

"Turn that \$20,000 into the city treasury on the principle that values created by the community should belong to the community, sir."

"That," cried Prof. Jenks, horrified, "is simply single-tax insanity, and as a sane, safe and conservative Democrat, as well as an instructor of youth, I cannot sit here and listen to such mad revolutionary nonsense."

"All right, my boy," called the Colonel after the retreating form of the shocked educator. "All right, but just the same Astor has got that \$20,000, earned by the people of New York, tucked away in his seams, and by the same process his estate, which was worth \$100,000,000 five years ago, is worth over \$125,000,000 now."

"Yes, gentlemen," said Col. Edgerton, speaking to the unsympathetic and suspicious cove, "there are no flies on William Waldorf, even if the rest of us are pretty well covered with them. He was quite right when he said to the reporters the other day that greater fortunes are to be made in New York real estate than in Wall street."

#### PRUSSIAN OWNERSHIP OF COAL MINES.

Editorial in the New York Evening Post of September 14, 1904.

The attempt of the Prussian government to add another to its numerous coal mines has met with a severe check, if not with a final defeat. At a meeting of the stockholders of the great Hibernia mine, held at Dusseldorf, the government's bid for the property was rejected by an overwhelming vote. With more than two-thirds of the stock represented, the government and its ally, the Bank of Dresden, polled only two and a half millions, while their opponents voted shares valued at more than 29 millions of marks. Then, as if to make the government reverse the more hopeless, a six and one-half million increase of the stock was decreed, very little of which will be allowed to find its way into the hands of those who favor government ownership. Naturally, the opponents of the sale are jubilant. In their opinion the real desire of the Prussian Minister of Commerce and Industry, Herr Moeller, is to acquire all the large coal mines in Rhenish Westphalia, the most important group in the entire kingdom.

Those newspapers and individuals which favor nationalization, like the Deutsche Tageszeitung, will not, however, accept the defeat as final. That organ of the Agrarians declares that the government will not be balked, and intimates that there are other and

surer ways of accomplishing its end than by the purchase of a majority of the shares. By this it can only mean legislation against the coal trust or a condemnation of the mines, on the ground of the general welfare. It unhesitatingly avers that nationalization must come some day, and its opinion is of considerable importance, because of the friendly relations of the Agrarians to the government, as evidenced by the latter's readiness to sell coal to the farmers' associations at a lower rate than the trust will give them. Even so liberal a newspaper as the Frankfurter Zeitung, perhaps the most weighty in Germany, which is certainly beyond all governmental influences, declines to believe that the stockholders' vote is final. A financial crisis or hard times might, it thinks, induce the owners of the Hibernia to part with their property, and on less favorable terms. It has heartily approved Herr Moeller's plan.

From the American point of view, the most interesting phase of this situation lies in the announcement that the government's action was based on fear of a dangerous private monopoly. This the semi-official Politische Nachrichten, of Berlin, very clearly intimates. The government's original aim, as set forth in the inspired press, was to assure itself a sufficient supply of coal for its railroads and for military purposes, and also to become a member of the Rhenish-Westphalian Coal syndicate. As it investigated the situation, it found that the trust's influence had grown very rapidly; that it had absorbed all the small mines which had hitherto acted as a check upon its operations; that it was supreme in its field, and meditated incursions into other and related industries. The government then decided that the general welfare was a further and more cogent reason for its entering into competition with the syndicate. The decision is noteworthy, since this is the first time that it has admitted the danger of a monopoly of any industry.

It is not, of course, the first time that Prussia has taken a step toward State ownership. The control of railroads and telegraphs was assumed long ago, and it has owned coal mines in the Saar district and in upper Silesia for many years. Hitherto other considerations than a fear of the trusts have guided such investments. As in this country, the great industrial combinations seem to be doing the work of State socialism far better and far more rapidly than its avowed advocates ever dreamed. The coal strike of two years ago re-

vealed to our public the practical monopoly of the Pennsylvania coal fields. As in monarchical Germany, the thought which then presented itself to many minds in this republic was government ownership and control; even though we had no such excuse as the national ownership of railroads. In his letter of acceptance, President Roosevelt says that it was his interference which alone prevented the movement from becoming too "irresistible" for even his unchanging "principles."

Fortunately, in this country, the working of statutory and economic laws has shown, and will continue to show, the needlessness of a plunge into socialism. In Germany the possibility of a resort to legal control seems for the moment all but forgotten. Her editors see the State fighting the great combination of capital in Westphalia and coming out second best. They see ministers and chancellors taking orders from manufacturers or Agrarians in Landtag or Reichstag, and they ask, in despair, what is to be the fate of the consumer and the individual? They remember that the government itself has helped into being the Coal and Steel Trusts, which now terrify the very ministers who were the fairy godmothers when these infants were born, and praised them so highly but the other day, when they were growing to their full strength. Only the Frankfurter Zeitung and one or two others call for a revision of the laws bearing on coal mining. The rest of the press affects, like the Berlin Tageblatt, to believe that the decisive conflict between the State and the capitalistic forces has not yet begun, or urges the government on to further attempts to obtain control, not only of the Hibernia, but of all private mines, in order to avenge its defeat and to prove that the final arbitrament rests with itself, and not with the capitalists that defy it.

#### WHATSOEVER YE WOULD THAT MEN SHOULD DO TO YOU, DO YE EVEN SO TO THEM.

An address delivered by Edward Howell Putnam, of Moline, Ill., before the Congregational convention in session at Genseo, Ill., September 14, 1904.

That command of the Master asserts the equality of human rights, and enjoins the Christian to defend every individual against any encroachment upon his rights.

The inequity of material condition that prevails in the world to-day exists because Christians have not understood this command and therefore have not obeyed its spirit.

Every human being is both object and subject of this command. That is, if every one must do unto others as he would be done by, every one is also entitled to be done by as others would wish him to do to them. Could equality of rights be described in more precise terms?

Christ's object was to set up in this world the conditions that obtain in Heaven. This world is as truly a part of God's Kingdom as is any other world. "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." Wherever a human being is, there, potentially, is the Kingdom of Heaven.

In modern industry, the individual does not produce the things that he needs. One man preaches, another practices law, another merchandizes, another manufactures furniture, another raises wheat, another makes nails, etc. Each individual seeks to confine his work to a specialty—to as limited a field as possible, while drawing from as wide a field as possible to satisfy his wants.

No matter how well a man may do his part, his reward is determined by society as a whole. When the individual enters into the industrial mechanism, his duty is to do a man's part; and the duty of society is to maintain a system that will insure him a reward commensurate with his service. That is simple equity.

A preacher may bargain directly with his church as to salary, a workman with his employer as to the number of dollars and cents that he shall receive in exchange for his work—but if society permits a limited number of men to monopolize the sources of the raw materials of industry, those monopolists will overreach both the preacher and the workman in the hocus pocus of exchange.

The workman may do an honest day's work, and his employer may pay him the full wage agreed upon, but so surely as monopoly exists, it will extort a tribute from both employer and workman.

Why do men seek to establish monopolies? What is the object? It is for the purpose of enabling them to get more of value than they impart.

Monopoly controls the greater part of the raw materials of our industries; and its motto is: "Charge all that the traffic will bear." Years ago, when the product of industry per capita of the population was comparatively small, the traffic would bear but a correspondingly small tribute to monopoly. But with the rapid advance in the social productivity monopolies have multiplied and grown rich beyond the dreams of avarice!

Monopoly seeks to control as large a part of the industrial field as possible. Its method is to expand the field, and contract the number of the beneficiaries. Monopoly is valuable only in proportion to the number of individuals excluded from its benefits. The very definition of the word "monopoly" indicates that—and it is amazing that men who wish to be regarded as intelligent should hold their peace in the presence of this gigantic iniquity! to say nothing of those who profess to be followers of Christ, and yet who lift not a finger to crush these juggernauts of commerce, that roll their merciless wheels over the writhing bodies of the struggling masses of humanity!

Monopoly has so far extended its field as to control the major part of the raw materials of industry, without which we cannot work. Its power is so great that it can appropriate to itself the greater part of the rapid increase of the social productivity. No matter how much more productive we become from year to year, monopoly can, by charging all that the traffic will bear, extort the larger part of it from us.

It is a demonstrable fact that increasingly strenuous industry on the part of the people as a whole does not and cannot result in proportionately increased reward to themselves. For, the harder they work, the more monopoly can extort from them. The greater the volume of traffic, the more the traffic will bear—and monopoly charges all the traffic will bear!

Monopoly is to-day charging more than the traffic will bear, with the result that a check is put upon industry, and two hundred thousands of men and millions of capital are thrown out of employment. This whole country is now being plunged into the throes of business depression, solely because monopoly is charging more for the raw materials of industry than the people can pay, and at the same time consume as much as they can produce; therefore, we must produce less—men must be discharged from employment, capital in large volumes must lie idle, entailing a period of hard times.

Do not fall into the inexcusable blunder of antagonizing capital; of fighting employers of labor. It takes a man of heroic mold to venture his capital anywhere in the competitive field to-day. Capitalists, as such, are not oppressors of the laborer. Capitalists are the world's greatest benefactors, in a material way. So long as a capitalist must compete with the whole world, is it not puerile for us to denounce

him for his success? For the capitalist, in the competitive field, succeeds by means of outdoing his unsuccessful competitors in service to the public. He maintains his position just as you and I maintain ours. There are lots of men who would like to get your place, and it is only by successful competition that you hold your own. I have been amused to hear preachers decry competition! The preacher is a competitor as surely as the merchant or laborer. I hope I shall not be asked to prove this. I could do it by citing examples that it would not be pleasant for you to hear.

Competition is the true law of human industry. It is "civil service" in practical application, wherein each finds the place that fits him as nearly as can be so long as the element of monopoly exists in the social mechanism. Abolish all monopoly, and universal competition would determine each individual to the place wherein his service to himself and all society would be greatest, and each would be able to take from the market the equivalent of his contribution to the market; demand would equal the utmost possible supply, and never ending prosperity would enrich and gladden the world.

Universal competition would be the exemplification in industry of the command: Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.

Monopoly is the infraction of that command.

The individual may do his part never so well, yet unless society maintain social equity—equality of opportunity—the equal right of all and each, he will inevitably be defrauded by those whom society permits to deprive him of his equal rights.

Monopoly is the great generator of social inequity. The attitude of the church should be one of unremitting aggressive hostility to all private monopoly, and the time is near at hand when the preacher who is not equipped by special education to fight monopoly intelligently, will be retired in favor of competitors who are able not only to apply the command, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," to the simple, obvious things of life, but also to the complex intricacies of the social system.

Society owes it to the individual that his rights shall be safeguarded. Every individual shares in the social responsibility. The church, being the repository of the sacred law, is under two-

fold obligation to lead the fight against monopoly—that concrete defiance of Christ's command—two-fold, because it is bound to antagonize immorality as a human matter of course, and, beyond that, it is bound to denounce whatsoever is opposed to the teachings of the Master.

### O LAWD! OH—LAN'LAWD!

#### A "COON" DITTY.

For The Public.

The lan'lawd's settin' on top his fence—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
He's livin' high an' at my expense—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
He's got mo' nalls, an' he's got mo' boa'ds,  
An' he's got mo' gall 'n a hog affoa'ds;  
Gwine t' bull' mo' fence, an' collec' mo'  
rent,  
Till he gits this niggah man's las' red cent!  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!

The moon's tu'n red an' the sky's tu'n  
black—

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
Oie Nick's gwine home an' he won't be  
back—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
His wuk's done finish' on top this earth,  
An' he laugh' t' hissef fo' all he's worth;  
An' he say t' the man on the fence up  
there:  
"You mus' run things now while I go some-  
where."

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The sistahs weep an' the eldahs pray—  
But Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The preacha's got a whole lot to say—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
But, you that's talkin', jus' tu'n me loose,  
Fo' yo' can't, fo' true, give a good excuse  
Fo' the pa'dnin' grace that the lan'lawd  
gits

When he comes to meetin' an' draps two  
bits.

O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The soul an' stomach—they fus' rate  
friends—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
The things life borries, why earth it len's—  
O Lawd! Oh—lan'lawd!  
But this the thing that the lan'lawd say:  
"It's the earth that len's, but it's me you  
pay."

An' he'll skın yo' clothes neahly offen yo'  
backs  
Less you bus' his game with the single  
tax—

O Lawd! No—lan'lawd!  
E. J. SALISBURY.

Rev. Charles Wagner, the author of a book entitled: "The Simple Life," is now visiting this country for the purpose of giving our people further light on his theories in the lectures which he proposes to deliver. The new gospel—that of the simple life—is in truth very old. The Roman satirists pleaded for the simple life and hashed the luxury of the day. As far back as we can go in history we find the same doctrine eloquently preached. And it could hardly have been otherwise. For the very moment that man became conscious that

he possessed a soul, or a spiritual nature, he realized that his true life was not dependent on the multitude of his possessions—rather that it was cramped and fettered by them.—Indianapolis News.

"Yes," said the proprietor of the "A—," as he came out from Mr. Max Hirsch's lecture, "what Mr. Hirsch says is all right, but . . . it recalls to my mind the story of little Bobbie, who told his mamma that he quite enjoyed the doctor's advice, but it was his horrid medicine he hated to take."—Progress, of Melbourne, Australia.

Race hatred never settled any problem on this earth. The way for one race to show a greater degree of superiority over any other is by a greater degree of kindness, of thoughtfulness and of brotherly love. No race is free, indeed, so long as it is ruled by passion and brute force.—Booker T. Washington, before the Peace Congress in Boston.

Uncle Hiram—They say that the sun never sets on the British empire.

Aunt Hannah—Doesn't it, now? And we have such lovely sunsets over here!  
—Puck.

## BOOKS

### A PROBLEM IN DEMOCRACY.

It is always refreshing to read an author who meets the common cry that "democracy is a failure," with the response that it is not democracy, but lack of democracy, that has caused the conditions which to superficial or hostile observers look like failures of democracy. "What we need is not less democracy, but more," writes Delos F. Wilcox in *The American City, a Problem in Democracy* (New York: The Macmillan Co., price \$1.25 net); and in that friendly spirit he studies his problem.

Any discussion of the many details of city affairs would fail to escape just criticism at some points, and Dr. Wilcox's work is no exception. But on the vital points of his subject he leaves little room for controversy from the democratic point of view. His chapters on the control of public utilities, municipal home rule, municipal revenues, and municipal debt are especially valuable. On the subject of municipal debt he reaches the important conclusion that "we must call a halt in the piling up of debts for our children to pay."

The book is extremely conservative in method and tone; but advances in the direction of what has been commonly regarded as "radical" are for that reason all the more valuable. Dr. Wilcox's advances in that direction are particularly noticeable in his discussion of

the subject of municipal revenues, where the single tax on land values is considered. After an intelligent explanation of that reform, something quite unusual in books of this conservative class, the author concludes that "clearly, as regards cities at least, the single taxer is right; the only really legitimate source of municipal revenue is the tax on land value."

Dr. Wilcox includes in that category "a franchise tax and a vehicle tax." The classification is hardly correct, but the author practically minimizes the error by this qualification: "If the city desires to treat the streets like other land and make them self-supporting."

Problems of municipal government are forging so fast to the front as the favorite problems of modern democracy, that books of this character are becoming indispensable to all public-spirited men, and this one is among the best that have as yet appeared. It is published in Macmillan's Citizens' Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology, of which Prof. Richard T. Ely is the editor.

Note.—In reply to inquiries with regard to "Democracy," the early production of Richard Whiteing, author of "No. 5 John St." and "The Yellow Van," our information is that the firm (Chatto and Windus, London) which published the book is no longer in existence. We are not aware of an American edition.

## PAMPHLETS.

In *Plain Facts and Figures* Mr. D. M. Hall (Washington, D. C.) makes a statistical but reasonable comparison of the rate of increase in prosperity under Democratic administrations down to 1860 with that under Republican administrations subsequent to 1860.

Those ill-informed persons who suppose that anarchism and assassination are synonymous terms may improve their knowledge, whether they find edification therein or not, by reading Joseph A. Labadie's leaflet (Detroit) on *Anarchism, What It Is and What It Is Not*.

## PERIODICALS.

Joaquin Miller opposes the Chinese exclusion Act, in the *Arena* for October, but for reasons that appeal more strongly to the class feeling of employers than to democratic sentiment. Three articles on popular government are especially useful: Flower's account of the referendum in Brookline, Tyson's Single Vote in Plural Elections, and Doty's Chicago referendum. A symposium on the Presidential election is one of the features of this number.

R. F. Powell's *Vacant Lot Gardens vs. Vagrancy*, in *Charities* for October 1, is a suggestive story of one of the Pingree "potato patch" experiments,—that at Philadelphia, of which Mr. Powell is the superintendent. This is the scheme proposed by Gov. Pingree for ridding society of the tramp evil. "If," said Gov. Pingree, "we will give the members