

discover what that service has been and what it is to the person waiting for a car or trying to ride on one, the result is likely to be a decided improvement in the near future. The alderman who said it is 'the worst in years' may find that he spoke in full accordance with the facts."



Alexander Jonas.

Whoever had the good fortune to know that gentle, thoughtful and weariless worker for his cause, Alexander Jonas, the Socialist editor of New York whose death occurred last week, will join in sympathy with the 20,000 people of that city who exalted his memory at his funeral. Mr. Jonas was for many years editor-in-chief of the *Volkszeitung*, the long established and influential German organ of Socialism in the United States. He was devoted to his cause with that all-round devotion which brings into the service of a cause the wisdom of the tactician no less than the sincerity of the evangelist. Unobtrusive but persistent, reserved in manner but aggressive in purpose, intellectual but with no flavor of any aristocracy of intellect, a friendly gentleman with ideals to live for and ideas to feed them with, a leader who dared to follow and an adviser who used his mind, Alexander Jonas richly deserved the confidence of the multitudes whose affection his long life of service with and for them had won him. Among those mourning crowds there must have been some who, though they had worked as citizens in other and possibly divergent ways from his, nevertheless held him in respect and if they knew him personally remembered him also with affection.



JAMES B. WEAVER.

Over the bier of no man of the present day could we bow with more reverence than over James B. Weaver's. In an era of sordid reaction his name was distinguished as that of a leader in the cause of democracy, and there he remained until in the ripeness of his years and service death has relieved him.

General Weaver won his military title in a war involving the issue of a republic all slave or all free, and won it on the side of freedom. But he had both the heart to feel the sanctity of that cause in its later and wider applications and the mind to perceive the marshalling of its newer and more subtle enemies through their most attractive disguises. He was among the first Republican insurgents. While La Follette was yet at school,

General Weaver was turning his back upon the political party of his early manhood, which would have honored him with high office; and was defying its plutocratic captors who would have enriched him had he bargained with them, and who tried to ruin him because he wouldn't bargain.

It was as candidate of the "Greenback" party for President that General Weaver, a Congressman and an able one from Iowa, came into national notice. Whoever imagines that this leadership of his was only as a chip upon the current of political life, argues himself no interpreter of political history. Do they say that General Weaver represented only an ephemeral financial fad? Be it so if they wish to think it so, but that "financial fad" was the first concrete expression in American politics of popular revolt against the plutocracy which had been born of the Civil War.

This revolt was quelled through the ignorance and indifference of a people who were losing their democratic ideals and under the leadership of as gay and bold a set of political and business buccaneers as ever seized upon a ship of state. The people rose again and with another "financial fad," William J. Bryan carrying their banner. And to the eternal honor of General Weaver, let it here be said that he had the acuteness to perceive and the patriotic generosity to acknowledge Bryan as his own true successor. In the desperate struggle to throttle plutocracy and revive democracy wherein the leadership began with Peter Cooper, General Weaver hailed Bryan as the new leader. He was no self-worshipper. Where he saw leadership he followed.

Since Bryan's first battle, the pioneer insurgency of the Coopers and the Weavers has developed the insurgency of the La Follettes, and growing in power has passed into a progressivism which brings accessions from strange camps. It now faces the mammonistic array with an indignant army of discontent that may not be so easily fooled as the earlier ones. When the progressive triumph is recorded, there will be found in the first line of the roll of great leadership no name more worthily distinguished than that of James B. Weaver.



THE PROBLEM OF MAKING A LIVING.

The advance in American wages in the last few years has made possible a general advance in prices of commodities. And since trusts and monopolies are able to fix prices, these are arbitrarily raised, to absorb the increase in wages.

Why not? For what else do trusts and monop-

olies exist—for what else than to wrest from the consumer “all that the traffic will bear”? If the wages of a dozen million workers are raised, then the traffic will bear a higher price, won't it?

But right here schools and colleges fly to the defense of the trusts, by diverting attention from that quarter into a morass of misleading speculation, which begins anywhere and ends nowhere. “There has been, as we know,” said President Taft in his Syracuse speech, “a movement from the farm to the city. . . . How can the movement . . . be stopped? How can proper labor be obtained on the farm? Is there no remedy, or must we change our nature as a people and all become a manufacturing nation, and look for our future supplies to some other source in distant countries while themselves are looking forward to a *limit upon their production*?”

There speaks, precisely, the “economics” of the colleges. Most of our statesmen have imbibed it apparently without a thought of questioning its validity.

Here is the case:

In this, the “most prosperous country on earth,” fully “protected” by a stupendous tariff wall, prices have advanced so greatly that the common people find it as hard to get a living now as it was in past years, when wages were much lower. Whereupon the President, delivering the message of a school of “economics,” reminds us that the area of farm-land in this country is occupied nearly to its limit, that the rest of the world is “looking forward to a limit of their production,” and that our two means of recourse are to “stop the movement from the farm to the city,” and to adopt “some other method than by the mere extension of area. . . . for the increasing of our crop production.”

Behold! We inhabit the youngest (and the last) great territory on earth—a nation born yesterday, and today face to face with the Malthusian problem: “The pressure of population upon subsistence”! “The Malthusian problem,” I say; for no true science of political economy can have any such problem. Yet that “problem” is, to the mind of President Taft, and to the minds of “economics” professors in our colleges, quite as real as were the antagonists of Don Quixote when, lance in rest and spur in Rosinante's flank, he valorously charged the windmills!

There is not, never has been, nor ever can be, any general pressure of population upon the possible means of subsistence. The subsistence supply is today abundant. We have not so enormous a *surplus* of crop products perhaps, but there is

plenty and to spare. If the egg-supply is short of what it was when the packing companies put into cold-storage millions of dollars' worth, and held them there until they rotted, then they will be saved that item of expense in the matter of maintaining the highest possible price to the consumer. If the banana-crop is short, then the lords of that market can maintain prices without the expense of dumping the excess supply into the sea, as they have done in the past. If meats are comparatively scarce, then the packing companies will have less to hold out of the market in cold-storage in order to produce an artificial “shortage,” that the price to the consumer may be “all that the traffic will bear.”

With monopolies, trusts and combines in every great branch of commerce, with statesmen and newspapers assuring us that this form of business “has come to stay,” and with representatives of the trusts going about the country affirming that they fix prices and maintain them “in the interest of market and industrial-stability”—in the presence of all this as matter of common knowledge, the President of the United States warns us that our recourse from the pressure of population on subsistence is the “increasing of our crop-production”!

England and Scotland have the problem of the “pressure of population upon subsistence”—and there (where the “problem” was born) the land is fenced off into deer parks and game preserves (practically untaxed), while the people who ought to have access to the land for the purpose of production starve in the cities.

Here in the United States, where more land than England and Scotland contain has been given outright to great corporations, and where the government has permitted millions and millions of acres to be fraudulently appropriated by land-thieves (some of whom have been Congressmen and Senators), even here, where the conditions of land monopoly are rapidly approaching the conditions that prevail in Europe, individuals high in public esteem turn their backs upon all the obvious conditions that alone cause the general distress, and seriously assure us that our recourse is to increased production!

If, now, after fifty years of rapidly increasing production, by thousands of labor-saving devices; if, after multiplying again and again our production, there is not enough, then how much more must we increase production before the problem will be solved? If the power of private monopoly and special privilege has been sufficient to advance prices to the consumer thus far as fast as produc-

tion has increased, then how much more must production increase before it will pass beyond the power of private monopoly and special privilege, to keep up with it in the matter of advancing prices?

The question presented to intellectual honesty is: Are the proponents of the spurious and absurd "economics," which totally ignores the preponderant factor of the problem (the effective power of private monopoly and special privilege)—are these proponents sincere, and do they speak as they do through ignorance? or are they insincere, and do they utter their absurdities trusting that the general ignorance will shield them from detection?

In either case it is the high duty of every man who understands, to declare the truth, to keep open the way of progress, that the toiling millions may pass on to the plains of plenty.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

EXPOSURE OF AN OHIO REACTIONARY.

Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 6th.

The use of the Singletax as a scarecrow with which to damage the Initiative and Referendum proposals now before the Ohio Constitutional Convention was amusingly exposed before the taxation committee of that body today.

The gentleman to take a double tilt at the I. and R. was James W. Halfhill, a lawyer of Lima, Ohio, and delegate from the County of Allen in the Convention. The man to expose the double purpose in the attack was the chairman of the committee, Edward W. Doty, a Cleveland delegate for Cuyahoga County.

Mr. Halfhill submitted a proposed amendment to the Constitution which contemplated tying the hands of both the State legislature and the people against taking ground rent by taxation. The proposal read: "The General Assembly may classify all property for the purposes of taxation; but no class of property shall be taxed for the benefit of any other class, no double taxation shall be permitted, no confiscatory rate or levy shall be legal, and the single tax on land or ground rent shall never be established."

In the course of his remarks for this curious proposal, Mr. Halfhill informed the committee that his proposal was submitted purely as a vote-getter, and that he had no intention that it should be written into the State Constitution. The idea, he said, appealed to certain persons in his own constituency and was included in his proposal purely for "local consumption." The frankness of this statement amused the other members of the Convention present, and the Chairman took advantage of the situation to draw some further reactionary teeth.

The Initiative and Referendum is the great question before the Convention. It is the question with

an emphasis on the "the," so that many of the plays by the delegates are intended solely for their reflex influence. For instance, one delegate was heard to remark that he favored the recording and printing of the debates and proceedings of the Convention for the reason that the expense would discredit the whole proceedings in the eyes of the electors. That is why he had voted for the recommendation of the printing committee. With this situation evidently in mind, the Chairman of the taxation committee pointed out to Mr. Halfhill that the Singletax is not an issue before the Convention, and is not now in force in Ohio and not likely to be for some time to come. The Chairman wanted to know of Mr. Halfhill if he could not be equally candid with regard to the Singletax clause in his proposal. Was not that also inserted for an ulterior purpose, for the purpose of heading-off the Initiative and Referendum?

To this Mr. Halfhill, with continued candor, assented.

"What do you mean by Singletax?" asked Mr. Geo. W. Harris, one of the committee men. The question caused some perplexity to the man from Allen, and afforded no little suppressed mirth to the Singletax chairman of the committee.

Mr. Halfhill fell back upon the name of Henry George, and then followed the interesting spectacle of a reactionary and self-confessed political manipulator reading with dramatic emphasis the eloquent statement of Mr. George's proposals, as found in *Progress and Poverty*.

"Sounds good," commented the Chairman as the reading concluded.

Mr. Halfhill ejaculated contemptuously: "Not to me."

"Don't you like that about abolishing poverty?" asked the Chairman.

"That shows the man was a dreamer," retorted Mr. Halfhill.

A long and animated discussion on the definition of Singletax followed, in which it was demonstrated by Mr. Harris, of Cincinnati, that the idea as drawn from the writings of Henry George is very different indeed from that in the minds of some people who oppose it.

A. W. R.



AUSTRALASIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, January 12.

The State elections held in Victoria in November made practically no alteration in the position of parties.

This was the first time that women in Victoria could vote at State elections.



In South Australia, owing to a disagreement between the State Houses of Parliament, the lower House has been dissolved, and general elections will be held.



General elections were held in New Zealand last month, and resulted in a great change in the state of parties.