

which found his cause *in extremis*, invested in bold Rhode Island bribery the cash necessary to his salvation, and took out of the transaction a tariff advance which made them perhaps a million for every thousand they put in. This did not require ability on their part or on his. It merely required the coexistence of a disgraceful State, an ambitious candidate for the Senate, and a corrupt and corrupting trust. The ability necessary to the transaction could have been furnished by Hinky Dink or Bathouse John.

And here is where Aldrich is overestimated—his low cunning is taken for commanding intellect. Not that he hasn't ability, but that he has far more low cunning of the Hinky Dink sort. In his Senatorial career I have never seen him display any more ability than any clear-thinking member of a city council in a town of 50,000 might be expected to show. If he wants the vote of a Senator from Louisiana, the button that leads to the Sugar Trust is pressed. If he wants a man from Georgia, the railway-combine button is pressed. And it has taken no great ability to install this system of push buttons. The stupid George III had almost as good a one to the rotten boroughs of his day.

Do you see my point? The thing required is ruthlessness—which Aldrich has; clear common sense—which Aldrich has; moral depravity—which Aldrich has; and a bomb-proof emplacement for the tool—which Aldrich has. It needs the Hinky Dink order of intelligence—that is all.

Aldrich may be the greatest tariff expert in the country, but his handling of himself in the last tariff debates showed him merely full of the sort of expert knowledge which a tool would have—an immense amount of cooked-up, *ex parte* information. Often his failure to answer the arguments of his opponents would have been ruinous—if the debates had been addressed to the intelligence or conscience of the Senate. Time after time Aldrich turned pale and trembled under the attacks of the Insurgents; and time after time he left the Senate floor, whipped. But the power of which he is the tool was never whipped.

As in the tariff, so in his work for currency revolution, Aldrich is the tool and not the power. Still Rhode Island's rotten-borough condition, freeing him, as it does, from the pressure of public opinion, makes him the perfect tool. So he goes forth to win for that power more power. The thing which will tax his ability is getting the votes in spite of public opinion, and not the financial plan—that is easy. All that is necessary for that is to take the British, French and German systems, and "edit" out of them their subjection to government. The power back of Aldrich will by the same stroke of the pen be "edited" in. Any good committee of currency specialism could accomplish this in a few days.

But getting the votes is a different matter. And in getting the votes Mr. Aldrich's ability will be

exercised, not along the intellectual lines of Hamilton, Pitt or Webster, or even of Thad Stevens, but along the devious lines of Hinky Dink. In his Western trip, Mr. Aldrich never gave forth a single syllable of illumination on the subject of a central bank of issue. He went feeling about like a ward wire-puller, shedding darkness and subtracting from the sum total of human knowledge.

BOOKS

LAND NATIONALIZATION AND INTEREST.

The Economic and Social Problem. By Michael Flurscheim. Published by Jefferson Publishing Company, Xenia, Clay County, Illinois.

This book is a very earnest plea for a better world than the one in which we now live. Whether it will have great effect in the direction evidently intended by the author is doubtful, for while it contains much interesting data, it also abounds in hasty conclusions and rather rash assertions, as well as unmerited flings at some who would receive his contribution in a spirit of friendliness.

Land nationalization and the abolition of interest are the ends to be attained.

To achieve these results all other matters are subsidiary, if not objectionable. Socialism and the Single Tax are quite as much in the way as is monopoly and the rest. Meanwhile the referendum and the initiative, especially the referendum, are desirable. And the final outcome may be Socialism after all—particularly in the United States. But the Single Tax is all wrong because, among other reasons, Single Taxers "are wedded to special methods, which can never be successful."

The "special methods" seem to be the holding of such economic heresies as "free trade," "sacredness of property and full play to individual effort," "the professed belief that most landowners will voluntarily consent to the imposition of the single tax," "the notion that wages and interest rise and fall together," etc., etc.

Incidentally, in one paragraph, the value of land is attributed to three different sources: "What produces most of the land's value is not the improvements made by the landowner, but those made by others outside of his land;" "the main value of both improved and unimproved land would be created by the neighborhood of millions of men and women who need this land as a place of work and residence;" "what gives to land most of its value is not the labor of its owner, but that of all humanity, since untold ages." Of course the actual or potential need of men and women to use gives value to land—nothing else. But the

third reason suggests that land values are made by the dead hand, opposition to which notion quite likely constitutes another heresy.

Instances are given in which wealthy men have driven the people off from land in Scotland to make room for deer parks, and inquiry is made as to what under the Single Tax would prevent the Rothschilds and a few other millionaires "turning Great Britain into a deer park," as Rockefeller and Carnegie have an income of "12 or 15 million pounds each." The Rothschild families have more, "and without going any further, we have already obtained one-quarter of the yearly tax required." This is on the basis of valuing Great Britain at 200 million pounds per year. Lloyd George may be saved the expense of ascertaining the worth of British land. And then, "How long would there be a rental value of 200 million pounds in a depopulated England, in that magnificent new deer park?"

Besides, the author does not quite agree with Single Taxers that taxes levied on land holders cannot be shifted over to the tenant in higher rent, for—

If a tenant pays \$300 rent and \$50 taxes and you make the landlord pay the \$50 taxes, will not the rent at once rise to \$350?

This is entirely in agreement with Henry George's own teachings, according to which all progress in the last resort increases the landlord's rental income. Now, the Single Tax would certainly mark a great progress over our existing system of taxation, and thus would increase purchasing and rent paying power all round, which according to George's own theory, raises rent proportionately. If this is not shifting, what is?

Rents would rise in exact proportion with the economized taxes, if it were not for the land kept out of use by speculation which is offered cheaper in consequence of the higher tax. However, we must not count too much on this element of the calculation; because once the landowners got over the loss caused by the imposition of the Single Tax, they would find an ample compensation for holding land out of use, in the increase of rents, and consequently of land values, as they do now. Of course the new increase of rents might be taxed away, too, the proceeds being used for public improvements; but these, too, have a rent raising effect; thus rent would continually race ahead of the Single Tax.

Having thus demolished the proposal made by Henry George, the author reminds American Single Taxers that "they want to make the land value tax the sole tax; and a tax productive enough to permit the abolition of all other taxes; which practically means a confiscation of the rental value of the land, the basis of its selling value. They thus leave the domain of tax reform to enter that of robbery, pure and simple; and in this way they have become the worst enemies land restoration ever had."

The author now proposes to achieve land nationalization by following the plan adopted in Ire-

land—save that the state would be the purchaser, not the tenant. Land is presumed to be capitalized at 5 per cent and the state is supposed to be able to borrow money at 3 per cent. The difference of 2 per cent would enable the state to pay for the land in time—but as the value of land will rise, increasing public income from rent, and as interest rates will fall, the time will be much less than if we depended on the above 2 per cent margin alone. Thus we could get the land without robbery, and the land being leased to occupiers, the rent would flow to the state.

Under this plan we are assured that if a capitalist should "offer a million pounds a year for a certain county in Scotland, whereas fifty thousand poor crofters could afford only £10 each . . . the crofters would be allowed to continue raising oats and hearty men and women; . . . the capitalist would have to look elsewhere for partridge coverts."

Regarding interest we read: "If I have \$100 worth of goods of any description, with which I can purchase a piece of land, bringing \$5 worth of rental income, I should certainly be foolish if I lent this \$100 in money or goods of any kind to anybody unless he paid me at least \$5 a year for the privilege of getting the use of my capital during that time. . . . Thus *rent*, though appearing in the shape of interest on land values, *became the mother and justificator of interest* on all other market values." Not however, the only parent, for, "an unelastic money is the father of interest."

Having placed rent, the mother, in possession of the state, the author proceeds to get rid of an unelastic money, the father, by the following means, quoting Arthur I. Fonda, of Denver, Colo.: "Let a commission be appointed by Congress to select a sufficient number of commodities, say one hundred, to be used as a standard of value," articles most largely bought and sold, not excluding some foreign products, to be selected. "With the aid of statisticians, the average price of each of the commodities selected, in their principal markets for a few years past, should be ascertained and tabulated. . . . The length of time over which the average of prices should extend would be determined as closely as possible by the average length of time that existing indebtedness had run." Also "the approximate amount or value annually consumed in this country (of each commodity) should be ascertained."

From those facts the average amount one dollar would purchase of each commodity is to be learned. Thereupon Congress is to retire existing money, substituting a new paper currency, which is to be legal tender (save as to contracts payable in gold). This new currency is to be a promise to pay a definite value, not in any particular article—as gold. It would be redeemable in any commodity at its market value.

The value or stability of this new money is to

be maintained by increasing the amount in circulation if the average purchasing power of the dollar rises, and by decreasing the amount in circulation if the purchasing power falls—so that the purchasing power of the dollar, as to the average of the one hundred commodities, will remain constant.

This currency is elastic—increasing in volume when needed, decreasing when the need has passed. Any attempt to corner money would of course be met with further issues, and so the attempted corner fail of its purpose—although the plan has a tendency to set one to dreaming of possibilities.

Mr. Flurschheim then develops his notions of co-operation, and expresses the belief that while the state may not do well at manufacturing, farming, etc., it could do the work of merchants (that is, distributors, in that sense). He calls attention to the retail tobacco trade carried on by France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Spain, Roumania and Japan—monopolized of course. He thinks it hard to see "why ten postoffices in one little town would be more wasteful than are the ten or even twenty groceries which now do a business that one could efficiently attend to."

After complimenting the state as a distributor, in comparison with the many little concerns, the author calls attention to the tobacco trust, which he says, "improved things in this respect." That raises a very strong suspicion that Mr. Flurschheim is not a smoker.

The private appropriation of rent being stopped, money monopoly destroyed, and co-operation developed, the author holds that production would be so enormous that capital would be constrained to pay as much for maintenance as it could receive as interest. In short, interest would disappear.

So long as the simple laws of economic science, which deals with land and commodities as related to human beings, are not understood, it is hardly to be hoped that the subtleties of finance will be grasped, or the difficulties of co-operation be overcome.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—An Interview. By Daniel W. Church, Chicago: The Berlin Carey Company.

—Bygone Days in Chicago. By Frederick Francis Cook. Published by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago. 1910. Price, \$2.75 net.

—Latter Day Sinners and Saints. By Edward Alsworth Ross. Published by B. W. Huebsch, New York. 1910. Price, 50 cents net.

—The Beast. By Judge Ben B. Lindsey and Harvey J. O'Higgins. Published by Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. 1910. Price \$1.50 net.

—The Politician. By Edith Huntington Mason,

author of "The Real Agatha." illustrated in full colors by the Kinneys. Chicago. A. C. McClurg & Co. 1910. Price, \$1.50.

PAMPHLETS

Big Business in Politics.

What one business man favorably situated and stimulated by honest impulses can do towards purifying politics of its most poisonous poison, is told, with all the interest of a personal experience intensely described, by Lynn Haines in his true story (Minneapolis) of "The Property Power in Politics." George S. Loftus is its hero.

+ +

Training for Social Workers.

The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, of which Graham Taylor is President and Julia C. Lathrop Vice-President, has just sent out its prospectus for this spring and summer. Its list of lecturers includes a number of eminent social workers and the description of courses is most attractive. Courses on "The Public Care of Children," on "Social Extension of Civic Functions," on "Occupations for Attendants and Nurses in Institutions for the Insane" or on "Municipal Co-operation of a City Population" given by men and women of recognized authority in their subjects and combined with the opportunities of an endowed "Department of Social Investigation" in a big city, must be of truly great value. (The address of the school is 35 Dearborn St.)

A. L. G.

PERIODICALS

The Cosmopolitan Student (Madison, Wis.), the official organ of the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs (p. 189), has issued its first two numbers, March and April. Articles on The Peace Movement, The Cosmopolitan Movement in Europe, and personal reports of progress from the various clubs in the United States, with their authors' foreign signatures, somehow lend a brightly reality to the well-chosen motto on the cover, "Above All Nations is Humanity."

A. L. G.

+ +

In the Open Court for April is an editorial in favor of "Woman Suffrage and Ballot Reform," which is a model of what such an article ought not to be. The arguments mentioned for women's suffrage are of the same calibre—just as trivial and undemocratic—as the usual pleas against suffrage. And as for ballot reform—any man who writes that "it might be advisable to give an extra ballot to the educated man, say to every one who has graduated from High School," and "that the tax-payer who finally pays the public expenses should be heard and that his vote should have more weight than the numerous voters of the irresponsible class is but just"—any such advocate of aristocracy, moneyed or educated, would by a democratic woman be preferred for foe instead of friend to women's suffrage. It is time