

experts discover their mistake. Of course no one from the outside can help; first, because most persons think of expertitis as a fetish for worship rather than a disease to avoid; and second, because victims of expertitis regard all suggestions from the outside as obtrusive ignorance.

+

Now and then, however, a sane expert appears. One of these is Dr. Richard C. Cabot, of the Massachusetts General Hospital, who, in a lecture before the City Club of Chicago last spring, spoke incidentally upon the subject of the "absent-mindedness which comes with specialization." In this connection he said:

I do not suppose that anybody in this age and generation is so crazy as to believe that we can get along without specialization. But there are quite a number of people just about crazy enough to forget that the evils of specialization must be neutralized or they will altogether counterbalance its values. There must be some machinery, some forces, personal or impersonal, to neutralize the evils of the division of labor. I suppose that is just as true in business as it is in medicine; I know it is true in medicine.

Every word of that statement is as sound as the soundest dollar ever coined. And Dr. Cabot was right in his supposition that the evils of specialization are prevalent in business. Expertitis develops wherever there is specialization; and everywhere it may be illustrated as Dr. Cabot illustrated it in medicine:

The weak side of specialization can be exemplified by the particular knack with which a physician uses a microscope. He does not use it as most of you would use it for the first time. You would probably screw up your face so as to shut one eye, or put your hand over that eye so as to use the other more freely. But the physician who has used a microscope for any length of time does not do that; he keeps both eyes wide open, and one eye absolutely blind. That is merely because he wants to see nothing with it. He is specializing on what he sees in the microscope, and that limits his attention to that one object and makes him oblivious of all that goes on outside it. Every specialist is precisely in that position.

+

A little reflection upon those true words will bring to any thoughtful mind an appreciation of the value of democracy in government. The evils of specialization must be balanced with common sense: and common sense in government is not to be had of individuals, much less of individuals afflicted with expertitis. Common sense comes from the common people—which means all the people in their communal capacity of one man, one woman, one citizen—each thinking in the

mass. This minimizes selfishness by balancing opposing selfishnesses off against one another; it eliminates the excessive ignorance of some by modifying it with the larger knowledge of others; it eliminates pedantry by merging it in the mass; it soothes the inflammations of expertism by forcing experts to see with both eyes. He who said that no individual is wiser than all individuals, was himself a wise man. Democracy is no loose-ended sentiment; it is a scientific truth.

+ +

How Protection Works.

An Australian writes this from his State of Victoria:

I bought some hay making tools last week. They are manufactured at Springfield, Ohio. To get here they travel more than half way round the world, pay 5 per cent duty, and the agent's commission; yet I get them for one-third less than the Ohio price.

This is for the protection of the American farmer to whose nostrils free trade is a stench. The same Australian informant reports another example:

Owing to our rapid growth the State works could not build locomotives fast enough. Twenty were bought in America and twenty in England, all made after Victorian designs. The American engines are cheaper than the British by 15 per cent.

But the Baldwin works are protected. What against and what for?

+ +

Progress in Land Monopoly.

A recent issue of the St. Louis Journal of Agriculture published the following census synopsis on Oklahoma farms:

	1900.	1910.
Number of farms	108,000	189,000
Average acreage	213	152
Average value per acre.....	\$6.50	\$22.54
Farmed by whites.....	88%	89%
Farmed by Negroes.....	12%	11%
Farmed by owner:		
Unmortgaged	52%	26%
Mortgaged	4%	19%
Farmed by tenants.....	44%	55%

Observe that the number of farms has almost doubled, but not so much by bringing in new land, as by reducing the size of farms from an average of 213 acres to 152. Observe also that the acreage value has risen from \$6.50 to \$22.54. Some of this increase in value is doubtless due to improvements. To that extent it is significant of general prosperity. But some of it is certainly due to scarcity prices for land merely as land; and to that extent it is significant, not of general prosperity but of the prosperity of farmers who farm farms at the expense of farmers who farm farms. Observe, too, another form of the progress of land monopoly in Oklahoma—the form that

makes a thoughtless working farmer feel that he owns his farm when in fact he is less an owner than a tenant (present or prospective) of a mortgagee. The increase in mortgaged farms is from 4 per cent. of the Oklahoma farms in 1900 to 19 per cent. in 1911—which is sure enough “going some!” The increase in actual tenantry is not slow, either: from 44 per cent. of the 213-acre farms in 1900 to 55 per cent. of the 152-acre farms in 1911. The same tendency may be observed, probably, in the farming regions of every other agricultural State; and in town and city regions, this tendency would probably stand out even more conspicuously.

+ +

Peonage.

The inevitable development of personal slavery from land monopoly finds startling illustrations almost anywhere in the agricultural regions of the Southern States. That there may be no ground even in appearance for accusing us of sectional prejudice, we quote directly from *The Southern Cultivator*, of Atlanta, Georgia. Commenting favorably upon the tenant system of halving the crop, the *Cultivator* says, frankly even if cautiously, that—

many farmers who control large numbers of tenants under this system contrive to keep their tenants in debt, and while we are in no wise questioning the integrity of these gentlemen nor impugning their methods as in any sense dishonest, the fact exists that if another farmer wishes to remove one of these tenants he often has to pay up an old account before the tenant is free to make the change. Another bit of experience gained last fall was that out of more than one hundred applicants who applied to us for crops on the half system, the cheapest one was \$5, and they ranged from that sum up to \$175. It is a very common occurrence for one farmer to sell another farmer on account, and the Negro goes with it. Thus the Negro starts out in debt, and as he knows nothing but an antiquated system of growing cotton at the average rate of 500 lbs. seed cotton to the acre or ten bushels of corn, there is little hope for him to ever get very far ahead of anything but his landlord. Many of these farmers have made their fortunes working Negroes under this system, and there is small hope of accomplishing any reform with them, just as it is impossible to develop intelligent labor from that class of tenants. Hence for those of us who are to develop this new agricultural era we see but one avenue to success, viz.; turn to other fields for our tenants and secure another class—a more intelligent class—to do the more intelligent work.

A wise suggestion, that with which the *Cultivator* closes. But it could yield good effects only temporarily, if the legal system were continued under

which crop producers get half and land monopolizers the other half.

+

In so far as the land monopolizer's share is a return for supplies furnished on fair terms, what we are about to say does not apply; but in so far as it goes to him because he has title to the farm site and its natural soil, the question is not a race question, nor a sectional question, nor an efficiency question. In the long run monopolizers of the earth will come to be the virtual owners of users of the earth. The peonage of the South, so pointedly hinted at in the above quotation, is not peculiar to the South except possibly in its greater intensity or its more visible manifestations.

+ +

Southern Superstitions.

Every place, every section, has its superstitions. So no one need gloat over the superstitions that flourish beyond his own horizon, nor take offense if attention be honestly and good naturedly called to those within it. Boston, for instance, has indulged superstitions that have given her a somewhat derisive fame as the “Hub of the Universe”; while New York, the most provincial community of the Western world, is straight-jacketed with the superstition that provincialism flourishes everywhere else, but not there. The South, too, has its superstitions. There are two big ones, according to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, who goes South every year, and who defines superstitions as things “approved on account of being uttered so often.” You will find it all in *Unity* for April 20, 1911.

+

Of the first of those two superstitions of the South—that “prohibition does not prohibit”—Mr. Jones says, as a result of an annual inspection for eighteen years or more:

I come back to say to you that there is a mighty change, in appearances at least. I walked the streets of Savannah, a city of 75,000, for a week, and failed to see any signs of the old time debauchery or the ruffianism of the old regime. The shameful list of drunks and the attendant shootings and assassinations which appeared in the daily papers are not now to be found. The saloon as a center of debauchery, coarseness, and brawls is gone. In my week's stay in the city I saw but two drunken men, both of them manifestly gentlemen of the higher order. The saloon as a center of degradation is gone. The Mississippi River, under the sanction of the United States Government, still carries on the humiliating trade. The passenger boat is a floating saloon, and at its landing it takes on customers who, once in mid-stream, lay in their stock of fire-water, then go ashore at the next landing and walk back. Still, decency is on the increase and the illicit drinking is at least subject to good manners.