AGRICULTURE AND LAND MONOPOLY.

Among the valuable bulletins of the Census Bureau at Washington is a series exhibiting agricultural conditions in the several States. For a brief consideration of the relations of agriculture to land monopoly as exhibited in those Bulletins, we refer to the one for Illinois. Any of the others, however, would doubtless be as interesting; and in somewhat greater or less degree, probably as significant.

Certain official definitions must be understood. The language of this Census Bulletin is to be interpreted as follows:

A "farm" is all the land which is directly farmed by one person, either by his own labor alone or with the assistance of members of his household or hired employes; and it may consist of a single tract of land or of a number of separate tracts, even though the separate tracts be held under different tenures.

When a landowner has one or more tenants, renters, croppers or managers, the land operated by each is considered a "farm."

As to size, any tract of three acres or more is a "farm" if used for agricultural purposes, no matter what the value of the products or the amount of labor; and so are all tracts of less than three acres producing $250 worth of farm products or more.

A "farmer" is a person who directs the operations of a farm. Owners of farms who do not themselves direct the farm operations are not farmers.

Farm owners include (1) farmers operating their own land only, and (2) those operating both their own land and some land hired from others.

"Farm tenants" are operators of hired land only, whether tenants, renters or croppers.

"Managers" are farmers who conduct farming for wages or salaries.

"Farm land" is reported as (1) "improved," including all land regularly tilled or mowed, land pastured and cropped in rotation, land lying fallow, land in gardens, orchards, vineyards and nurseries, and land occupied by farm buildings; (2) wood land, including all land covered with natural or planted forest trees which produce or later may produce firewood or other forest products; and (3) other unimproved land, including brush land, rough or stony land, swamp land, and "any other land which is not improved or in forest."

Bearing in mind those official definitions, we shall find in the Census Bulletin for Illinois much significance for farmers, both those who *farm farms* and those who *farm farmers*.

For instance: The average value of farm *land* in Illinois, which in 1900 was $46.17 an acre, was $95.02 an acre in 1910—an increase of 105.8 per cent in those ten years. This increase in farm *land-values* was at a rate six times greater than the increase in population; which suggests either a more productive population or more intensely speculative tendencies.

But perhaps the most significant, at any rate the most sinister, disclosure is the fact that while the increase in farm *land-values* was 105.8 per cent, the increase in farm *building-values* was only 71.9 per cent, in farm implements and machinery values only 63.9 per cent, and in domestic animals on farms only 59.4 per cent.

To help appreciate the value of this comparison, the actual increase in values may serve better than percentages, and we tabulate them:

	1900.	1910.	Increase.
Land value (unearned)	$1,514,113,970	$3,090,411,148	$1,576,297,178
Buildings	$ 251,467,580	$ 432,381,422	$ 180,913,842
Implements and machinery	44,977,310	73,724,074	28,746,764
Domestic animals.	193,758,037	308,804,431	115,046,394
Labor values (earned)	$ 490,202,927	$ 814,909,927	$ 324,707,000

So we see that in the brief space of ten years, and in so far as Census figures may be trusted, the total increase in *earned* values of all kinds on Illinois farms, is enormously less than the increase in the same time of the *unearned* values. The total increase of earned values is only $324,707,000, while those that are unearned rise to $1,576,297,178. For every dollar's worth of those earned values farmers had to toil hard and save carefully, but for the other values the owners did nothing. It was done for them by increase of population, growth of towns, villages and cities, and general improvement in farming communities.

The contrast is still more striking if we put the land values against buildings, implements and animals separately. To make the increase of $180,913,842 in buildings, farmers had to work; but the increase of $1,576,297,178 in land values (8 times as great) cost them no work—they got it from society as an unearned gift. To make the increase of $28,746,764 in implements and machinery, they had to work; but the $1,576,297,178 in land values (50 times as much) cost them no work—they got it from society as an unearned gift. To make the increase of $115,046,394 in domestic animals, they had to work; but the $1,576,297,178 in land values (14 times as great) cost them no work—they got it from society as an unearned gift.

But please observe that in growing degree he who gets from society those rich and unearned gifts is not the farmer—not the kind of farmer who *farms farms*. His function is to play in the role of

"goat" to the farmers who *farm farmers.* Some indication of this may be got from that same Census bulletin for Illinois.

To begin with, Illinois farms have in the decade been passing out of the proprietorship of farmers who farm them. Here is a tabulation of the figures by farms:

	1900.	1910.	Decrease.
Total Illinois farms....	264,151	251,872	12,279
Owned by the farmer.....	124,128	107,300	16,828
Owned and hired by the farmer	34,375	37,807	*3,432
Total farmer ownerships	158,503	145,107	13,396

*Increase.

	1900.	1910.	Increase.
Operated by tenants.....	103,698	104,379	681
Operated by managers....	1,950	2,386	436
Total exploitation	105,648	106,765	1,117

So, with a total of 264,151 farms in 1900, and of only 251,872 in 1910, we have not only a decrease in the total number, but also a decrease in farmer ownerships and an increase in tenancy and hired management. The decrease in the number of Illinois farms in that decade was 12,279; the decrease in farmer ownerships was 13,396; the increase in tenancy and hired management was 1,117. At the rate, then, of somewhat more than 100 farms a year, and with a diminishing number in the aggregate, the farms of Illinois have for the decade of 1900-10 been passing from working owners to capitalistic exploiters.

Yet the working farmers of Illinois are told, and some of them are simple enough to believe it, that the exemption from taxation of everything but land values would impoverish *them.* While the farmers who are deceived by such "dope" are farmers who farm farms, the farmers who profit by the present situation and administer the dope, are plainly enough farmers who farm farmers.

How soon will working farmers begin to do their own thinking about taxation and land monopoly, instead of allowing land monopolists to do it for them?

You are beaten to earth. Well, well, what's that?
Come up with a smiling face.
It's nothing against you to fall down flat;
But to lie there—that's a disgrace.
The harder you're thrown, why the harder you'll bounce.
Be proud of your blackened eye.
It isn't the fact that you're licked that counts,
It's how did you fight, and why.

—Edmund Vance Cooke.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SOCIALIST NATIONAL CONVENTION.

Indianapolis, May 17.

The contrast between the factions of the Socialist Party came out with new distinctness in the national gathering at Indianapolis, May 12-18.

The revolutionary "left," standing flat-footed on the Marxian platform, has grown more aggressive and militant. Its tendency is to make terms with the ideals and principles represented by the "Industrial Workers of the World," an independent labor crusade which undertakes the organization of working people by industries instead of by crafts or trades, and which promotes concerted action of the entire wage working class against the employing class.

In connection with the "I. W. W." crusade, the movement called "Syndicalism" in France and England has made its appearance in the United States, and has become a factor in the councils of the American Socialist Party. This term refers to the massing, or "syndicating," of labor in response to the consolidating of capitalism.

Another phrase now heard frequently is "direct action," referring to working-class tactics which may or may not involve violence. The extreme direct-actionist has little or no faith in political activity by or for the working class. According to this view, political action, which is by its nature indirect, has but little promise for the common people. This tendency is making its influence felt among the Socialists.

The I. W. W. itself (the independent labor organization just referred to) includes a purely "militant" wing of direct-actionists, as well as those who also believe in connecting political activity with the working-class program. Through the combination of these two methods of activity, William D. Haywood is a leader in the I. W. W., and also a factor in the political Socialist Party.

Haywood believes in the ideal of Socialism—i. e., ownership of the means of industry by the wage-working people themselves; he is a member of the Socialist Party, and he was recently placed on the National Executive Committee by party votes. Haywood has been connected with labor troubles in Colorado, as a consequence of which he was dubbed an "undesirable citizen" by Roosevelt; and he was an active manager of the great strike at Lawrence, Mass.

One of the largest and most spectacular problems before the convention at Indianapolis was, What shall the Party do with its revolutionary "left" wing, and especially with Haywood? The national convention this year was looked forward to with more than usual hope and fear by the entire party. Adherents of both factions had been throwing mud and calling each other bad names with great in-