

upon a variety of subjects. But let the conversation be shifted to the steel works and they immediately become reticent. It is safe to talk with a stranger about local option, the price of groceries, or the prospect of war with Japan, but it is not regarded as safe to talk about conditions in the steel industry." Again he says: "One man of long experience as a steel worker who gave me a better insight into mill conditions than any other one person, remarked: 'I used to write for labor papers a great deal, and sometimes I fairly burn to do it now—to declare before the world, over my own signature, the facts about working conditions in the steel industry. But I can't. It wouldn't be safe.'" That is free America—not despotic Russia. Espionage and discharge as a trust method of subjugating Labor is supplemented by the subtler and gentler device of "welfare work." The Steel Corporation has done much work of this character highly to be commended. Stung by the whip and scorn of publicity, this sensitive corporation has for several years made great strides in introducing safety appliances; and during the last year has gone far in reducing the seven-day week; and it has provided compensation for accidents and established a pension system. But its compensation and pension schemes are so devised as to rob the detached workman of an all-powerful corporation of what glimmer of freedom and independence remained. They create a new form of peonage. . . . Many of the new party leaders admit such hardship to labor and such injustice as I have described. They grieve over it and want to put an end to such practices. They say it is because of these abuses that they advocate the policy of legalizing private monopoly and regulating it; or, in other words, domesticating industrial monsters and taming them. They propose to secure relief by legislation and an Interstate Trade Commission. I, also, want legislation and an Interstate Trade Commission to help enforce the laws, but I don't think the community ought to be forced or bribed into legalizing private monopoly in order to get the legislation and the commission. And it seems to me very unwise, particularly for Labor, to surrender industrial liberty and to rely wholly upon legislation and a commission. Legislation and commissions help only "him who helps himself"; and a social program which accepts these things as a substitute for industrial liberty, instead of using them as means of securing industrial liberty, is fundamentally unsound.



La Follette and Roosevelt.

Peculiarly Rooseveltian is the pretense that Mr. Roosevelt was supporting the La Follette fight for progressivism until Mr. La Follette's illness necessitated new leadership, and that then Mr. Roosevelt came reluctantly to the front. Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the work of La Follette, when the latter was fighting the Interests alone in the Senate and the former was fighting for them and not alone in the White House, testify with great force against Mr. Roosevelt's present pretensions. But some leopards are allowed to change their spots

to suit the seasons, and maybe Mr. Roosevelt is such a leopard. More directly to the precise point, it may be, however, is the conduct of Roosevelt toward La Follette when Roosevelt skilfully managed to speak in Wisconsin just after the primaries instead of just before. Why did he make that side-step? And when he did speak in Wisconsin after La Follette had carried the primaries, why was he so eloquently silent about La Follette? This bit of political history is not consistent with the present theory that Roosevelt was supporting the movement which he now assumes to lead in La Follette's place.*



Edward Keating.

One of the candidates for Congressman-at-Large from Colorado is Edward Keating, the president of the Colorado State Land Board. Mr. Keating was nominated at direct primaries in spite of the fact that he declared unequivocally for free sugar, although the beet-sugar industry in Colorado is supposed to be under the fostering care of the tariff, and in spite of the further fact that he is well known as a thorough-going Singletaxer. He has frequently presided at Henry George celebrations in Denver. His nomination was, we say, in *spite* of those facts; but ought we not to say that it may have been in some degree *because* of them? Free sugar isn't so unpopular as it used to be, and neither is the Singletax. Familiarity with both doctrines is fast breeding the reverse of contempt. At any rate, Mr. Keating has been nominated, and it seems to be more than likely that he will be elected. This probability should be made a certainty by the Free traders and Singletaxers of Colorado. Able, brilliant and popular, but no time server, Mr. Keating would be a valuable accession to the Singletax group in the national capital—Congressmen George, Lewis, Buchanan and the rest in the House, and Owen, at least, in the Senate.



An Echo from "the Dunne Board."

The "Dunne Board," as Mayor Edward F. Dunne's progressive appointees to the Chicago School Board were sneeringly called by corrupt politicians and grafty newspapers less than five years ago, are vindicated now in another of the policies which in their official day won for them the complimentary enmity of all the crooks in Chicago politics. Of the policies for which they fought and lost and which have since been adopted, the latest is the use of school buildings out of

*See The Public of September 16, 1910, page 866.