ing as a controversialist. There is no reason in him. He must be the original altruistic genius who invented the doctrine that "what's yourn is mine and what's mine 's my own." Labor unions do not urge their restrictions in the interest of part of the people; they urge them in the interest of all. Just as Mr. Parry would say that the man who pays more for what he buys, on account of protection, will profit by a better market for what he has to sell, so the labor unionist says, and with far more reason, that the man who pays higher wages on account of labor restrictions will profit by a better market for his output, since higher wages makes greater purchasing power. If protection is for the whole people, so is trades unionism. „

—

One might like to know, however, how protection can serve to advance the interests of the whole people. For instance: Imported maple sugar is taxed for protection at the rate of 4 cents a pound, which is equal to $80 a ton, or $1,600 for a 20-ton carload. If, then, you buy a 20-ton carload of maple sugar in Canada for $3,200 and pay $1,600 in duty upon the importation, you will have invested $4,800 in that carload of sugar. In order to get your money back you must sell the carload for $4,800; and in order to make a profit to pay for your work and expense of handling, and for your investment and risk, you must sell it for more than $4,800. Now whatever that profit may be, two-thirds of it will be on your investment in sugar and one-third on your investment in tax. It is a profit you would not get if there were no tariff, and goes to show that it may be as profitable to sell taxes as to sell goods. But how does that profit on the tax tend to advance the interests of the whole people? Is it not, on the contrary, a profit wrenched out of the American consumers of Canadian maple sugar for the purpose of enabling a few American producers to wrench an extra profit out of the American consumers of their product? And how do these sugar-eaters get any corresponding advantage? No how. Nor does Mr. Parry wish them to, if they are workingmen; for he objects to their evening-up by combining to raise their wages above the level of natural competition. The natural laws of competition may be suspended by tariffs for the benefit of men like Mr. Parry, but must not be suspended by trade unions for the benefit of employes of men like Mr. Parry. Mr. Parry's rule works only one way, and that is his way. Like a county fair fakir he would fix the thing so as to "catch 'em a-coming and catch 'em a-going."

THE ECONOMIC LESSON OF THE ROMAN CAMPAGNA.

In view of the juggling with statistics that is so common, and of the possibility of infinite and interminable juggling, may it not be true that Luigi Cossa pricked the "historical method" of economic study at a very vulnerable point when he said that it reduced political economy to a mere narrative of facts? And mighty slippery and elusive facts, too.

It seems to me that the historical method is rather a means of covering up, than of clearing up, the truth. I am persuaded that no more effective means of misleading seekers after economic truth could be devised.

If an exponent of the historical school, knowing the history, milleniums long, of the Roman Campagna, can say:

> If we are asked whether this doctrine of rent, and the consequences which Ricardo deduced from it, are true, we must answer that they are hypothetically true in the most advanced industrial communities, and there only, * * * but that even in those communities neither safe inference nor sound action can be built upon them—

if a member of the historic school can say this, in the light of the history of the Roman Campagna, is it not a fair question to ask, 'Will the time ever come when he, or his kind, will say anything that human society can afford to listen to? If the stretch of time through which the latifundia have grown mosquitoes and sheep, to the extinction of human beings, is not enough to convince the "historical" student that the so-called Ricardian law of rent is valid, and that safe inference and sound action can be built upon it, about how many thousand years more will be required to furnish him a sufficient historical background from which to flash the dazzling splendor of his economic revelation?

—

Prof. Rudolfo Lanciani, writing in the Youth's Companion, says: "We may gather an idea of the activity which prevailed in an ancient farm from the following extract from the official gazette—Acta Diurna—published in Rome at the time of Caligula, reproduced by Petronius Arbiter in his "Supper of Trimalchio:"

> On June 25, in Trimalchio's farm by Cumae, were born 70 children, of whom 30 were of the male sex. The same day 50,000 modii of wheat (about 100,000 gallons) were removed from the thrashing floors to the granaries; 500 young oxen were broken. The same day one of the slaves, named Mithridates, was executed by crucifixion, because he had cursed the sacred name of the Emperor (Caligula), and lastly, 10,000,000 sesterces (about $400,000) were deposited in the safes.

That was about eighteen hundred and fifty years ago, and what a population that farm must have supported! Seventy children born in one day! Think what herds of cattle there must have been, when five hundred young oxen were broken on a single day. A hundred thousand gallons of wheat put into the granaries, and four hundred thousand dollars put in the safe!

To-day a handful of men do all the work of one of those ten-thousand-acre farms. Why? Because the owner of land finds it more profitable to himself to raise sheep, cattle, horses and hay than to let human beings live upon it.

"Since the days of the Empire," continues Prof. Lanciani, "the state and condition of the Campagna have only altered for the worse." And now the hovels which the few laborers inhabit "are unfit for human beings to live and die in."

The totally unsheltered cattle, horses and sheep must withstand "the inclemency of the weather, no matter whether it freezes hard

for forty-one consecutive days, as in 1878, or rains for seven consecutive weeks, as in 1884."

Many of the greatest farms have been entirely denuded of trees, and the laborers are obliged to buy or steal fuel.

The corn land is worked only every third year to save fertilizing.

The regular population of a Roman farm consists of a massaro, or manager-in-chief, of three or four cowboys, of three or four shepherds, of a few plowmen, and of one or two cartmen, who carry the milk to the city in the early morning and come back in the cool of the evening with provisions.

"The hired hands [harvest hands], like the cattle, have no shelter in the farm buildings. They sleep in caves or in huts, or under a tent, or in the open air, and they furnish, therefore, a considerable percentage of the general death rate of the country."

The rents have all gone to a small number of people during those two thousand years, and now the laborer on the land must steal his fuel, or go without, and is reduced to the alternative of sleeping in the open air, or in a cave, or of looking elsewhere for a job; which is to say that he must accept whatever the landlord may choose to give, or die. For it is certain that he would take a better job elsewhere if he could get it.

In that fertile territory, in the heart of the Old World, pasturage and sheep prevail, while agriculture and human population decline.

The Italian government has been trying to improve conditions in the Campagna, and has divided up great farms among the peasantry. Prof. Lanciani says that the landlords do not get half the income from the land under this plan that they did before, and that "experienced colonists from Lombardy have been put in charge of some of the farms to ascertain if it is possible to improve the state of the Campagna without undue injury to the interests of the landed proprietors."

The landlords have exercised their power to take everything hitherto, whether that everything was little or much. By the introduction of the Lombardy colonists, it is no doubt confidently believed that conditions will be greatly improved, without having recourse to so harsh an expedient as interfering with the landlord's power to take everything, as heretofore! This may be "historical" sociology, but it certainly is not economic science.

Remember, Prof. Lanciani says that: "Since the days of the Empire the state and condition of the Campagna have only altered for the worse." If any advantage from any source whatever has arisen, then, the landlords have appropriated it—and more too. Which means, of course, that if any advantage arises from the introduction of the Lombardy colonists the landlords will not appropriate that! So thinks the learned professor.

Thus we perceive that "neither safe inference nor sound action can be built upon" the theory that rent tends increasingly to absorb the produce of human industry! Do we or do we not?

"The most interesting result of this campaign," Prof. Lanciani further observes, "has been the colonization of the once pestilential swamps of Ostia by a band of socialists, who have become models of thrift, order and propriety since the late King Humbert gave them the means of acquiring possession of the lands which they had rescued and drained with their own hands."

Now, at the risk of incurring the contempt of the "historical" economist, I confess that I deduce, from the Ricardian law of rent, that but for the intervention of King Humbert the landlords would have reaped the benefits of the improvements made by the peasants in this case, as in all others in that territory.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

OHIO.

Columbus, O., June 1.—I think I am able now to make you a fair statement regarding the principal happenings at the Democratic convention of last week, and about which the papers of Ohio are not yet through speculating.

To begin with, the reactionaries had a majority of the delegates. They are likely, too, to control the Ohio delegation at the national convention, although this is not certain. Notwithstanding their majority in the State convention, however, they were so badly managed that the radicals under Mayor Johnson fairly beat them on two distinct and important contests.

One was the nomination of A. P. Sandles for secretary of state. Mr. Sandles is an out and out radical, who has always been with the Johnson faction, and who is likely to dominate the party organization against the interest of the reactionaries. He was nominated in a contest against a reactionary.

More significant even than this was the contest regarding the railroad ring. This ring had influenced the committee on resolutions to keep out of the platform the demands for 2-cent per-mile railroad fares, prohibition of railroad passes, and equitable taxation of railroads. It was plausibly argued that as no legislature was to be elected this year those questions ought to be ignored by the convention. Mayor Johnson did not think so, and making a test of one of the demands, that for reducing fares to two cents, he started a contest on the floor of the convention, and greatly to the chagrin of the reactionaries he won.

It is evident that if Mr. Johnson had made any fight at the primaries for delegates, he could have controlled the convention. But he had decided not to do this, and his friends now say that he does not regret that decision. They do not regard his temporary loss of control, which they look upon as more apparent than real, as a calamity at this time. On the contrary, they believe that the principles he is fighting for will soon stand out all the more clearly for this seeming eclipse.

The most sensational thing regarding Johnson's relation to the convention is the story, which is persistently published, that a break has occurred between him and his political lieutenant—Charles P. Salen. There is just enough truth in the reported facts to make the story plausible.

Salen is not Johnson's kind of politician. Whereas Johnson is frank in all he does and says, depending upon the essential honesty and common sense of the people in the long run, Salen is a politician of the machine type who believes in heelers and combinations rather than political principles for effectiveness in winning political battles, and who has not the patience to court present defeat for the sake of future victory. But Salen is a skillful manager, in whose personal probity and loyalty to the radical principles of democracy Johnson has had implicit confidence, notwithstanding his unwisdom at times as to methods. Many of Johnson's supporters have never shared his confidence in Salen, and when they found him lobbying here