

Filipinos. Yet how indignant and horrified were both American and British Jews at the news from Kishineff!

The Jews have still the lesson to learn that their own rights are not secure so long as the rights of others are trampled upon.

When the Jews are willing to extend their love of justice, of liberty and of equality to others besides themselves, and devote some time and attention to the support of rather than opposition to movements with this end in view, they may be surprised to find anti-Semitism die a natural death. Such Jews as have, to the horror of their race, cast in their lot with some such movement, know that among their comrades in this struggle there is no prejudice except against wrong, no hate but of injustice. In this limited number, Dr. S. Solis Cohen, of Philadelphia is prominent. In a comparatively brief article entitled "What Zionism May Mean," and which all Jews, particularly Yale and Harvard graduates, might read to their profit, he says:

The ready acquiescence of well-to-do Jews in the social injustices by which they are surrounded, and from which they, equally with their Christian neighbors, derive wealth and comfort; the leading part that many of them take in the perpetuation of these smug injustices; the horror with which they regard those who question the wisdom or rightfulness of existing institutions; and, saddest of all, the facility with which Russian Jews, that 20 years ago were exploited by their American and German brethren, to-day enter the ranks of the exploiters, to rob where they were robbed and to oppress where they were oppressed—all these sorrowful but indisputable facts emphasize the need of Zionism.

I would add that Zionism has no place for lengthy statements of petty slights by either self-satisfied Jews or Gentiles. Dr. Cohen and such other Jews have realized the truth of the words of Henry George on this subject:

"The gospel of deliverance, let us not forget it, is the gospel of love, not of hate. He whom it emancipates will know neither Jew nor Gentile, nor Irishman nor Englishman, nor German nor Frenchman, nor European nor American, nor difference of color or of race, nor animosities of

class or condition. Let us set our feet on old prejudices, let us bury the old hates. There have been 'Holy Alliances' of kings. Let us strive for the Holy Alliance of the people!"

DANIEL KIEFER.

EQUALITY.

Uniformity of condition is by no means to be desired. That would make for social stagnation. What men must insist upon is equality of opportunity. If uniformity of condition were the social ideal either they that could and would rise above the common level would be arbitrarily held back, or else they would be compelled to support and carry forward all others, equally with themselves. How could social progress be made under conditions so formidable? The industrious man would be compelled to divide his hard-earned substance with the sluggard, thus putting a premium upon laziness, and penalizing thrift.

But both the monopolist and the lazy (and therefore penniless) man have a common interest in confounding the meaning of the term "equality," as used by democratic reformers. The monopolist purposes to discredit the reformer by dint of putting a ridiculous interpretation upon his demand of equality, and the sluggard adopts that interpretation because it expresses his desire. They both wish to get something for nothing. Under a regime of uniformity of condition the sluggard would get something for nothing; for if his condition were equal with that of the industrious it would necessarily be at the cost of the latter. Now, that would be ridiculously unjust; and the monopolist, knowing that the common sense of mankind would repudiate such a proposition, craftily puts precisely that proposition into the mouth of the reformer, thus purposely misrepresenting him.

Under the prevailing conditions the monopolist actually gets something for nothing; and, realizing that society would put an end to such injustice if it recognized it, and knew how to, and perceiving that equality of natural opportunity would effectually solve the problem, he cunningly

clothes the term "equality," as used by the reformer, with the signification attached to it by the possessionless sluggard, and so presents both as individuals having an identical aim. The result is that the reformer is regarded by the general public as being the champion of the shiftless and improvident, and thus the monopolist is enabled to continue his plundering of the befuddled public.

The voluntarily idle poor produce nothing, and the monopolist, as such, produces nothing; therefore it necessarily follows that, whatever either of them gets is derived from the industrious, who produce more than they consume.

I say that the monopolist, as such, produces nothing. Here again the defender of monopoly may befool the public. The monopolist may also be a producer, and this fact may be pointed out in controversion of what I have said. Of course, such an argument is irrelevant and puerile; but it will pass current with the unthinking just the same. A thief may also be a blacksmith, and, as such, a producer; but as a thief he merely appropriates what others have produced. Likewise, a monopolist may, in addition, be a producer; but as a monopolist he appropriates what others have produced.

Every man, monopolist or not, is in justice entitled to the equivalent of his product, and no more. For how can we get more except that some one else gets less? The individual may have a threefold income, as, a salary for service, interest on his capital, and tribute to his monopoly, if he have one. He is justly entitled to salary and interest, but not to the monopoly tribute. Monopoly affords opportunity to its beneficiaries in proportion to and because of, its deprivation of opportunity to general society. Equality of opportunity and monopoly cannot co-exist; either one destroys the other. Monopoly is inequality of opportunity.

Now, monopoly does not absorb all the increasing produce of industry, but it seeks to do so.

Take, for instance, the anthracite coal monopoly: Why does it not advance the price of coal to

the extent of a dollar a ton at once, instead of ten cents a month? Because so great an advance all at once would concentrate universal attention upon the enormous power of the monopoly, and, by alarming the public, would lead to remedial legislation. The alarmed and outraged public would rise and crush the monopoly. Therefore, the monopoly uses its power discreetly. But it has the power just the same and it uses it.

This monopoly is but one of many, all of which exploit the public, with greater or less discretion, to the limit of what they deem expedient; that is, so far as they can without bringing upon them the destructive wrath of the public.

It is inequality of opportunity that gives the monopolist the power to exploit the public.

But (it will be retorted) would equality of opportunity enable the average mechanic, for instance, to cope with such a man as Mr. Baer?

The question is irrelevant. Mechanics, as such, never compete with entrepreneurs, as such. Equality of opportunity would enable any one, or all, of a thousand men, as able as Mr. Baer, to compete with him in operating coal mines and transporting coal to market; and this competition would result in the mechanic's getting his coal at an equitable price, instead of paying a price that includes a monopoly tribute to the Baers, as now.

The act of competition is, in effect, a bid for the opportunity to render service. The method of competition is to give an increased value in exchange for a given compensation. In the absence of all monopoly this increased value would go to the consumer, by virtue either of improved product or of diminished price; but under the conditions now prevailing, the increased value goes to the monopolists by virtue of increased price of monopolized material or service. This accounts for the coincidence of progress and poverty.

Equality of opportunity would not produce uniformity of individual personal conditions; but it would determine the benefit of

competition to the consumer, whose patronage is its object.

In the absence of monopoly all strenuous competition would be entirely voluntary. But the monopolist forces the consuming manufacturer into intensified competition; because if he raise his price in order to cover the tribute to monopoly the market will absorb less, and if he do not raise his price, he must either redouble his manufacturing economies or else pay the monopoly tribute from his own pocket.

In the absence of monopoly the business man would have to increase his exertions only in response to the voluntarily increased exertions of his business competitors, but monopoly drives him and his competitors into desperate competition.

In the former case the purchasing power of the public would rise in proportion to the decline in price of commodities, and thus demand would gain on supply and an expanding market would clamor for greater product; but in the latter case, the purchasing power of the public would be reduced in proportion to the arbitrarily increased price of commodities, and thus demand would fall below the current rate of supply, and a consequent glutted market would necessitate diminished product, entailing intensified, destructive competition and business wreck.

The vast majority of business men have the alternative of natural, voluntary competition, under circumstances where the very act of competition would enrich general society and expand the market for product (demand leading supply); or, on the other hand, of unnatural, involuntary competition, superimposed by the arbitrary power of the monopolists upon natural, voluntary competition—that is, in addition thereto — under circumstances wherein the coerced measure of competition yields only tribute to monopoly, while curtailing the market for product (supply leading demand) with consequent business stagnation and frequent bankruptcy.

That is the alternative. But before it can become available, the more intelligent business men, at least, must be able to distinguish

between the significance of Uniformity of Condition and Equality of Opportunity.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 15.

As authentic news from the field of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 356) comes slowly in, the fierce battle of Liaoyang, a continuous struggle for almost seven days, appears to have terminated in great disaster to the Russians. They are now under the necessity either of engaging in another terrific battle to save Mukden, or of abandoning that place and seeking winter quarters still farther north.

Official reports of Japanese casualties at the Liaoyang battle are at hand. They aggregate 17,539 officers and men killed and wounded. Of these the army of the right (Kuroki's) lost 4,866; the center (Nodzu's) 4,992; and the left (Oku's) 7,681. The number of officers killed was 136, and the number wounded 464. The Russian casualties are roughly estimated by the official reports of Gen. Kouropatkin as less than 17,000—4,500 killed, and about 12,000 wounded.

The Russians are supposed to have sent a formidable naval reinforcement to the scene of the war. On the 11th their Baltic fleet sailed from Cronstadt, at the head of the Gulf of Finland, apparently bound for the Far East. It consisted of 8 battle ships, 4 cruisers, and several torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers, and was under the command of Vice Admiral Rojestvensky. On the 14th, however, reports from St. Petersburg announced that the fleet had been detained at Reval, near the mouth of the Gulf of Finland, and instructed to remain there for orders.

The United States has become slightly involved in this Eastern war by the act of the Russian cruiser *Lena*, of the Vladivostok squadron, in taking refuge on the 11th in the port of San Francisco. She is under the command of Capt. Benlinsky, and with 488 men and 16 officers carries 24 guns.