

labor will be larger and more sustained, and more capable of insuring itself against fluctuation.

The wisest course is to attack these bad conditions boldly and fearlessly, to abolish them, or, if we can not do that, to modify them; deal rigorously with vested interests and monopolies which cause public injury or stand in the way of improvement; enlarge the powers of local authorities, readjust our taxing system, and so alter our land laws as to increase the supply of houses and of available land in town and country alike; equalize burdens local as well as imperial; give—as far as laws and customs can give it—give a chance to every man.

Give every man a chance; those are the lines of progress and development. It is along those lines that lies the path of prosperity, happiness and strength. There lies the true wisdom, and not false, sham wisdom; true patriotism, and not tinsel patriotism; true imperialism, and not treacherous imperialism.

### THE CLOSED SHOP.

Fred J. Miller of East Orange, N. J., in the New York Evening Post.

The statements put forward by and on behalf of the anthracite coal-mine operators—which are the anthracite coal roads and which again compose the anthracite coal monopoly—to the effect that they stand unalterably opposed to the closed-shop idea sound very well but will not bear examination. Whether they oppose or favor the closed-shop idea depends entirely upon whose closed shop it is. Undoubtedly they oppose the miners' closed shop, but how about the closed shop they themselves maintain? It is a matter of common knowledge, and no longer denied, that the coal roads own and control over 90 per cent of the anthracite coal lands and mines; that they allow only so much coal to be produced in any given period of time as they think will best serve their purpose of getting out of coal consumers the last penny possible to be extracted from them; that the State of Pennsylvania helps them to maintain this monopoly by assessing their unused coal lands at a nominal valuation as "unproductive farm lands"; that at meetings held periodically in New York the representatives of this trust get together and decide how much anthracite coal shall be mined and brought to market during the period under consideration and what proportion of the total each road shall be allowed to bring in; that here in the Oranges—and I suppose the same conditions prevail elsewhere—there is a retail coal dealers' association, and that unless a retailer belongs to this association he will not be able to buy anthracite coal ("it has all been contracted for by the association"), and finally that if one who proposes to engage in the business applies for membership in this association he is informed that "the membership is filled, there are no vacancies." If this is not the closed shop then what is it?

The retail coal dealer in this section is no more at liberty to exercise his own judgment as to what he will do or what he will not do in the conduct of his own business than is the individual union printer free to decide what he will or will not do with respect to wages, hours of labor, etc. The terms upon which he sells coal are dictated to him by the association to which he belongs, and that association is dominated and controlled by the anthracite Trust. In view of these facts of common knowledge, is it true that the "mine operators" are opposed to the closed shop? Is it not clear that whether they are opposed or in favor depends entirely upon which closed shop you talk about, theirs or the miners'?

I do not say that the operators ought to cease opposing the closed-shop idea, for I believe that idea is fundamentally wrong, but I do most emphatically believe that those who support the coal operators in their contention against the closed shop of the miners ought never to cease calling attention to the fact that the operators themselves maintain a closed shop which is at least equally wrong in principle and far more to be feared, not only on account of its effect upon our pocketbooks and upon the manner of life of our poorer people, but also because of its effect upon our legislatures and our public life generally. Closed shops are wrong because they are monopolies; but those who oppose them must, to be consistent and to escape the charge of being insincere, oppose all other monopolies, including that of the coal mines and the coal-carrying roads.

### REAL-ESTATE REFORM IN EUROPE

From The Review of Reviews for March, 1905.

Socialism and capitalism will be reconciled only when land monopoly has been abolished. This is the opinion of Mr. Johan Hanson, a Swedish economist. Writing in the Social Tidskrift (Stockholm), Mr. Hanson reviews the land-ownership situation in both Europe and America.

As early as the middle of the eighteenth century, this writer reminds us, there were those who foresaw the evil results of private ownership of land. It was not until 1880, however, that an American, Henry George, first brought the problem of land-ownership forcibly to public notice. Mr. George's ideas have, in general, been accepted by real estate reformers. The practical application is the only point at which the views diverge.

After discussing the single tax theory as held in the United States, and complimenting Mayor "Tom" Johnson, of Cleveland, as the American Tolstoy, the Swedish economist turns to Canada. He says:

In Manitoba, farming land has been rented successfully on a system based on the principles of Henry George, which should dispel any doubts as to their advantages. The Single Tax Association of Toronto, where enormous rents prevailed, has also won a victory. Their programme, higher taxes on the value of property and less on the buildings, conquered at the last elections, in spite of the opposition of the authorities. In Australia and New Zealand the movement for real estate reform is making great strides of progress, because laboring men are less prejudiced by the socialists than in Europe. The single-tax associations are better organized than those in America.

Mr. Hanson asserts that British real estate taxation is the "most abnormal in the world."

In spite of reforms during the last decade, practical results are yet to be expected, though probably near at hand. There are two reform associations,—the Land Nationalization Society and the League for the Taxation of Land Values. Under the leadership of Dr. A. R. Wallace, the former organization contends for the appropriation of private land by degrees, its organ being Land and Labor, of London. The latter organization advocates the Henry George system. The organ for single tax is the Land Values, of London and Glasgow.

In Germany, real estate reformers have organized the Bund der Deutschen Bodenreformer.

For thirty years German writers have contended for the same principles as are advocated to-day. In 1872, the physician, Dr. Th. Stamm, issued a work in which almost the same views as those of Henry George were held forth. The present association was founded in 1888, and for some time advocated the principles of Henry George with a radical platform. Yet single tax, as well as the nationalization principle, met with insurmountable obstacles in Germany, and the above association was therefore reorganized in 1898. The platform, briefly summarized, states that land shall be controlled so that the

abuses of private exploitation are excluded, and that the increase of the value of property to the private individual shall be for the benefit of the community, the latter to be obtained by special taxation. In Prussia these reforms have already passed legislation, and the endeavor of the Bund is therefore directed to the application of the reform. It is the well-known writer, Adolf Damaschke, the editor of the organ, *Deutsche Volksstimme*, who deserves much praise for his energetic leadership and the speedy development of the German organization. It now includes two hundred thousand members, among whom are a great number of prominent politicians and men of science. Since last year a scientific monthly, the *Jahrbuch für Bodenreform* (Jena), has added to the significance of the reform in Germany, where private exploitation in real estate, particularly around the larger cities, is almost impossible.

In Denmark the reformers are organized in the Danish Henry George Association. The question is vigorously discussed in word and writing, and the new Liberal government seems to be in favor of the movement. In Sweden there are signs that the real estate question will soon become a public issue. The large domains of the country need legal protection. An organization is also under formation the purpose of which will be to open up the land and its riches to the people and control private exploitation.

\* \* \*

## THE TRUE DEMOCRACY.

An Extract from a Sermon by the Rev. C. Lemont Hay,  
Pastor of First Methodist Episcopal Church  
of Maywood, Ill.

The term "democracy" is used in a double sense, (1) in an applied and arbitrary sense as the name of a great political party, and (2) in the original and proper sense as describing the kingship of the people.

In political philosophy there is a doctrine known as "the divine right of kings." It was probably of very ancient origin, and became systematically formulated and advocated by the Stuarts in England. It has come to mean the God-given right of an individual or of a family to rule over others, and to maintain the position and title against all comers. This is one of the fundamental ideas of hereditary monarchy, and was in practical effect long before formulated and taught.

Opposed to this is the idea of democracy, or the kingship of the people, and of government only by consent of the governed, and then in the interest of the governed. In their practical workings out the two theories are as wide apart as the poles, and the true nature of the difference may be seen in the difference between Russia and the United States.

Now you err grievously if you think you have secured democracy when you have established republican government. You mistake if you think we have a democracy in the United States. You mistake if you think we would have democracy with the establishment of the Democratic party in power. The political situation in the United States is this, that the old doctrine of the divine right of kings has been resurrected and rehabilitated, and is become now the doctrine of the divine right of a ruling class, of one party or class to rule the rest of the commonwealth. Each party thinks it possesses that right, and the party in power feels that God has vindicated that right.

Now the history of political life is this: For power and influence to concentrate in the hands of the few; for that power to become corrupt to the point of intolerability; for "demos" to arise, enthrone himself and secure his rights; for "demos" gradually to become enslaved again by the same elements that he dethroned; for the same corrupt situation again to recur, and for the same process of cleansing

again to be gone through with; and this series of events may be repeated indefinitely through history.

I will venture a political prophesy concerning the United States: There will always be two great political parties in this country, one representing the moneyed interests or the minority, and the other representing the common people, or the majority. That does not mean that the interest of the majority always prevails, for often a majority of voters enthrones that individual or that party that works for the interest of the few. In the present situation, as popularly regarded, the Republican party stands as the representative of the financial interests of the country, and the Democratic party, and more latterly the Socialist party, poses as the champion of the common people. (And you will notice that the Republican party during the later history of the country has been almost continuously in power.) And I prophesy further that, if the Democratic party or the Socialist party should come to power for any long continued period, the conditions would ultimately be reversed, and the party out of power would become the exponent of the masses and the party in power the representative of the "interests." For mark you this, that so colossal have become the corporate and financial interests of this country that they will not remain long connected with a party out of power, but will affiliate themselves with the party in power, and, having done so, will seize the reins of government, and will shape its policies to suit their own ends. And the moral of it all would be this: Let every voter constantly examine current political policies and tendencies; let him always vote to enthrone "demos"; and let him be prepared to change his party jacket as often as the interests of "demos," or the people, may demand.

\* \* \*

## WHY THE LADY STOOD UP.

"Young man," said a gray-haired and tired-looking old lady who was standing up on a crowded street car to a gentleman who was seated, "would you mind getting up and giving me your seat? I have been hard at work all day, and am so weary it seems as if I could not stand up another minute."

"Madam," the gentleman replied, "I would have offered you my seat long ago; but the last time I saw you, you said that you would rather stand up on a street car than to sit down, no matter how weary you might be."

"I do not recollect," said the lady, with manifest rising indignation, "ever saying that I liked to stand up on a street car."

"It is strange you do not remember it," replied the gentleman. "It was a week ago this evening, at the rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association; a debate between a member of that association and a member of the Economic Educational League. Three judges had been previously selected; one by the Y. M. C. A., one by the E. E. L., and these two selected a third. As you are a woman of prominence in literary circles, and of presumably good judgment, these two judges selected you as the third."

"You remember the arguments adduced by the representative of the Economic Educational League. He began by referring to the capitalistic means of conveyance by which most of those present had come there—the street cars; to the fact that the Capital Traction Company had, at the beginning of 1906, distributed among its stockholders a dividend of six per cent.—\$720,000; that this immense amount went to persons who had done nothing whatever to earn it."

"They had successfully managed the enterprise