

vain. Everybody who read and remembers the newspaper reports of the time (vii, pp. 170, 177), knows that Sullivan's man Quinn, backed by a mob of plug uglies imported from Chicago for the purpose, used his gavel as chairman of the convention to silence its majority and make a false registry of its purposes and its action. Every person in attendance upon that convention, Sullivan included, knows that Sullivan has no right to represent Illinois in the national committee. If any honest Democrat disagrees with Bryan on the subject we have yet to hear of him. Incidentally it may be remarked that every genuine Democrat rejoices to see Sullivan denouncing Bryan as a liar and the plutocratic press echoing his words. Every friend of Bryan is happier when men like Sullivan denounce him than when they flatter him. When a man publicly calls your friend a liar, you know he is not contriving to play any confidence game upon him.

* *

Warren Worth Bailey Not a Candidate for Congress.

We fell into error in stating last week (p. 434) that Warren Worth Bailey, editor of the Johnstown Democrat, had been nominated by the Democratic party in western Pennsylvania as their candidate for Congress. Mr. Bailey had been urged for the nomination by the convention of his own county, Cambria, but the other two counties are, for some inexplicable reason, favorable to a protectionist. They need the benefit, probably, of the kind of democratic work that Bailey has been doing in Cambria. The convention of that county not only endorsed Mr. Bailey for Congress, but it nominated two other single tax Democrats for the legislature, Alexander Strittmatter and Thomas J. Itell; while Professor Harry S. Bender, also a single taxer, was made chairman of the committee on resolutions. The chairman of the county committee, as well as the recognized leader of the party in the county, are both of the same faith. With Democrats of this type to the fore, there would be no reason to fear either plutocracy on the one hand or socialism on the other.

* *

COMPETITION.

"You come to church and worship, to-day, yet to-morrow you will go out and compete!" The preacher really believed that he was uttering a terrific arraignment of the business men of his congregation!

"To compete" was, in his view, to oppress!

He was no ordinary preacher. On the contrary, he was a man of exceptional scholarship and extensive reading, profound in moral philosophy, and uncompromising in his loyalty to truth, as he saw it. He sincerely believed that "competition" was immoral.

Another able preacher is quoted as saying: "If it is duty to compete . . . then the battle for self must go ever grimly on, the strong must subdue the weak, the rich the poor, the able the unable!" That is, if business is to be done competitively, then "the battle must go ever grimly on," etc.

+

Now, the earnest sincerity of these clergymen is beyond question; they really think that they "know what they're talking about." In their opinion competition is, necessarily, oppressive. They are as sure of that as Cotton Mather was of witchcraft, or as Urban was of Galileo's sacrilege. They see competition in actual operation, and the pain of it horrifies them. A crowds B to the wall; for which he ought to be ashamed of himself! C sells goods for less than D is able to, and the latter goes bankrupt; oh! the wickedness of C! Mind, C the "able" crushes D the "unable." And how does he do it? Why, by *imparting* more good than D could for a given return. C the "able" grows rich by accepting less for his service than D could accept! In other words, D would have starved on C's income, but the latter gets rich on it! He grows rich, and "subdues" poor D!

But meantime where is D? Isn't he somewhere out in the crowd, a potential beneficiary of C's low-priced service? He was formerly selling shoes at two dollars a pair but C's competition cut them down to one seventy-five. That was the straw that broke poor D's back. While D was dominant everybody had to pay \$2.00 for shoes; but now that C the "able" is getting rich on a price 25 cents less than D the "unable" charged, anybody—everybody—saves 25 cents on each pair of shoes purchased. It looks as if everybody but C and D were benefited by this result of competition; and our preacher seems to think that even Mr. C is a large beneficiary—he is the "strong," the "able," the "rich" man who "subdued the weak" Mr. D!

+

Besides, isn't there something else than selling shoes that D can do? And if he does any other kind of work, can't he save 25 cents on the shoes he purchases, as well as the rest of the people? In other words, is it not plain that the competi-

tion between C and D has exhausted itself in placing each where he will be most serviceable to society?

Suppose that C had not competed for D's place—the price of shoes would not have fallen; D would have continued in the shoe business, prosperous at the expense of his customers. Suppose also that C had started up a shoe store, building up a big trade without selling to any of D's customers, but only to new-comers, with increase of population. C could sell at a cut of 25 cents in price, but, being sentimentally opposed to "competition," he maintains the old price, which enables D to keep his head above water, while he, C, makes a profit equal to D's, plus 25 cents a pair for shoes, which he would surrender to the purchasers but for his aversion to the wickedness of "competition"!

Now, then, under these circumstances, will not C grow "strong," "able" and "rich" very much faster than he would if competition were in play?

*

And now comes E, a bright clerk in C's employ, who, perceiving how great a profit C is making, starts in on his own account, cuts the price 25 cents, thus compelling C to do the same, and driving incompetent D out of the business.

What would you have? Must everybody keep on paying \$2 merely to enable D to occupy a place that he is manifestly unfit for? Must D's incompetency be permitted to stand in the way of society's securing the higher service of C and E?

Remember, the general chance for employment is greatly improved by the cut in price of shoes. The purchasing power of the customers in reference to other things is increased by 25 cents for each pair of shoes purchased. The demand for other things will therefore be increased that much, and D stands a better chance of getting a job than men like him did before. Therefore, society as a whole is better off than before. D has suffered some loss, no doubt; but the "competition" that thrust him out of the shoe trade has improved the general situation, in which he stands an equal chance with men of like abilities.

Now, shall we advance the price of shoes 25 cents a pair in order to set D up in the shoe trade again? Shall we undo the work of competition?

"The battle for self goes grimly on," to be sure. We do not deny that. But we see (or ought to see by this time) that it must be something else than "competition" that makes it a "battle," a "struggle for existence," or anything indeed but a healthful and universally beneficent rivalry in social service.

You thought it was "competition" that was the cause of the "struggle." Try and forget it. Strenuous, extreme competition is not the cause of the struggle; it is the struggle.

It is not denied that the conditions complained of exist. The "battle for self" goes grimly on, the strong subdue the weak, the rich the poor, the able the unable—that is to say, inordinately strenuous competition is an existing fact. Also, it is admitted that this condition ought to be remedied. But it cannot be cured by people who regard competition as anything less than an inevitable element of social co-operation. Common sense dictates the competitive placing of individuals in the social machinery, and socialism itself affirms that fact.

The fact of competition arises from individual differentiation; that is the cause of competition. Unless you can cast all men in the same mold you cannot prevent competition; for competition is the concrete expression of individual differentiation. It is rivalry.

And under perfect freedom, competition would exhaust itself in the placing of individuals where they belong, economically, and therefore where their social service would be greatest.

*

But the condition of "perfect freedom" is wanting in the present regime. Society is not "competing" in the distribution of its whole product, but only as to that remainder of its total product, after Monopoly and Special Privilege have taken "all that the traffic will bear."

Destroy all private monopoly and special privilege, and the total product of industry would then be distributed competitively; that is to say, the billions of dollars' worth of wealth which is now extorted from us by the monopolists would be distributed competitively—equitably—enriching all society, banishing want and the fear of want, and so, naturally, reducing competition to a healthful rivalry, which would exhaust itself in determining the place to be occupied by the individual in the social mechanism, under conditions wherein the ablest would supersede the less able only by imparting increased benefit to society. And even so the less able would not be disemployed; only shifted to the place that he was best fitted for—to the place wherein he would be most productive, with the assurance of his being able to take out of the market, for his own uses, the full equivalent of what he put into it.

It is not competition that oppresses, but absence of competition. In the distribution of the enormous values that private monopoly abstracts

from the common wealth, without giving anything in return, competition plays no part.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Manila, June 21.—Although there are plenty of people here, the population isn't much greater, if as great, as it is in the States, counting people who think for themselves. We have a very pernicious custom house that hits most everybody; and although the duties are not nearly as high as they are in the United States, it pinches so badly that there are very few protectionists, even among those who were so before they got here.

The American population is made up largely of ex-soldiers. I suppose I don't need to explain to you what sort of people go into the army. Folks here do get lazy, probably from the climate, which is not conducive to hard work or study, and we get so we don't care.

The fate of the Islands, or the government, seems to be a little uncertain as yet. We can't find out whether the Islands are going to be sold, kept, or turned over to the natives. The worst course of the three would be preferable to the uncertainty that is hanging over them at present, for then folks would know what to look out for. As it is, nobody will branch out, or invest, and there is nothing doing beyond the barest necessary work that has to be done. Many people here would like to start ranches, but if the Islands are going to be turned over to the Japs, they realize that the Japs will soon freeze them out; and if the Islands are to be turned over to the natives, I doubt if there are many Americans who could stay here.

As a class, the natives don't like us, and as a class the Americans don't like the natives any more than they like the Negroes of the South. There are exceptions, of course. But all this talk about benevolent assimilation is rot—"there isn't no sich thing," as Nasby would say.

Some of the Filipinos have intelligence, but not many of them. They are great folks to stay home. Those who have traveled have learned, but few have traveled. When the American troops, in 1899, were advancing on Mololos the Filipino Congress, instead of arranging supplies or trying to get their forces together to make a stand, was debating the question as to whether a colonel's uniform should have two red stripes on the sleeve, or one gold band on the shoulder, or some such equally important question. Most of the Filipinos are like people in other places; as long as they get enough to eat and don't have to work too hard, they are contented, and don't get restless. Very few are ambitious. It is easy to make a living, and they have but few wants, which are easily satisfied. Such a thing as a failure of crops is almost unheard of, and there is no winter, therefore no incentive to saving; consequently they spend their money quick, and live from hand to mouth.

If there is an American or other white man who thoroughly understands the native, I haven't heard of him. The native is a study. They are all sup-

posed to be Roman Catholics; and I guess they are, in so far as they are anything at all. They haven't got religion so bad but that it will all come off later on.

We don't hear much more about the invasion of China. I expect the authorities in Washington, or wherever it came from, have seen a great white light. It is said the Chinese have a well drilled army of about 200,000 now, armed with the best guns and drilled by Germans and Japs, and that in a few years they will have an army of a million. What the United States has to fight China for I am sure I don't know, and I am equally sure that they will not find it as easy to walk over China as it used to be. Since the Japs licked the Russians people seem to have a good deal more respect for yellow men. If the Chinese can make a better use of the earth than the white people, I don't see but what they are entitled to it; and everybody knows (who knows anything on the subject) that the Chinaman is a worker, sober, and minds his own business—qualities that win in the end.

THEODORE SIDDALL.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, August 15.

Russian Conservatives Demand Constitutional Government.

Disorders continue (p. 441), while parties are crystallizing. On the 10th the Grand Duke Nicholas, uncle of the Czar, while putting troops through blank firing practice, was nearly killed by bullets which whistled about his head. As precautions are taken against the troops having any ball cartridge in their possession except when on patrol duty, the occurrence is not believed to have been an accident. One of the Grand Duke's aid-de-camps is quoted as saying: "It was no more an accident that was the firing of the charge of grape from the saluting battery at the Winter Palace on the occasion of the ceremony of blessing the waters of the Neva by the Emperor a year and a half ago" (vol. vii, p. 678). On the other hand it is believed that the troops, even when not prepared to go to the length of mutiny, are becoming less and less disposed to fire on their brethren the peasants. It is reported that 2,000 soldiers have notified their officers that it will be useless for them to give orders to shoot down the peasants. On the 11th trial was begun by court-martial at Helsingfors of the Sveaborg mutineers. At the first sitting two lieutenants and five soldiers were found guilty, and all were shot, and buried in a common grave. On the 14th began at St. Petersburg the trial of the Kronstadt mutineers.

✦

A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, writing