributed in sparsely settled places; but there is more of it on an average to each inhabitant where population is thick than where it is sparse. There is more per capita in the world now than there was a century ago, when the world's population was smaller. There is more in thickly populated Belgium than in sparsely populated Ireland. There is more in cities than in the country, and more in large cities than in small ones. We have no reason for doubting but every reason for believing that productive power, instead of being outrun by population, outruns population. Just as truly as two men can do more than twice as much as one, can two million do more than twice as much as one million, or 30 million more than twice as much as 15 million.

The only limitations are limitations of space. Not until population is so thick that workers physically interfere with one another's movements can increase in population naturally lessen the per capita increase of wealth. The man who imagines that this space limit would be reached in the old Louisiana Purchase with many times 15 million inhabitants, will have no business to be among the shouters next year at your centennial.

Along with the increased ratio in productive power that comes with increase of population—not only along with it, but as one of its effective methods—come labor saving machinery and discovery after discovery of Nature's hidden resources. The farther invention and discovery go, the farther seems to be their power to go. With "these powers born of progress," and in turn promoting progress, the possibility of supporting myriads of people within the region of the Louisiana Purchase comes to the imagination as a vivid and glorious reality.

It may be said, however, that the multiplication of inhabitants is so certain to be a reality that we need not

concern ourselves about it. But are you quite sure of that? If you are sure, let me beg of you not to base your inference upon anything I have said or suggested. I make no prediction of further growth; I have said nothing to justify confidence in further growth. What I have tried to show is that there is room in the Louisiana territory for a vastly larger population. I do not say that its population will in fact be very greatly augmented. Though more population will doubtless come, it will press more and more against ever-stiffening barriers. For there is a sense in which this territory is already overcrowded.

If that were not true how should we account for the tide of emigration that passes on to the still farther west? Do you believe that there would be less than 15 persons to the square mile in the Louisiana Purchase to-day if the people were not under some pressure to push on? And what is that pressure? It does not all originate in the itch for adventure. It is not all due to the hope of finding a pot of gold at yonder foot of the rainbow. Most people are not adventurous. Most people seek only to live out their lives in peace and comfort where they already are or at the first agreeable abiding place. When they go west, or farther west, or spread up into the north under another flag, it is not because they want to but because they have to. They are not drawn on, they are pushed on. They are not emigrants, they are exiles. They go, and they keep on going, to find room. They are crowded out and crowded on.

But what is it that crowds them, if the land is, indeed, still sparsely settled? A little candid reflection will furnish the answer. Instead of confusing your minds with the obscure facts and seeming complexities of continental movements in population, study the problem in its local manifestations with reference to your own city. When you get at the secret of movements of population in St. Louis, you will have discovered the principle of its movements upon even the largest and most extended scale. Your own city is a laboratory, as it were, in which you can bring the phenomena of social problems within a narrow enough field, both as to space and time, for intelligent observation and study. The modern city is the social world in miniature.

Now, the same paradox is manifest in your city that we have noted for the

whole Louisiana Purchase. Here we see the same conflicting phenomena of a congested yet sparse population. And not alone in your own city, but in all American cities, does this curious phenomenon appear. Isn't St. Louis a crowded city? Aren't Chicago and New Orleans crowded cities? Aren't Minneapolis and St. Paul and Cleveland and Cincinnati? Aren't Boston and New York? Yes, they are all crowded. If you don't believe it, look at the slums where men and women and children are herded like pigs in filthy sties. Look at the flats where the middle class are rounded up. Ask the reason and you will be told that the city is overcrowded. Yet the population in every one of these cities is sparse. In New York it is only 19 to the acre. In Philadelphia it is barely 18, in Chicago less than 17. And in your own crowded city of St. Louis, this dreadfully crowded metropolis of the Louisiana Purchase, the population is less than 15 to the acre. I wonder if it would comfort you to know that New Orleans is crowded with a population per acre of less than 3?

Think of it. Consider it. Ponder on it and profit by it. There is room within the city limits of St. Louis for all the present population, allowing amply for streets and parks, and still giving to each family of five persons a space 100 feet square. Yet St. Louis is a crowded city! Why? Let us see.

Are there any vacant building lots here? You needn't answer. Even the stranger within your gates knows that this universal phenomenon of city life makes no exception of St. Louis. But why are those lots vacant if the city is crowded?

Another inquiry. Are there any improved building lots here which are improved inadequately? You needn't answer that question either. I can see for myself. But why are these lots not adequately improved if the city is crowded?

Why do people herd in your slums, why are they crowded in your tenement apartments, why are they jammed into four-room flats, why do they seek homes at long distances from their places of work—why all this cramping and crowding and exile if the improvement of poorly improved lots and those that are not improved at all would furnish such ample accommodation as we can easily see would be the case? Isn't the answer as plain as a pike staff?

What else can it be than that the building lots of your city are monop-

olized and that the monopolizers hold them at rack rent prices? This social blight has enormously reduced the population of Ireland, and made that unhappy country more and more crowded as the population has declined. That fact itself sufficiently indicates that it is not large populations that cause overcrowding. It is land monopoly. How blighting this may be in your city I do not know, but in Boston, the highest populated of all our cities, 56 per cent. of the land is vacant—56 per cent. There is your secret of overcrowding.

Just as a few families have crowded the Irish out of Ireland, even one family could crowd us all out of a city, or off the continent, or off the earth itself, if they were so disposed and we did not resist. Precisely this principle of crowding is operative in St. Louis. Not only as the population of this city increases, but as it seems likely to increase, the owners of the site of St. Louis are able to raise the prices of building lots.

Every improvement in the life of your city gives them a leverage for doing the same thing. Let business thrive, and land values go up. Let an exposition come, and land values rise. Let population move in one direction, and in that direction land goes up in price. Let it seek another outlet, and land prices go up there. If these prices rise so high that population makes a jump, then land goes up where the jump carries it, leaving over-valued vacant spaces between. Everywhere you look you find patches, and strips, and blocks of land, as vacant and unused as when the Louisiana Purchase was made; yet worth at any time in the market a price which speaks eloquently of desire to use it. It is held out of use by the owners' demands for prices higher than it is yet worth.

Your population is driven by these rack rent prices, by these "stand and deliver" demands, either to huddle in contracted quarters, or to pass by whole areas of good building lots, leaving them vacant, in order to utilize poorer and cheaper ones farther away. And so your city seems to be overcrowded when there is room in it to assign space to all who live here at the rate of a quarter of an acre to every family of five.

The same principle operates in the same way and with the same kind of result throughout the Louisiana Purchase. Pretty much all this territory is monopolized and he who would use any of it must pay more than it is yet worth or move on. While that le-

galized method of robbing the workers to enrich idlers is tolerated, neither your progressive city nor the magnificent section of country of which it is the metropolis and whose acquisition you are about to celebrate, can develop the best civilization of which the people are capable. Your growth of population will be checked. Your industrial specialization will be limited. Your wealth will be unfairly distributed. Your workers will continue to constitute your poor class and your schemers and idlers your rich class. If you would truly celebrate the acquisition of the Louisiana territory, you must resolve to put an end to its blight of landlordism wherever your influence extends.

That may seem a difficult thing to do. But its difficulties are not so great nor its consummation so far off as the thoughtless throng may imagine. The advance of this reform has been equal to that of most great reforms. Even now nearly 300 British cities have petitioned parliament for leave to adopt it, and the Conservative party majority against it in parliament has been reduced to 13, while the Liberal party is committed to it beyond recall. In New Zealand and Australia it has received legislative recognition and is forging ahead. For local taxation more than 50 municipalities in New Zealand have adopted it. In our own State of New York, a measure has just become law for the city of New York which takes the initial steps in the adoption of this reform. May I not also point to the evidence of its advance which is manifested by the fact that pronounced and well-known leaders in the single tax movement are also leaders in the public affairs of the country? I might give you a catalogue of these, but it will be enough for my purpose if I name Gov. Garvin, the chief magistrate of Rhode Island, and Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland.

So far as the inherent difficulties of popularizing the single tax are concerned, it must be remembered that the abolition of landlordism does not involve the abolition of private tenures. The private possession of land for use is a good thing. The private monopoly of land for monopoly is a bad thing. What is necessary to do, therefore, is to regulate tenures so that private monopoly may disappear and private possession be made more secure. This is the cause that Henry George worked for, it is the cause that we work for, it is what the single tax would accomplish.

If land were taxed in the ratio of its value, regardless of whether the owner used it or not, and the tax were high enough to discourage ownership without use, by making it unprofitable, we should destroy land monopoly. No one would then wish to possess land or to control it in any way except to use it. But none would be discouraged from possessing land to use. The taxation of land values would furnish a public income so abundant that all taxes on the use of land could be abolished. Consequently possession for use would not only not be discouraged; it would be positively encouraged.

Can't you see it? If city lots were taxed heavily in proportion to their value, and houses were not taxed at all, isn't it plain that lots would tumble into the market and fall in price, and that houses would spring up where high priced vacant lots testify to obstructive land monopoly now? Isn't it true that then the unimproved lots would be improved, and the inadequately improved lots would be adequately improved. Your enterprising people would then make their money by putting city lots to their best use, and not by holding them out of use for higher prices.

The same kind of effect would under the same circumstances be produced throughout the whole Louisiana territory. There would be no sparseness of population, for the single tax policy would invite immigration, and would encourage people to remain, whether they came to you from Europe or from Heaven. There would be no crowding, for the single tax policy would make room for all until every possibility of further development had been exhausted.

And why should this policy not be adopted? What is land monopoly that we must be solicitous for the conventional rights of its beneficiaries and indifferent to the natural rights of its victims? Land monopoly is fundamentally unjust. It gives the earth to some of its inhabitants and denies it to the rest. It decrees that the disinherited shall work for the privileged. It reverses the ordinance that every man shall eat bread in the sweat of his own face. It is the thong which binds the masses of men in a newer slavery. Let us have done with it. The child of an Astor has no better right to a place upon the earth than the poorest babe that comes wailing into the world in the wretchedest slum of a New York or a St. Louis. More than that, every child has an equal right with every other to enjoy all the ad-

vances which society has thus far gained; and of these advances most children are deprived, wickedly deprived by monopoly of land.

It is not the greed of business men, it is the pressing want of the disinherited, that drives babies into factories. Of course these babies are not ours—not yours or mine. They are only abstract babies to us, and their misery does not pull at our heart strings. But imagine them for a moment to be yours. Imagine your little Mary, or your little Harry, or any other child of your own affections—imagine such a child, a concrete child of flesh and blood which you love, imagine that child wearing out its baby life in a dusty coal breaker or a roaring factory. Do that, and if the tears do not come, nor the righteous wrath of your soul boil over, you will at least have less respect for vested rights and more for human rights, than you ever had before. These child-labor children are disinherited children. They are denied their social birthright by an infamous system of land monopoly.

When the site of one city is worth more than that of another, when lots in one part of a city are worth more than lots in another part, when some farming locations are worth more than others, when some mineral deposits enrich their so-called owners while impoverishing their workers, and Nature's gift of oil ruins scores of thousands to make a billionaire—when these differences appear what do they mean? They mean that the more valuable places command greater degrees of control over social or industrial advantages. If one baby inherits a place on the earth that is valueless even though useful in a primitive fashion, and another inherits one that is not only useful but valuable, the latter inherits a larger share of common social benefits than the other. That is wrong and should be no longer tolerated. A fair field and no favor is the slogan alike of righteousness and of progress. It is such a field that the single tax policy offers.

The principle which animates the single tax policy is one of two forces that to-day are gathering for conflict. The other is the socialist principle. I do not allude to the Socialist party. That may or may not figure in the struggle before us as the representative of the principle of socialism. No one can tell. What I do allude to is the force of which the So-

cialist party is now an expression. Whether it finds ultimate expression in a party calling itself Socialist or otherwise makes no difference. So with the single tax principle. This raises no question of particular political parties or platforms or programmes. It is the vital principle of practical individualism. It is the principle with reference to property, not of "mine," nor of "mine and thine," but of the sacredness of mine, the sacredness of thine, and the sacredness of ours. In the conflict between these two principles, socialism and the single tax, every man who lives much longer will be compelled to choose.

The question he must sit in judgment upon is whether, on the one hand, he will promote a social principle the philosophy of which is economic fatalism and its ideal the making of society everything and of the individual nothing; or will, on the other hand, promote the principle which distinguishes social from individual functions, social from individual rights, social from individual duties, conserving them all by taking for society what belongs to society and leaving to each individual what belongs to him. This is the issue.

According to the socialistic principle the industrial change from the use of cheap tools to expensive machinery is a functional change completely revolutionizing the character of industry. According to the single tax principle this change is not functional but structural, making no revolution at all, though intensifying certain phenomena. Single taxers hold that the same functional adjustments exist that always have existed, that the same elementary principles apply that always have applied.

There never was a time when the things that men need could be produced otherwise than by human labor. There never will be. There never was a time when labor could produce anything, or even exist, without recourse to land. There never will be. There never was a time when the artificial implements of labor, whether tools or expensive machinery, were produced otherwise than by the application of labor to land. There never can be. There never was a time when labor in freedom with land unmonopolized could not and would not produce everything that is needed up to the limits of the existing accumulation of knowledge. There never can be nor will be.

There never was a time when control of the land would not give control of the men who have to use it. There never will be. Let me own all the land and I care not who owns the machinery. Give me the land and I could make slaves of you all.

In truth there are only two modes of slavery. One mode operates directly upon men themselves by the direct exercise of arbitrary power; the other operates upon them indirectly by the monopolization of the land they must use. In our day we have survivals of the former mode in our systems of taxing men arbitrarily, without regard to the service society renders them. A head tax, for instance, is to that degree chattel slavery. If it took all the man's earnings except a bare living, it would be chattel slavery complete. It is the same with taxes on houses. All these are arbitrary exactions, precisely alike in principle with the master's exactions from his slave. The other mode of slavery operates by withdrawing land from the worker which the worker needs for use. By that process the effects of slavery are produced. The only difference is that in the first mode of slavery the slave must be whipped to his task if he balks. In the other he never balks. He begs for a task. He blesses the man who gives him one. He damns the man who does his work for him. He organizes strikes and boycotts to make secure the very toil which a chattel slave would relinquish gladly but for the whip.

Do not imagine that we suppose work a thing to be avoided. We regard it on the contrary as a solemn duty and a sacred right. I agree entirely with that New York man of money and piety who has challenged labor unions to discuss the question of the right to work. I agree with him when he says that "it is just as immoral to keep a lot of men from working and thus cause great loss to other people and prevent them from earning money needed for the support of their families," as to steal property. I cordially agree with him in that. What I do not agree with him in, is his partial application of the principle. He thinks it immoral for workingmen to threaten other workingmen with violence if they take strikers' jobs. So do I. But he does not think it immoral to prevent men from working by keeping land out of use. I do. Like those men of

his kind down in Palestine 2,000 years ago he is straining at an immoral gnat and swallowing an immoral camel, hump and all.

The interference with labor of which trades unions are guilty is trifling in comparison with that which land monopoly causes. Moreover, if it were not for land monopoly there would be no interference by trade unions. Jobs would then be more plentiful than workers, and trade unions would be as useless and as scarce as refrigerators at the north pole. If natural opportunities for labor were not monopolized, every man would be his own trade union.

That most desirable condition, with its concomitants of continuous prosperity and advancing civilization, would be produced by the triumph of the single tax principle. Put this principle in operation in the old Louisiana territory, and at the next centennial there will be a degree of progress to celebrate, of which one may hardly venture to prophesy in these days of social disorder and sordid ideals. There would be no taxation of industry or thrift or enterprise; for the social increment of wealth that now excites the cupidity of land monopolists would then provide for public expenses. There would be no parasitical class; for individual earnings would then enrich the earners themselves, each in proportion to his usefulness. There would be no vacant land that was wanted for use; for then the monopolizer must annually pay to the public the annual market value of the privilege of keeping others off, and no one would do that on speculation, for it couldn't possibly pay. There would be neither strikers nor scabs; for jobs would then hunt for workmen instead of workmen hunting for jobs, and nobody would have any incentive to take work away from anyone else. There would be no involuntary poverty; for all who were willing to work would find abundance of remunerative work to do. There would be no hoboes at either extreme of the social scale. Meanwhile your city slums would have disappeared. Your homeless would have made homes for themselves. Your deserts would bloom, not only with wealth-making vegetation, but with wholesome men and women, neither over-rich nor under poor, who would earn their own living and get the living they earned. Then we should know for the first time what it means to have a responsible citizenship of free men, among whom, though some might lead and

many might follow, none could be master and none would be serf, none could command and no one would cringe. We should realize, too, the blessed import of those almost meaningless words, "our country," "our city," "our Louisiana Purchase."

This, my friends, is what our cause triumphant would do for your city. This is what it would do for the old French territory of which your city is the metropolis. This is what it would do for our common country. Who is there so sordid, so selfish, so unpatriotic, as to count the cost of such a consummation?

"You seem to be pretty confident of winning the race," said the sporting editor.

"Well, I think I ought to be," replied the owner of the automobile, as he examined the steering gear; "my machine used to belong to Tom L. Johnson."

G. T. E.

In Cincinnati when they drive hogs through the streets to the slaughter house they usually have following what I call the butcher's ambulance. If a hog is too weak to walk they are kind enough to put him in the wagon and give him a ride. But they take him to the slaughter house just the same. That is charity.—Herbert S. Bigelow.

"Is your son a busy lawyer?"

"Well, according to his sign board he is fighting all the time; it says he is an 'attorney at law.'"

G. T. E.

And Yawcob, observing his dog Schnitzel, spake unto him as follows: "You vas only a tog, but I vish I vas you. Ven you go mit your bed in you shust durn round dree dimes und lay down. Ven I go mit my bed in, I haf to lock up der place und vind up der clock und pud der cat out und undress myselluf und my vrow vakes und scolds, den der paby vakes up und cries und I haf to walk him mit der house around; den maybe ven I gets myselluf to bed it is dime to get up vonce more again. Ven you gets up mit your bed you shust stretch yourselluf, dig your neck a leedle und you vas up. I haf to light der fire und put on der kittle, scrap some mit my vife aletty und git myselluf breakfast. You blay mit der day all round und haf plenties of fun. I haf to vork all der day round und haf plenties of

drubble. Ven you die you vas dead. Ven I die I haf to go to hell yet."—Boompennickel Blatter.

"But you are certainly more prosperous now than you were five or six years ago," asserted the senator in a tone that precluded any denial.

"Yes," replied, in apparent acquiescence, the constituent who had been complaining of certain unsatisfactory conditions, "but I have to be more prosperous; it costs me so much more to live."

G. T. E.

BOOKS

MORRISON DAVIDSON'S NEW BOOK OF KINGS.

We have just received a copy of the new (Coronation) edition of this book, noticed some months ago in these columns. It is issued either in paper at 1s., or in cloth at 2s., by F. R. Henderson, 26 Paternoster square, London. According to the publisher's announcement it is now selling in its one hundred and thirty-fifth thousand.

The last four chapters are an addition to the original edition. Three of these were written in 1887 at the time of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, the last in 1894, on the occasion of a royal christening. The chapter entitled "Mene, Tekel, Upharsin" is an unusually strong piece of writing. Who that knows anything of the intimate and personal side of English history can deny the truth of the following?

"Nearly all the kings and queens of England have been criminals and reprobates of the deepest dye; yet we have pampered them with every luxury during their lives, and erected statues to their memory, and written fulsome eulogies of them after their deaths. Our historians, when they come to deal with a real royal monster, generally ascribe to him qualities the very opposite of those for which he was distinguished."

After all his terrible record, Mr. Davidson is willing to make some apology for the individuals. "It is not," he says, "that kings and queens are worse naturally than other men and women. It is the institution that corrupts and degrades them below the level of their fellows."

As was said in a previous review, this book will be an offense to many; but so long as historians gloss the truth for rank's sake, such books will continue to be written.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—An Essay on the Theory and Practice of the Christian Religion. By P. R. Benson. Published by the author, Anoka, Minn. To be reviewed.

—The Pilgrim of the Future; or, Outlines of Spiritual Philosophy. By Rev. Samuel

Well. Boston: Arena Publishing Co., Copley square. Price, 50 cents. To be reviewed.

—Modern Paradise. The Model Home.—Solution of the Social Problem. Future Greatness of Electricity.—Proposed Experiment in Social Science.—An Earthly Eden and How to Attain It. A Unique Power Plant. Wonderful System of Education. Elegantly Illustrated. Prof. Henry Olerich, author and publisher. Omaha, Neb. Price, 50 cents.

PERIODICALS.

In the Arena for May, B. O. Flower considers Jefferson's service to civilization during the founding of the American Republic. The number opens with a symposium on Mormonism, led by President Joseph F. Smith, of the Mormon church.

In the Craftsman for April (Syracuse, N. Y.), one of the finest specimens of elegant typography among American periodicals, Ernest Crosby begins a consideration of Shakespeare as a democrat, something which he does not believe Shakespeare to have been.

In the May Scribner Gen. John B. Gordon begins a series of articles on the civil war which promise to be of exceptional interest. In this number the Southern viewpoint of the cause of the war is put with unusual clearness and succinctness. Gen. Gordon begins by confessing "that had there been no slavery there would have been no war." Other interesting features of this number are Prof. Brander Matthews's account of "The Strangest Feat of Modern Magic" and a story entitled: "Where the Ways Crossed," which is far superior to the average magazine story. The poetry of this number is also much above the average. J. H. D.

How the whole world is kin appears in an article in the May Harper entitled: "A Strange People of the North." These people are the Chuckchee, inhabiting the extreme northeastern part of Asia. The author, representing the American Museum of Natural History, visited them in 1901, and one of the features of his entertainment was a spiritualistic performance, which was almost identical with the common performances given by mediums that may be seen almost any night in any American town. The question of lying, apropos of Mark Twain's story in the December number and a letter replying thereto, is discussed in a happy way by the editor in his study. "Truth," he says, "is too sacred to be trifled with; but it is possible that in the very fanaticism of our homage we may profane her." J. H. D.

The Lincoln (Neb.) Independent, easily in the front rank of the Populist papers of the country, has made of its issue for May 14, a single tax edition. Henry George, Jr., writes the biography of his father, and among the special contributors are Bolton Hall, A. C. Allison, J. B. Sharpe, Ralph Hoyt, L. P. Custer, J. H. Sheets, John Flirer, James Bently, Joseph Leggett, J. H. Dillard, Ernest C. H. Crosby, E. T. Weeks, C. F. Nesbit, C. B. Fillebrown, John B. Howarth, F. W. Maguire, Lawson Purdy, George B. Rounsevell, Florence A. Burrell, August Dellgren, J. Bellangee, W. H. T. Wakefield, W. L. Crosman, C. F. Shandrew, F. M. Marquis, Walter H. Roebuck, F. H. Augspurger, E. C. Clark and Speed Mosby. The issue of the Independent for June 11 is to be devoted to criticisms of the single tax.

The Spring number of the Single Tax Review (Quarterly, New York), is an exceedingly interesting issue of this publication. It contains a full report of the joint debate between Mr. Louis F. Post and Prof. John B. Clark on the single tax, held in Cooper Union, February 20. Other interesting features are "The Assessment of Real Estate" by Lawson Purdy, a speech by Congressman Robert Baker and "A Great American," by the editor. The great American of whom Mr. Miller writes is Gerrit Smith, the famous anti-slavery leader. It will be interesting to those who know of Gerrit Smith in other connections to learn that though he died in 1874, and therefore had never heard of Henry George, he said: "The right to the soil is as natural, absolute, and equal as the right to the light and air," and declared "land monopoly the chief cause of beggary." J. H. D.

Mr. Victor Rosewater, of Omaha, has an article in the current number of the Political Science Quarterly on Value in Tax-