

ers for like altruistic or "scientific" reasons.

Prof. Le Rossignol, however, is a dubious advocate for his land monopoly cause. One point he dwells upon in a way well calculated to make votes for the Bucklin amendment (which would allow each county to exempt personal property and improvements if its voters wish to), rather than against the amendment. Considering the probable effect of the system of taxation which the adoption of that amendment would permit if desired, this astute economist says:

Already, in anticipation of the possible adoption of the amendments, the depression in land values which began with the panic of 1893 has been unduly prolonged. If the amendments are carried at the November election, this condition of depression will no doubt be greatly intensified and the value of unimproved land is likely to fall in anticipation of the adoption of the land tax in one or more counties of the State. If, at the general election of 1903, a single county should adopt the tax, there would follow a sharp decline in the value of unimproved land in that county, together with a sympathetic decline throughout the state.

What possible objection to that result anybody could have who is not a land forestaller, it is extremely difficult to imagine. The basis of prosperity is cheap unimproved land, as the history of this country abundantly testifies. Cheap land makes prosperous farmers, high wages, brisk business; dear land checks prosperity and culminates in hard times. The Denver professor argues for dear land neither wisely nor well, but fallaciously enough to induce the forestallers of land in Colorado to publish what he writes in order to humbug the monopoly-ridden people of Colorado into voting for dear land. When dear air and dear sunlight are good things for anybody but their owners, dear land will be a boon. But never before, and let the voters of Colorado mark it well.

If it were not for our tolerant disposition a good many people that we know would lose our friendship.—Puck.

STRIKE BREAKERS AND STRIKE MAKERS.

A new business has sprung up under the pressure of that thickening conflict between labor and monopoly, which is so often miscalled the "conflict between labor and capital." It is the business of supplying "strike breakers."

To illustrate the character and scope of this detestable occupation we quote from the advertising card of a New York detective agency which has embarked in it, evidently on a large scale:

Special.—We are prepared to furnish strike breakers, men to take the place of strikers, in every capacity from messenger boys to locomotive engineers on reasonable notice. This includes machinists, boiler makers, blacksmiths, carpenters, conductors and brakemen for steam roads, conductors and motormen for trolley roads, etc., etc.

If labor were in great demand how could "strike breakers" be so easily secured. If there were real prosperity they would be better employed. That they can be secured, however, does not depend upon the unconfirmed advertisement of a detective agency. It is demonstrated by actual experience. A large squad of "strike breakers" was recently taken by a Chicago detective agency a distance of 1,000 miles from Chicago to New Orleans to break a street car strike.

Rioting resulted, of course. So long as human nature is what it is, such things will cause violent outbreaks. If you dispute it, put yourself for a moment in the place of the New Orleans strikers. You have your home in that city. Your family is dependent upon your wages. Your wages are low and your hours are long. You solicit of your corporate employer a consideration of your condition, asking for a few pennies more in wages and a few minutes less in working time. Your solicitations are ignored. Then you do the only thing you can do, unless you merely keep on at your work, with its exhausting hours and shabby pay; you join with your associates in a peaceable strike. While this is in progress a group of strange men, imported from a thousand miles away, come into your city, in charge of a private

detective. They do not come to settle among you as neighbors. They do not come to cast in their lot with the citizens of the city where your humble home is established. They come as aliens, as enemies, as professional "strike breakers," and their coming means the loss of your home as the alternative of continuing in the slavish dependence for a negligently livelihood upon the soulless body corporate for which you work.

Perhaps you wouldn't heave a brick at the interlopers. But have you ever been put to a similar test and withstood the temptation?

If it were true that strikers wantonly prevent their fellow citizens who are nonunion men from working, something might be said for the "strike breaking" business. But it is not true. When they do interfere in this way it is not wantonly, but as part of a struggle between two sets of men, each wanting the same scarce jobs and each needing them in order to live and rear their families. One set is meekly willing to suffer greater impoverishment to get them, while the other adopts the more strenuous policy of fighting for them.

"We are contending," protested the president of the Erie railroad, referring to the anthracite coal strike, "for the right of the American citizen to work without regard to creed, nationality, or association," and he went on to declare that it is a crime to prevent this.

Is that liberty loving gentleman quite sure that he was not talking just for buncombe? Didn't he really mean that he and his monopoly associates were contending for power to control the American citizen's right to work? And isn't that what his sympathizers wished to see?

For instance, the anthracite coal area of Pennsylvania is very extensive. Only a small part of it is open for mining. The rest is kept closed by so-called owners.

If their privileges of monopolizing natural resources were abolished, American citizens, "regardless of creed, nationality or association," could voluntarily exercise their right to work by working there. Nor would capital be lacking to open and

operate these coal deposits, though it is lacking to buy permission to do so.

But what would the president of the Erie road and his sympathizers say to a proposition to secure to the American citizen the right to work, by giving him access to the monopolized natural coal deposits? Would they say it is a crime to prevent it?

If they would, then the virtue of sincerity may be attributed to the sentiment he expressed when denouncing the miners' union for interfering with the right to work. If they would not, then the liberty loving sentiment which he expressed and his sympathizers profess to admire is a good doctrine in a bad cause, quoted merely because it happens momentarily to serve a selfish purpose. The devil often quotes Scripture in that spirit.

There would be no interference by labor unions with the right to work, if men like this railroad president and his sympathizers did not systematically restrict the right to work by forestalling and monopolizing natural opportunities for work. There would be no excuse for "strike breakers" if land monopolists were not such effective strike makers.

ARTHUR H. STEPHENSON AND JOHN H. MOORE.

The recent death of these two men, both unknown to that larger world which buzzes away with its sensations and follies, but in their respective parts of the country prominent figures among thoughtful people, adds to the roll of those who have responded to Henry George's "clarion call" and like himself have passed away almost before the opening of the battle he planned.

Widely separated by distance and unknown to each other, Mr. Stephenson in Philadelphia and Mr. Moore in Texas had for nearly two decades, each in his own way and among his own people, devoted themselves to the popularizing of George's theory of social regeneration. Either might have been a plutocrat in his social ideals and political affiliations without exciting special wonder. For both were, by comparison at any rate, favorites of

fortune. Yet each turned away from the temptations of personal "success" to work for the general good.

Mr. Moore was the son of a wealthy slaveowner, once chief justice of Texas. His own opportunities in the conventional Democracy of a generation ago were good enough to advance him, while still a young man, from a seat in the Texas legislature to the post of secretary of state. But personal advantages lost their importance to him when George's voice awoke the sterling democracy of his nature; and in the fullness of health and at the height of a promising public career he embraced the then unpopular cause.

The circumstances of Mr. Stephenson's choice of a life were not much different. It was a brilliant commercial career that opened before him, and which, without being undiligent in business, he subordinated to the higher calling to which "Progress and Poverty" invited him. He was among the very first to respond to George's call. Throughout the rest of his life he never wavered with reference either to the moral principles involved or the economic adjustments proposed, nor hesitated in the work for their realization.

Both were men of reasonable financial means, of about the same age, of great natural abilities, and of excellent educational acquirements. In business the one was successful in spite of his practical and effective devotion to a moral ideal. The other, had his health not suddenly failed him, would doubtless have risen to political leadership while impressing that ideal upon the common sentiment of his State. They were types of men whom it is a satisfaction to contemplate in times when the spirit of money-making has become an obsession and spectacular examples of mere success are held up to the young for emulation.

ANGER.

The tendency of a good deal of modern writing and preaching is to discredit anger of all degrees and kinds. We might mention certain much-read periodicals and books that savor of a constant peaches-and-cream sweetness. They would criticize the devil himself with gentle-

ness and forbearance. Their cue seems to be to assume an air of judicial superiority which forbids them ever to be angry or even indignant.

The philosophy of these superior people seems to rest in the idea that "all's well with the world," warping Browning's saying out of its true interpretation. We must believe that "all's well with the world," so far as God's laws are concerned; but to use the expression with the extended idea that man's acceptance of, and dealing with, God's laws are all well, is simply playing with words.

Another cause of this all-serene attitude probably lies in the surrender of the idea of an absolute standard of right and wrong. All right and wrong being merely relative, who can say that this or that course of action is right or wrong? And so, why condemn anything, without a large and exceptional "but"? If we cannot be sure that anything is evil, then of course we cannot "hate the thing that is evil."

Doubtless also some of this notion of the advisable suppression of all anger is due to a partial view of the words of Jesus. Some think of him as meek and lowly, and forget that he was more. No one ever showed more of genuine anger, or gave stronger expression to his passion. Can we imagine a more stinging epithet than to call a class of men "sons of snakes"? And yet this is the literal translation of words which Jesus in his anger—why should we shirk the word?—applied to certain men whom he saw in Jerusalem.

We have said this much merely for the purpose of introducing a quotation from the Rev. C. Ernest Smith, an Episcopal clergyman of Baltimore, who is reported by the Sun to have spoken as follows in a recent sermon:

"What is the need of anger? First, the whole man needs anger as part of his make-up, along with the sterner qualities of an inflexible will, aggressive courage and righteous indignation. Lacking these he is developed but on one side. Second, the world itself is poorer without it. Anger has its part to play. When a man sees some dastardly deed, it is his business to express his opinion in a clear, unmistakable manner. In doing so the very air is clearer and