

equality of rights for all, but privileges for a "chivalrous" few.

The recent revolutionary municipality decision of the supreme court of Ohio (p. 201) has produced a picturesque political situation in that state. For many years Republican legislatures have been making special municipal charters and regulations under a constitution which expressly forbids it, going even to the extent of distinguishing for legislative purposes between cities differing in no respect whatever except that at the previous census one of them had a larger population than the other by 18 or 20 inhabitants. In this way Cincinnati, normally a Democratic city, has been put under the government of state boards which has resulted in its being ruled by a Republican boss, Boss Cox, who dispenses the local patronage of the state. Cleveland, on the other hand, having always been a Republican city, was allowed to have an excellent system of home rule government, known as the federal plan, under which the heads of departments are directly responsible to the mayor and the mayor is directly responsible to the people. Yet the only municipal difference between these two cities is that Cincinnati once had the larger population. Cleveland has been the larger for some time, having outstripped Cincinnati in population, but the difference in forms of government were perpetuated. When Cleveland elected Tom L. Johnson as mayor, and Johnson began to work for the people instead of the monopoly corporations, the local Republican machine bethought itself that a state board government like that of Cincinnati was what Cleveland needed. So Mr. Hanna's attorney general saw his way clear to bringing an ouster suit. The plan was to "knock out" the Johnson administration by knocking out the federal plan, and then to put Cleveland under the control of Boss Hanna as Cincinnati was already under that of Boss Cox. Meanwhile, the Republican legislature, at the be-

hest of a Toledo ring of Republicans who could not "use" Mayor Jones, had abolished the Toledo police board and authorized the governor to appoint a state police board for Toledo—all under a constitution which forbids special legislation for municipalities. The object, of course, was to sidetrack Mayor Jones, and the voters who had elected him by a vast majority, by establishing a Toledo boss, to correspond with Boss Hanna of Cleveland and Boss Cox of Cincinnati. But the non-resistant Jones, saying he would ne'er resist, resisted. He sturdily refused to surrender to the state board, and that expectant body brought suit to compel him to. This suit came before the supreme court along with the Cleveland suit, and in disposing of the two the court took up the whole subject of special legislation for municipalities, rendering decisions upon principles which cut the roots of all the municipal legislation of the state for half a century. These decisions sustained Mayor Jones in Toledo on the ground that the new police legislation was special legislation; and on the same ground it declared the whole Cleveland charter invalid. Had the Cincinnati or Columbus charter been before the court it would have fared in the same way, and proceedings attacking these charters have since been set in motion. Mr. Hanna's fool friends in Cleveland and Toledo had jumped for the Cleveland and Toledo preserve jars and pulled down with a crash all the preserve jars on the pantry shelf.

Mr. Hanna's party in Ohio is consequently in great tribulation. Gov. Nash must call a special session of the legislature, in the midst of the state campaign, to enact a general municipal code. There is no escape from it, for the stay of proceedings ordered by the court when its decisions were rendered, expires early in October. But this is not the worst of the matter. The attempt to enact a general code promises to plunge all the local Republican rings of Ohio, with their

varying interests, into a Kilkenny-cat fight, from which the grand old party is likely to suffer. Nor is even that the worst. A code might be whipped through the legislature which would suit Boss Hanna of Cleveland and Boss Cox of Cincinnati—a code, that is, which would put all the cities of the state under the rule of state boards appointed by the Republican governor, and which would also protect the monopoly corporations from equitable taxation and other impertinent meddlings. The governor has gone so far in this direction as to engage two of the most notorious corporation lawyers of the state, one of them Mr. Hanna's personal legal adviser, to outline a code. That their work will be as nearly ideal as possible, from the point of view of corporation and boss government, goes without saying. But then comes the rub. If such a municipal code were passed by a Republican legislature, the party could hardly weather the political gale that would set in in Ohio, and in all probability Mayor Johnson would be promoted by the people of the state and called upon as governor to administer the very state board system which had been cooked up for the Republican ring. That would be bad, but there would be worse to come. Johnson's sincerity is becoming a recognized factor, and the Republican ring knows that he would use his power at once to repeal the plutocratic municipal code and put in its place a more radical home rule system than any for which he could possibly hope to get popular endorsement now. The situation is both picturesque and encouraging.

#### HISTORICAL EVOLUTION.

In the May number of the American Journal of Sociology Louis Wallis presented an advance outline of his forthcoming work, "The Capitalization of Social Development."

His conclusion is in harmony with the practical proposal of Henry George; though he arrives at this judgment by inductive or "scientific" methods, instead of the a priori

method adopted by George. In fact, George uses both methods, saying on page 327 of *Progress and Poverty* (Doubleday & McClure edition): "Deduction and induction have brought us to the same truth—that the unequal ownership of land necessitates the unequal distribution of wealth." But inductionists are apt to regard his method as wholly deductive.

Mr. Wallis attempts to trace the past movements of society, within prehistoric as well as historic times, and from "facts" so derived would indicate the next move—which is the above practical proposal, namely, the absorption of ground rent by taxation.

According to this writer the institution of slavery was society's first definite step in the upward march of civilization. He tells us that in prehistoric times man lived an animal life, scattered about in small groups, but gradually learned to make rude tools, to save seed for planting, etc. "These early steps in material progress changed the direction of forces hitherto operating among men." That is, instead of killing, and maybe eating, captives taken in war, their captors made them slaves, and put them at work utilizing these tools, and planting and cultivating these seeds, etc. It has come, therefore, to be "well understood by historical students, that ancient slavery was a great step in human progress."

Now, one who is not "scientific" would imagine that "the great step in human progress" was the discovery of the method of making those rude tools (suggesting, as it necessarily would, the possibility of better), and the discovery that the food supply could be increased and made more certain by saving and planting seeds, etc.—in short, increased knowledge on the part of men, whereby they could more fully utilize the resources of nature.

"Whatever its merits," continues Mr. Wallis, "the consideration of slavery introduces a much larger subject—the place of class relations in social development as a whole." For "along with the appearance of slavery came the rise of a ruling and owning class." Though this does not say so, it suggests that the ruling class

was incidental to slavery; yet, as matter of fact, some must assert authority over others before slavery is possible, unless we are to imagine free barbarians voluntarily entering upon a life of slavery—and even a "scientific" student of sociology will hardly do that.

A ruling class involves, of course, a ruled class, and the existence of these two classes constitutes, we are told, a social "cleavage." From this cleavage, as a "principal" agency, has come the vast industrial plant that society now enjoys, which is called "capital." For, the author says, "directly or indirectly, all social necessities resolve themselves into a demand for large material capital. This is furnished, neither from outside the borders of society nor by individuals in the conventional economic sense, but by a vast, unconscious cleavage within society itself." If we read aright, then, material capital "is furnished by an unconscious cleavage!"

Incidentally we are told that it "would save trouble if some social reformers would recognize that institutional injustice, uncrossed by deliberate human volition, is not immoral." This is no doubt good advice. We may even be positive about the matter when we remember that all slaves have been kept in servitude with no volition on the part of their masters; that Lord Scully involuntarily draws rents from occupiers of Illinois lands, etc., etc. This is truly "an ethic" that would save Rockefeller, Havemeyer and their ilk, and also their apologists, from much trouble.

But Mr. Wallis does not exclude economic facts and parallels. He says:

In its material aspect, property in men is an institution by means of which one class of people appropriates the labor products of another class without economic repayment. This relation is brought about by other institutions than slavery. For instance, if a class engross the lands of a country, and force the remainder of the population to pay rent, either in kind or in money, for the use of the soil, such a procedure issues, like slavery, in the absorption of labor products by an upper class, without economic repayment.

The change from slavery to the appropriation of ground rent is the

material aspect of the larger question of class relations above referred to—and according to the author the change is only in form, not in fact. Some men are robbed of the fruits of their toil by other men.

This is the result of a social cleavage, and is the cause of progress! "We have observed," the writer explains, "the origin of social cleavage into upper and lower strata, on this general basis, at the inception of social development. If we scrutinize the field carefully, it is evident that one of the greatest and most far-reaching facts of ancient civilization, as it emerges from the darkness of prehistoric times, as well as one of the most considerable facts of subsequent history, is just this cleavage of society into two principal classes. If the point is not apparent, let it be assumed." But it is perfectly apparent. It is the one thing that history makes undeniably clear. And almost any one of our modern monopolists could "give points" to the most ambitious of Oriental potentates in making that "cleavage" cleave. It was, indeed, a far-reaching fact. But so was the black death.

The next consideration is the historical fact that so-called groups of barbarians were gradually brought under one government, largely through conquest. Of course, the cleavage was thus accentuated. These communities "had struck out along the upward path of civilization; and, as the old life receded into the past, they were confronted, figuratively speaking, by a tremendous problem—or, perhaps better, by a number of problems with a common element." We are not sure the path was upward, but the problem, seems surely to have confronted them actually—not figuratively.

As these groups fused into larger aggregates they of necessity made provision for protection from hostile invasion, for food and water supply, for construction of roads, canals, etc., for exchange of products, for building temples of worship, and much besides. "All these and other necessities came into being as mankind rose above the levels of animality into advancing civilization." This seems another of those inverted statements to which sociological "sci-

entists" are addicted. Why isn't it true, not that these agencies came into being as mankind rose but that mankind rose as these agencies came into being? In another place Mr. Wallis adopts that view. "In the last analysis," he says, "they all resolve themselves into a general demand for large and increasing quantities of material tools, or capital. It may, indeed, be stated as a law that the integration of society rests upon a concomitant integration of wealth, of labor products, in the capitalistic form;" which is merely another way of saying that mankind rose as the various agencies before referred to came into being, and not the reverse as previously stated.

The point involved, seemingly, is that, if, as mankind improves, these various agencies are developed, it is a process of evolution. But, on the other hand, if men improved their condition as they learned to provide these agencies, there is merely an increase of knowledge—not evolution. A boy learning to make a whistle from a twig in which the sap has commenced to flow could hardly be cited as an instance of evolution at work—unless, indeed, we give the word two meanings.

The author next proceeds to tell us that: "Social cleavage into upper and lower strata has effected the capitalization of social development." Just what Mr. Wallis means by "the capitalization of social development" is difficult of determination. According to George, social development is capitalized in the value of land. Whether true or not, that proposition can easily be understood. If true, why not adopt it? If not true then what is social development capitalized in? Mr. Wallis does not say.

The least cloudy statement we get from Mr. Wallis on this matter is to the effect that around us in modern society there is a huge industrial plant technically known as capital, consisting of factory buildings, tools and appliances, agricultural and mining implements, railroad appliances, steamboats, business and dwelling houses, etc., etc. This huge industrial plant technically known as capital "has all been produced by the aid of earlier capital, which, in turn, rested back upon still earlier, and so on."

It [capital] has "been reserved out of labor products, thrown over from generation to generation." This seems to convey the notion that social development is capitalized in actual capital, which is precisely the contention of the socialists. It is one of the elementary differences between them and George. Whereas they hold that social development is capitalized in land and capital, laying stress upon capital and hardly considering land at all, George holds that it is capitalized in the value of land alone. In the last quotation, Mr. Wallis has asserted the principle of the wage fund theory, and elsewhere in his article he has indirectly affirmed the Malthusian doctrine. If he clings to these antiques, he "would save trouble" by directly meeting the arguments of George on those questions.

But if indirect in support of Malthus, Mr. Wallis is definite on these points:

That "social cleavage, based first on slavery," but "in modern times computed into land rents," is the principal agency in accounting for capital.

That "stability was organized out of barbarism by the forces of social cleavage."

That "social development depends upon the industry of material things."

That "the practical work of social development has been accomplished by the use of huge masses of lower-class products"—these masses of products being "appropriated" by the upper class.

But will these assertions stand?

Mr. Wallis tells us that in prehistoric times men had learned to make some tools, to plant seeds, etc. No one knows how much more they would have learned and performed, had they been left in their original freedom. Prof. Thorstein Veblen, of the Chicago University, is authority for the statement that before the time of the warring barbarians, of whom Mr. Wallis speaks, there was undoubtedly an era when the world was at peace. But now appears a ruling class and slavery, together with stability, a sort of Roman peace; and in this connection Mr. Wallis makes the fatal confession that "social development depends upon the industry of material things," which is an appeal to neither slavery, classes nor capital, but to the force

noted as existing in the prehistoric time of rude tools—namely human labor. And as if to emphasize this view, he tells us that "the practical work of social development has been accomplished by the use of huge masses of lower class products,"—the upper classes having stolen the same. Industry, then, and not capital, is the basis of material social development.

"Society disintegrate without capital"! Nonsense. Destroy all the capital in the world, leaving the knowledge of how it is produced, and almost as soon as Chicago was rebuilt it would be replaced. It is knowledge, not capital, that is "thrown over from generation to generation."

Mr. Wallis's practical proposal, though in harmony with George's, rests, of course, upon the "scientific" interpretation of history. The institution of slavery supplanted barbarism, operating to vastly extend industry; social stability made extended commerce possible; and ultimately slavery was commuted into competitive land rents. Under this arrangement, industry has enormously enlarged. But now, as industry and capital bear the burdens of these land rents, and also the burdens of government, it is evident that capital will be more effectively invested, if one of these burdens be removed—which is plainly possible by adjusting taxation so as to absorb land rent, as George proposed.

The fatal mistake of all this lies in the supposition that these historical moves were made in the interest of capital, and in the failure to perceive that the proposed move is not analogous to those quoted from history. When slavery was instituted, a ruling class—that is, an aristocracy—was, of course, the cause. When slavery was changed to land rent, the aristocracy was unharmed, provided it got the rent. Now Mr. Wallis proposes, as did George, that the state take the rent. The effect of all the preceding moves was to establish and maintain an aristocracy, and George knew that here was something which must be met and resisted in future with all the power civilization could exert. But Mr. Wallis has taken us through a historical essay to determine