

other man or body or generation of men. No franchise was ever granted by the unanimous consent of all concerned. All new-comers to a town after a franchise has been granted, are thereby governed without their consent during the lifetime of that franchise. The self-evident truth of "government by consent of the governed" invalidates every irrevocable franchise, —every one at least which is of unreasonable duration.

The Hon. Robert Baker's courageous and useful record in Congress is about to be rewarded, so it is reported, by the Democratic Boss of Brooklyn, inspired thereto by Wall street men, with an interdict forbidding his renomination. Political bosses and Wall street men have no use for a Congressman who declines railroad passes. Not that they care so much about the passes per se; but a Congressman who refuses passes, especially if he tells about it, thereby exposes a weakness for being honest and courageous in the public service, and this identifies him unmistakably with the "dangerous classes." It is probable, however, that the premature discovery of the Brooklyn Boss's purpose may frustrate it. At a dinner given to Baker on the 27th in Brooklyn (p. 106), where the subject was mentioned, the demonstration was menacing to Bosses. This dinner is reported by the New York and Brooklyn papers as having been extraordinarily successful and significant. Over 200 were present and the speaking was vigorous and excellent. Among the speakers were Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, and Bird S. Coler, the last Democratic candidate for governor of New York, besides Congressman Baker himself. Since Baker's district is a Republican stronghold, any attempt by the plutocrats to prevent his getting the Democratic nomination cannot but testify to his popular strength and indicate the wholesome fear in which he is held by spoilsmen of both parties.

Mr. Baker has issued a challenge

to the Republican party which might well be imitated by radical Democratic candidates elsewhere. It is contained in the following letter:

544 Carlton avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.,  
May 26, 1904. Hon. Jesse Overstreet,  
Secretary Republican Congressional  
campaign Committee, Washington,  
D. C.:

Dear Sir—A news item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 25 has been brought to my attention. It relates to the speech of Hon. William Bourke Cockran of New York, delivered in the House of Representatives on Saturday, April 23, and announces the intention of the Republican campaign committee to print large quantities of the speech for circulation in certain Congressional districts. I have no means of knowing whether this article was inspired or not. Assuming, however, that such announcement was authentic, I respectfully submit this proposition:

Should your committee print this speech, it will, of course, be because convinced that the free trade utterances of Mr. Cockran will lead voters to desert the Democratic and support the Republican candidates. Believing in the circulation of literature rather than "boodle"—especially literature which calls a spade a spade—I shall be glad to assist in the wide distribution of this speech and therefore hereby promise and agree, if your committee will supply the same, to address and mail a copy to every voter in this, the Sixth Congressional District. Being thus circulated under my frank, the voters will understand that I heartily indorse the free trade sentiments therein expressed.

I shall be glad to be favored with an early reply. Yours respectfully,  
Robert Baker..

The Republicans were supposed to have suffered great loss in the way of campaign management when Senator Hanna died, but Secretary Cortelyou is well-conditioned to make a good substitute. It must have been somewhat like an inspiration, the idea of turning the job of raising campaign funds and "jollyng" labor union leaders over into the hands of the cabinet officer who is at the head of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

A socialist orator, J. L. Fitts, as reported in Appeal to Reason, had an interesting time in Salisbury, N. C. When he undertook to speak on the street a policeman took him down, and when he appealed to the mayor he met the following decision:

I don't want my people stirred up. I know what is good for them, and have their welfare at heart. You don't look

like you do. I allow candidates and their friends to speak, but you can't. I have that entirely in my charge, and you need not talk any more about it.

The fine, large way in which the mayor talks of "my people" and "their welfare" is worthy of His Majesty Edward VII. or Kaiser Wilhelm, and shows that the "protective spirit" still reigns supreme in Salisbury, as well as in some other places.

It is with profound regret that we note the suspension of City and State of Philadelphia. Under the devoted editorial management of Herbert Welsh, that paper has exerted the most wholesome influence, both in its own commonwealth on local questions, and in the nation on imperialism. It has stood bravely and intelligently for clean politics, equal rights, just laws, and genuine democratic government. Deeply as its suspension is to be deplored its influence while it lived can not be forgotten. After all, with newspapers as with men, the vital consideration always is, not whether they are dead, but whether their work and influence lives and is worthy to live.

That distinguished anti-labor leader, David M. Parry, is reported to have drawn a queer distinction between restriction of competition by labor unions and restriction of competition by protective tariff laws. The matter is put in the form of this question to Mr. Parry and his reply:

Question: As you believe in unrestricted competition in the employment of labor, do you also believe in conducting industrial enterprises in harmony with natural competitive conditions? Do you believe in free trade or protection? If you are a protectionist, how do you harmonize the application of a natural law in employing laborers and the ignoring of this law in conducting a manufacturing enterprise?

Mr. Parry's reply: As an interference with natural law the tariff is to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of the whole people; but the interference of organized labor with natural law is not to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of only part of the people.

Mr. Parry's reply fixes his stand

ing as a controversialist. There is no reason in him. He must be the original altruistic genius who invented the doctrine that "what's yours 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, millenniums 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