

an party for the support of Wall street financiers. It is for this reason that I protest against mortgaging the party to the capitalists to secure an enormous corruption fund.

If any who are present to-night, or who read what I say, think that I am trying to interfere with Democratic success, let me answer that no Democrat is more anxious for the party to succeed than I am. No one has suffered more from dissensions and divisions in the party, and no one, I believe, is more eager for the country to enjoy the great benefits which a triumph of real Democracy would bring. But I do not desire that the party shall win offices only. If that is the only purpose of the party, let its principles be abandoned, and let its platform simply declare the party hungry for the patronage. The lesson of 1894 shows the folly of hoping to win by a surrender to the corporations, but even if success could be bought in such a way, it would not be worth the price.

No one can defend the Democratic party without defending its principles, and its principles ought to be so clearly set forth as to be easily understood. We ought to appeal to the conscience of the public, and arraign Republican policies as hostile both to the principles of free government and to the principles of morality. We have an opportunity to make the Democratic party a power in this country—not only a power, but a power for good. Let us array the party against every abuse of government and against every policy that is hurtful to the people. Let us drive out of the party every Democrat who betrays his trust, every official who would administer the office for his private advantage. Let us make Democracy stand not only for good government—for honest government—but for a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” And the first step in this direction is the adoption of a platform that recognizes the right of the people to decide public questions, as well as their capacity for understanding public questions. To present a platform which is evasive and ambiguous, shows that those who write the platform either distrust the people who are to act upon it, or have purposes that they desire to conceal.

The New York platform is ambiguous, uncertain, evasive and dishonest. It would disgrace the Democrats of the nation to adopt such a platform, and it ought to defeat as an aspirant for a Democratic nomination any man who

would be willing to have it go forth as a declaration of his views on public questions. In Illinois, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in Minnesota, in Indiana, in Ohio, and in every other State that has not acted, it behooves the Democrats to avenge themselves and organize, to the end that they may prevent the consummation of the schemes of the reorganizers. Their scheme begins with the deception of the rank and file of the party. It is to be followed up by the debauching of the public with a campaign fund secured from the corporations, and it is to be consummated by the betrayal of the party organization and of the country into the hands of those who are to-day menacing the liberties of the country by their exploitation of the producers of wealth.

#### “WHEN WAS A DUMB MAN SENT TO THE WHITE HOUSE?”

At the April dinner of the Gridiron club at the Arlington hotel in Washington, April 22, four members sang to the tune of “The Little Black Bull” a song, the title of which was given as “Peeping Through the Knot Hole in Papa’s Wooden Leg, or Why Was the Ocean Bull so Near to the Shore?” We reprint from the report in the Chicago Tribune.

David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
David B. Hill came down the mountain,  
Long time ago.

He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.  
He picked out a man whose name is Parker,  
Long time ago.

He says: “Don’t talk, and we’ll beat T. Roosevelt.”  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

He says: “Don’t talk, and we’ll beat T. Roosevelt.”  
Long time ago.

And he didn’t say a word all spring or summer,  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

And he didn’t say a word all spring or summer,  
Long time ago.

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Hoosan Johnny, Hoosan Johnny.

But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Long time ago.

#### CHORUS.

Long time ago, long time ago,  
But when was a dumb man sent to the white house?  
Long time ago.

Just as in a neglected house there may be conditions that attract vermin and breed a pestilence, so in the mind, long closed to light, there may be a stock of old ideas in different stages of decay in which are nurtured the germs of disease and death. To go down into the cellar of the mind and up into the garret, to drag out the moldy and infected thoughts

and scour the hidden corners and flood the darkness with the sunshine—what if we were to do this every spring?—Herbert S. Bigelow.

Miss Susan B. Anthony at 84, as chipper as a blackbird and merry as a cricket, says: “I may not be here when the campaign opens but if anywhere, I shall be somewhere.” This is lucid, diplomatic, a little mysterious and delightfully non-committal. She would make an excellent secretary of state if anything should happen to John Hay.—Lawrence (Mass.) Sentinel.

The man with narrow mind and low ambitions who is irritated at the mere mention of the wrongs of others and whose absorbing interest is in personal gain and pleasure—he is a vulture spirit, bent on carrion, and has not the moral perception to realize his own ugliness.—Herbert S. Bigelow.

## BOOKS

### A CHALLENGE TO SOCIALISM.

The anti-socialism crusade of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, seems upon the surface to be an ecclesiastical attack upon an economic and political movement. There are many things about the crusade and in the spirit and method of its active participants to account for this; but it must eventually be conceded that there is much in socialism that would justify such a crusade from purely religious motives and upon strictly religious grounds. For socialism, in so far as it is represented by what are called “scientific” socialists—and they are now dominant in the movement, not only in Europe but here—stands not alone for economic and political change, but also for the destruction of existing religious institutions and beliefs and the denial of absolute moral ideals and standards.

This is the keynote of the book before us: “Socialism; the Nation of Fatherless Children,” (Boston: The Union News League), by David Goldstein. Mr. Goldstein’s work is edited by Martha Moore Avery. His subtitle is an allusion to the subject matter of his chapter on “Homeless Children,” which explains that under socialism children would be reared no longer in family homes, but in collective nurseries.

It appears that Mr. Goldstein was for eight years an active and studious propagandist of socialism. Being a theist, though not a church-goer or advocate of any religious creed, he was always repelled by the assertions of the German socialists, who “controlled the organization, that ‘you cannot be a socialist without being an atheist.’” but for a long time he took this for their

personal opinion, not for "the bed rock of socialist philosophy," and assumed that as the movement advanced it would "come under American management and so outgrow its foreign atheistic accompaniment." In this expectation he was disappointed. "It was the accumulation of fact on fact," he writes, "which at last has left me with the conviction that the atheistic forces, which under the socialist propaganda are taking political form, will compel a closer association of those organizations which stand for the propagation and enforcement of a religious law." He accordingly declares that "the time-worn battle between right and wrong is on;" and gives it as his personal conviction that "upon the religious aspects of this great issue the fight now centers around the Catholic church."

Having come to this conclusion Mr. Goldstein, by letter of May 23, 1903, formally resigned his membership in the State committee of the Socialist party of Massachusetts, having already resigned as member of the Highland District Socialist Party club, of the Boston Socialist party and city committee, and of the general committee of the Massachusetts Socialist clubs. In resigning he announced his intention of publishing a book that would "prove to the candid mind (if facts count for anything) that a vote cast for socialism is a vote cast for the destruction of those institutions which promote and sustain civilization; namely, the church, the state and the monogamic family." The book named above appears in fulfillment of that announcement.

Mr. Goldstein is apparently animated by ecclesiastical motives. It may be that he is carrying on an anti-socialist agitation under ecclesiastical management. He is certainly embittered and possibly prejudiced by the resentments of the old comrades he has abandoned. Under the influence of these and kindred feelings he has weakened his book by not a little demagoguery. The space devoted to appeals to indiscriminating supporters of existing institutions might have been better used for judicial discrimination between good and bad institutions and for rational defense of the good. The subtitle, for instance,—“the Nation of Fatherless Children”—in which the author implies that under socialism the commonwealth would supersede the family, is manifestly an attempt to excite prejudice; and so is the chapter on “Homeless Children,” to which it alludes. Yet it would have been as easy to refute the socialistic literature on this point as to quote it without other protest than an unreasoning appeal to conventional ideas.

But every man must be allowed to make his own book in his own way; and if Mr. Goldstein, whose principal object was to demonstrate that socialism runs counter to cherished institu-

tions, chooses to start with the assumption that these institutions ought to be cherished, that is his affair. It is a perfectly legitimate mode of addressing audiences who are already convinced, whether rationally or not, of the soundness of the assumption; and Mr. Goldstein is not open to criticism for adopting it as his hypothesis. And that he accomplishes his main purpose, that of demonstrating the essential hostility of the present socialist movement not only to church, state and monogamous marriages, but also to the idea of a spiritual religion and moral principles, is hardly to be questioned.

Although the author enters so slightly into argument in refutation of the socialist doctrines and their corollaries which he discloses, he nevertheless exhibits now and then an ability in that direction of which one might have wished to find more instances. One of these instances is his short and incisive reply to the materialistic doctrine of scientific socialism. Quoting the epigrammatic statement of a socialist author in support of this doctrine, “the inventions and not the intentions of men have been the cause of progress,” Mr. Goldstein retorts: “This sounds well! The music of its rhythm is mistaken for logic. The simple fact is that the inventions of men have always been preceded by the intentions of men.” The materialistic postulate and the idealistic reply could find no better epigrammatic statement.

It is to be observed that Mr. Goldstein distinguishes socialism from public ownership of public utilities. His distinction is sound in economic principle and he credits it—though without citation, unfortunately—to the judiciary of Massachusetts, summarizing a judicial opinion as follows: “Public utilities are those things which require a governmental function, such as the distribution of water, gas, electricity—commodities which necessitate a single enterprise with supplies emanating from a single source—those things which require the use of the public highways, etc.”

There are implications throughout the book of a grasp of fundamental economic principle. But the reader whom these implications may favorably affect will be disappointed upon finding that Mr. Goldstein’s philosophy rounds up in trades unionism plus individual charity.

PAMPHLETS.

Hugo Bilgram, 1235 Spring Garden street, Philadelphia, publishes a proposed “substitute for elastic currency” and a “simple remedy for financial stringency.” His plan is borrowed from the clearing house idea. It could be put into operation by voluntary associations of any number of people having mutual business relations. Their object would be the settling of their mutual accounts, and this they would do precisely as clearing houses now settle the mutual accounts of bankers, except that the checks or due bills going through this clearing house “would rest upon original values instead of representatives of value, like cash

and its substitutes.” The checks or due bills of each member of the association would be secured by preliminary deposits of adequate collateral, and provision for paying the clearing house balances would be made by requiring small periodical cash payments by the members of the association.

Some very effective tax reform work has been done by the Massachusetts Single Tax League under the presidency of Mr. C. E. Fillebrown, of Boston. A distinctive feature of this work is the annual series of banquets which the league has for some years been accustomed to give to representative classes. One of these, the banquet of April 13, 1903, was given to some of the landlords of Boston, and the address of President Fillebrown on that occasion, together with newspaper comments, has been put into a pamphlet which must profoundly interest every student of taxation. Mr. Fillebrown’s speech is a rich mine of valuable and but little known fiscal facts. He has, for instance, collected the particulars of 120 real estate sales in Boston, which show an average of 80 per cent. as the ratio of tax valuation to true selling value. From the same data Mr. Fillebrown ascertains that the actual capitalized land value, net of those parcels of real estate aggregates \$5,623,470—about 77 per cent. of the value of land and improvements together. This is about the same proportion, as recently disclosed by the taxing authorities of New York, that prevails in New York city. Another of Mr. Fillebrown’s exhibits is a table comparing the assessed valuations of 751 pieces of real estate with their actual rentals. The tabulation particularizes for the whole 751 cases and presents the results in nine columns, aggregating as follows: (1) assessed valuation of the real estate, \$35,808,800; (2) assessed valuation of the land, \$25,067,800; (3) assessed valuation of the buildings, \$10,741,000; (4) net rental, less taxes, \$2,277,222; (5) ten per cent. allowance on building for interest, insurance, repairs and depreciation, \$1,071,800; (6) net income from land, \$1,205,422; (7) per cent. of net income on assessed valuation of land, 4.8 per cent.; (8) paid by the user for net ground rent, plus tax, \$1,577,425; (9) gross value of land, being the user’s rent, capitalized at five per cent., \$31,548,500. Mr. Fillebrown tabulates other facts which cannot but command serious attention. In these he shows that the actual and potential gross ground rent of Boston in 1902 was \$42,000,000, whereas the total of taxes paid was only \$18,000,000. On the question of the appreciation of real estate, Mr. Fillebrown makes a significant showing in a table of Boston’s growth for 15 years, which we condense, as follows:

Valuation of buildings, 1888.....	\$24,000,000
Depreciation, plus taxes.....	88,750,000
Value of same buildings, 1902.....	146,000,000
Valuation of land, 1888.....	\$328,000,000
Appreciation, minus taxes.....	245,000,000
Value of same land, 1902.....	\$573,000,000

Thus Boston buildings have depreciated in value over a third in 15 years, while Boston land has almost doubled its value in the same time. Well may Mr. Fillebrown say: “Those persons who agree with John Stuart Mill that it would be sound public policy and no injustice to land owners to take for public purposes the future increase in ground rent will be interested to note what an opportunity is shown by the above figures to have been lost 15 years ago for putting such a plan in operation in Boston.”

PERIODICALS.

—Henry George, Jr.’s, fourth article for Pearson’s, on modern methods of “finance,” appears in the May number. It tells the story of the wreck of the ship-building trust, and incidentally shows some

Mr. John Z. White Writes for “Why.”

Mr. White will have an interesting letter in April “Why” and each month thereafter, until further notice, describing his lecture tours and the work of the Henry George Lecture Association. You should not miss any of these issues. Send twenty-five cents in stamps or coin to FRANK VIERTH, Editor “Why,” Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This pays for yearly subscription.