



Class HX 86

Book .K5

Copyright N^o _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

248

A Socialist's Answer to The Catholic Progress.

Commenting on an editorial
in that paper of Nov. 4, 1904

By JOHN KINAN

HX86
, K5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
FEB 13 1905
Copyright Entry
Feb. 13, 1905
CLASS a X.C. No:
109057
COPY B.

27.1
5762

COPYRIGHT APPLIED FOR
BY
JOHN KINAN
1905

INTRODUCTION.

The writer of "A Socialist's Answer to the Catholic Progress" does not expect that this little book will revolutionize the world and its ideas of Socialism. He realizes that time and study, alone, can open the eyes of mankind as to what Socialism really means. He does think, however, that perhaps these ideas of his now brought to the light for the first time will bring Socialism, its aims and objects, and what it is opposed to, within the mental reach of all.

"A Socialist's Answer to the Catholic Progress" is written by one of the people for the people's consideration, in the hope that possibly it will help a few to break away from the old ideas so long driven into them, and set them in a position to do their own thinking.

When it comes to actual political economy, the average man is completely lost and repeats words and ideas handed out to him by the monied power, whose interests are best served by the ignorance of the masses along these lines.

It is to this class of people who have been taught that Socialism and Socialists are a threat to our existence as a nation and a people that this book is dedicated, with the hope that they may be wakened to see and realize the conditions as they are, and not as they are said to be.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Anarchists' Naturalization	85
A Socialist's Answer to the Catholic Progress.....	8
Bank of Venice.....	43
Capital as a Disturbing Element.....	42
Carnegie's Share of Twelve Years' Profits.....	14
Churches and Moral Training Protect Society.....	58
Conclusion	97
England's Rake-Off on the Demonetization of Silver.....	44
From Governor Mead's Inaugural Address.....	87
Gold the Base of All Value.....	37
Government Ownership	64
Fallacy of the Competitive System.....	39
History of the Great Northern Railroad.....	29
History of the Northern Pacific Railroad.....	28
How Socialism Would Arrange the Various Classes of Men.....	26
How Washington Affects Our Representatives.....	36
Importance of the Terms Used in Political Economy.....	24
Introduction	3
Land, Labor and Tools of Production.....	37
Man in the Primitive Age.....	41
Martin and Martinism.....	62
Ministers Paid by the State.....	61
Missionary Convention, Philadelphia, Pa.....	55
Mr. George's Theory a False One.....	38
Mrs. Toutenbaugh	58
Necessary Evil	16
Panic Failures of '93.....	44
Power of the Editorial.....	79
Prosecuting Attorney's Office.....	61
Rev. Mr. Graham on Henry George's Theory.....	32
Science a Word Much Abused.....	49
Scientific Economy	18
Socialism an Effect.....	92
Socialism Self-Condemed, by J. Sefton, S. J.....	47
Social Switzerland	65
Swiss Arbitration	74
Swiss Workmen's Secretary.....	70
The Cardinal Principles of Political Economy.....	25
The Competitive System.....	14
The Evolution of the Idea of the Absolute.....	50
The Four Schools of Modern Philosophy.....	49

CONTENTS

	Page.
The Granden Farm.....	64
The Grover Cleveland Panorama.....	83
The Labor Law of the Canton.....	65
The Press in Politics.....	16
The Prostitute Fund.....	19
The Tariff	34
The Wealth Labor Creates.....	77
Union's Effect on Price of Labor.....	35
Was Christ a Socialist? by Dr. Titus and the Rev. Stanley.....	96
What Gives Value to Gold or Silver?.....	42
What the Catholic Progress Says.....	7
Who Creates the Value in Real Estate?.....	30
Why Every Man Should Support the Church.....	57
Why Men Are Wedded to the Present System.....	20
Why Some Men Are Socialists.....	17
Why We Do Not Favor Socialism.....	7
Wilshire's Magazine	84
W. J. Bryan on Public Ownership.....	40

WHAT THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC PROGRESS SAYS

Why We Do Not Favor Socialism.

“A reader very politely asks us by letter why the Church condemns Socialism. We must say that we have reproduced many articles on Socialism in our columns in order to acquaint ourselves with the subject. We have our own views on Socialism which we wish to give without having it understood that we are speaking for the Church.

‘We do not favor Socialism because it is one of their principles to denounce the Church and all religion. We do not favor Socialism because we have asked the best known local exponent of the system what he proposes to substitute for the present plan of government when his party is sufficiently strong to displace it. To which he answered that they have no fixed plan, but that time will adjust this matter. This is too intangible and if this is the general view the agitation is not based upon any philosophy commanding our respect. We do not favor Socialism because the spirit of America is one of enterprise and industry. Socialism it seems would inflict upon us a race or nation of time-serving and indifferent workmen. We believe that men are not born equal in talent, and some are even incapable of self-direction and must be under the direction of employers who, in the language of Socialists, are exploiters. We believe the present system develops an individuality in men of average energy and ability and that this quality will be lacking under Socialistic reign. Since we are given different talents why should they be sunk in the maelstrom of mediocrity which must be engendered by loss of individuality?

“You ask why one should not have all his labor produces instead of his wage share of it. I would reply that if you were to quit your job tomorrow and set up a shop of your own and get all you earn it would go very well on a cash basis, but if Moran Bros. were to pay each man all his work produces where would they get the reserve to advance wage money each week pending the completion and acceptance of some gigantic piece of work? Here is where capital serves you most admirably and you should appreciate the condition. If the government were doing the work there must be a reserve and there would be, but for the privilege of having individuals and corporations decapitalized you have to surrender the privilege of gauging the degree of your personal liberty and personal choice in providing yourself and dependents with any but the average and ordinary comforts which neither distinguish, nor satisfy aspiration.

Not being able to realize more than ordinary comforts you will become ordinary in habits, energy and culture.

“Men are paid, and under any system, will be paid according to the quality of work they do. Under government ownership there must be expert managers and supernumeraries whose compensation will take more from the earnings of a laborer than employers and managers are now receiving. The specialist and the expert will not apply his talent for the allowance made the craftsman and the clerk. It is insolent presumption for a diffident workman to put himself at an equal financial value with the tireless and self-sacrificing manager. If ‘G’ will explain, or if Socialism can propose some plan of differentiation we shall take our first step in its comprehension. When the advocates of Socialism will outline a system and clear away such rubbish as the cry against monopolies and injustice which we all deplore we will be able to listen intelligently. We have listened to renowned lecturers and we have only heard the cry of injustice, wrong and capitalist as if such rage constituted a philosophic treatment of the subject. If Socialism is right there is a way to formulate and present it and the Church and the world will judge and approve or condemn it.”

A SOCIALIST'S ANSWER TO THE CATHOLIC PROGRESS.

The first objection to Socialism by the distinguished editor, is that one of its principles is to denounce the Church and all religion. I will say that I have watched the movement of Socialism for fifteen years; I have read a great deal of their propaganda; I have attended and read their various lectures; I have watched their various State and National conventions, nor have I heard one word from any Socialist of any standing that was derogatory or disrespectful of any Church. It is true that some Socialists are opposed to the Catholic Church and some are opposed to all churches, but you will find the same in the Republican party, the Democratic party and every other party. The Socialists are not opposed to churches on account of their Christian teaching, but on account of the stand they have taken against the Socialist movement. The Socialist co-operative theory is just as moral and as Christ-like as our present competitive cut-throat system. The Catholic Church is one of the greatest co-operative institutions in the world. From His Holiness, the Pope, to the least one in the service of that great organization, all are under one head.

The thousands of men and women engaged in the noble work, the uplifting of humanity, are not worrying about their individuality. They sacrifice their lives for the good of the whole; that is Socialism.

The second objection the distinguished editor has to the Socialist movement was that the local exponent of the system could not give him a tangible idea of how he proposed to run things. Between the best known local exponent, who admitted that he never had a fixed plan, and the distinguished editor, who from the drift of his remarks could not possibly have given the subject a rational thought, there is not likely to arise a philosophy that will command the respect of any thinking man.

The third objection that the distinguished editor has to Socialism is, that it would destroy American enterprise and industry. Yes, it will destroy corporate greed, frenzied finance, political rot and the prostituted press; all other industries will be stimulated. The distinguished editor thinks that Socialism would inflict upon us a race of time serving and indifferent men. I would ask the distinguished gentleman what we have now. I think it a very reasonable estimate that ninety per cent of the wealth of this country is produced by time servers under this present system, and why would they be any more indifferent under co-operation, where every individual would have a say in the matter, than they would under a task master? The distinguished editor believes that all men are not born equal in talent, and that some are incapable of self-direction and must be under the direction of some employer who, in the language of the Socialist, are exploiters. The Socialists do not call employers exploiters because they employ men, but because they take more than their share of the profits, nor will they employ any man, competent or incompetent, unless they can make a profit out of him. There are very few men so incompetent that there would not be some place in a large system that he could fill just as well as the superintendent fills his, and that is the beauty of co-operation.

The distinguished editor believes that the present system develops an individuality in men of average ability. Are you aware, Mr. Editor, that individuality in production is practiced only by the most primitive savage who builds his own hut, kills his own game, makes his own clothes, his own canoe, and his own fish line and cooks his own food? When he adopts any one of those occupations and exchanges with his neighbor for any or all of the other commodities, his commercial individuality ceases. He then becomes Socialistic or co-operative. This is the first step in commercial evolution. In regard to energy, Mr. Editor, there was a time when consumption pressed

so hard against production that incentive was necessary, but now our panics are caused by over-production.

The distinguished editor thinks we should not have our talent sunk in the maelstrom of mediocrity, which must be engendered by the loss of individuality. Admitting if that should be the case, it would not be as disastrous as to have our energies and abilities merged in and monopolized by corporate greed. The distinguished editor when asked why one should not have all his labor produced, instead of his wage share of it, replied that if you were to quit your job and set up a shop of your own and get all you earned, it would go very well on a cash basis; but if the Moran Brothers were to pay each man all his work produces, where would he get the reserve to advance wage money each week pending the completion and acceptance of some gigantic piece of work.

Now, Mr. Editor, do you think it was necessary or even possible, that Moran Brothers had three millions in their pockets when they took the contract to build the Nebraska? If so, they would never have built the boat. Now, Mr. Editor, they are not doing business that way. When Moran Brothers secured that contract the money was deposited in some bank subject to their draft as the work progressed each month, less a small percentage that was held back to guarantee faithful compliance of the contract. The money that built that boat was nothing more or less than the people's promise to pay. Moran Brothers did not even furnish experience to build this boat. The government furnished an expert and paid his wages, and Moran Brothers applied the profits to their own use. You say if the government was doing the work there must be a reserve, and there would be. That is true even for co-operation; if you build war ships there must be. The war ship is destructive and a waste of energy, and there can be enough of the people's energy wasted so their promises to pay would be no good. On the other hand, if you take three million dollars and irrigate several thousand acres of land and increase the value from one dollar to thirty, you would have something tangible to base your promise to pay on. In addition say, but for the privilege of having individuals and corporations decapitalized you have to surrender the privilege of gauging the degree of your personal liberty and your personal choice in providing yourself and dependents with any but the average and ordinary comforts which neither distinguish nor satisfy aspirations. The capital of individuals and corporations is their promise to pay, the same as the government, and cannot be destroyed except by repudiation, but the profits of individuals and corporations can be taken by others and appropriated to

their own use, as in the case of the Government vs. the Moran Brothers.

There are various degrees of liberty: There is the liberty of conscience, political and and the liberty that the hold-up man wants to protect him in his graft. There are also various stages of aspirations, from the man who is content with what he fairly earns to the gentlemen who are now figuring so conspicuously in Frenzied Finance. Co-operation will gauge and keep a safety valve on both. The distinguished editor says that men are paid, and under any system will be paid, according to the quality of work they do; that will be the case in co-operation. They will put man's time before the quality of work. This quality of work arises from that false delusion that some kinds of work is degrading. The man who digs and helps to build a sewer is just as good as the doctor who pounds pills, and his services are just as important to society; the man who cleans the street is just as necessary to the people as the cashier in the bank; the man who shovels and helps to build a railroad is just as necessary as the editor in his chair. But then, you will say that the experience of the doctor cost more than the man who works on the sewer. Under Socialism the government would stand the expense, therefore he could make no extra demands.

You say, Mr. Editor, that under government ownership there must be expert managers and supernumeraries whose compensation will take more of the earnings of the laborer than the employers and managers are now receiving. Now, Mr. Editor, imagine a thousand or ten thousand men in some co-operative concern sitting down and voting to have several hundred supernumeraries appointed and paid that they would have no use for. But, Mr. Editor, what about the supernumeraries under this present competitive system? What about the million tramps our present system has produced? He eats and wears clothes and produces nothing, therefore he is a parasite on the laboring man. What about the supernumeraries in the shape of three or four hundred gamblers in this city, Mr. Editor? They are parasites on the laboring man. What about the three thousand saloon men in this city? If that business was run by the government by establishing government dispensaries, one to every five thousand population, as in South Carolina, we could dispense with twenty-nine hundred supernumeraries. What about the six hundred physicians in the city, Mr. Editor? If we had the co-operative law of Australia, where the doctor's wages raise as the health of the community rises, and falls as the health of the community decreases, that law in Seattle would drive out two-thirds of the profession, and

that would be four hundred more supernumeraries. There are six hundred of the best average talent in the legal profession in this city; the co-operative plan would dispense with two-thirds of them. There are three or four hundred real estate men in this city; under co-operation we could dispense with all of them. Then, again, throughout this country there are a number of weekly papers and pamphlets and monthly magazines. Admitting that they give value received, all this could be done co-operatively, or even on the scale as the big dailies are operated, with at least one-half the labor and time that is now expended, and that would relieve society of more supernumeraries, and the same would be the case all down the line.

The distinguished editor thinks it would be an insolent presumption for a diffident workman to put himself at an equal financial value with the tireless and self-sacrificing manager. In the review of human conditions we must not base our opinions on isolated or individual action, but give our decision on the sum total. Now, Mr. Editor, the sum total of those insolent workingmen you refer to: Statistics show that the workingmen of the country produce fifteen billions of dollars in one year. The workingman has furnished all the eatables that you can think of; he has made all the clothes you need; he has built railroad Pullman cars and floating palaces to cross the sea; he has built houses and palaces; he has already made and keeps on hand all that the human mind can crave. I will ask you, Mr. Editor, if you think there is anything he has left undone? If you can't say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant?"

That the co-operative system leaves neither opportunity nor incentive for dishonesty is my unprejudiced opinion and firm belief after fifteen years, more or less, careful study of this question.

I am aware that such ideas are very unpopular with the average man, who regards such ideas as wild and airy delusions; but it makes no matter what my ideas or any other man's ideas may be on the church's belief. There is no man, no church, no party that can stop scientific evolution. There are forces behind this theory all over the civilized world. There are 10,000,000 votes behind that theory, all having the same ideas, the same thoughts. There can be but one correct theory, just as there can be but one in any other science. How many different theories are there in the competitive system? Almost as many as there are men.

It is notorious that the world is tangled up on the two most essential theories now confronting it. The world is in a political and theological tangle, though they are as much a

science as mathematics. Theology has its various ideas and systems, which are not, to say the least, harmonious.

We have all to begin as dualists in the religion of love. God is to us a separate being, and we feel ourselves separate beings, also. Love then begins to appear and man begins to approach God, and God comes nearer to man. Man tears up all the various relationships of life, as father, as mother, as son, as friend, as master, as lover, and projects them on his ideas as love for his God. To him God exists in all things, and the last point of his progress is reached when he feels that he has become absolutely merged in the object of his worship. We all begin with love of ourselves and the unfair claims of our little selves make even love selfish. At last, however, comes the blaze of light in which this little self seems to become one with the Infinite. Man himself is transfigured in the presence of this light of love. His heart is cleansed of all impurities and vain desires of which it was more or less full, before, and he realizes at last the beautiful and inspiring truth that love, lover and the beloved are one.

Yes, Mr. Editor, the laborer as well as nature has done his share, both together have made the world flow with milk and honey, but in the midst of this abundance we find dire want, particularly amongst those that have helped to create this great wealth. But the fault is not theirs; it is the fault of uneven distribution. Distribution is controlled by that highly valued financial manager, "tireless and self-sacrificing." The profound sympathy that the distinguished editor has for this class of men must have originated from an overheated brain. According to the distinguished editor a great many of those captains of industry are very good men, but they generally come out of the deal with more than their share, and that is where the uneven distribution of wealth arises. We have had some recent experiences with those highly valued self-sacrificing managers in the state of Colorado. When the miners demanded an eight hour day, a law which the state legislature had passed, and when the miners persisted in their demands the self-sacrificing managers undertook to drive them out of the state. The corporation organ of this city, referring to the enormous loss caused by the strikers, made the statement that the seven months of the strike then elapsed had cost the miners ten millions and had cost the mine owners in loss of profits thirty millions. Now, it would seem as though they could afford to cut down hours when they made that profit in seven months.

CARNEGIE'S SHARE OF TWELVE YEARS' PROFITS.

Twelve years ago Mr. Carnegie had his men shot down at Homestead because they asked a ten per cent rise. He went to Washington, persuaded our government to give him a forty per cent protective tariff that gave him a forty per cent raise on his product to be charged up to the people. At the end of twelve years Mr. Carnegie wound up business having for his services two hundred and ninety millions of dollars.

Two years ago, when there was a strike at Pittsburg, those men who created all that wealth could not stand a six weeks' strike. He is now grunting around like a great sow, gorged with swill, begging everybody and everything to take a library, a university or let him help them in a political fight—any old thing that wants money. He is a fully developed case of your tireless, unselfish manager.

The distinguished editor says if I will explain, or if Socialism can propose some plan of differentiation, we shall take our first step towards its comprehension. The distinguished editor is like the man from Missouri. "Show me!"

THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM.

The distinguished editor likewise says: "When the advocates of Socialism will outline a system and clear away such rubbish as the cry against monopolies and injustice which we all deplore we will be able to listen intelligently." I would say, Mr. Editor, that if you were familiar with their propaganda you would know that they have already outlined a system.

They might stop those cries against monopolies and injustice which you call rubbish. Yes, the gods might stop the wheels of evolution, so that you might be able to listen intelligently, if that would not mean indefinitely. You say you have listened to renowned lecturers and only heard cries of injustice, wrong and capitalists, as if such rage constituted a philosophical treatment of the subject. Now, Mr. Editor, the first thing to learn is that our present system is thoroughly rotten, and the renowned lecturer knows that he must impress that strongly and thoroughly on the minds of the people. Then when they see the injustice and robbery they will throw it over. That is the part of the propaganda that you do not seem to comprehend. This is rubbish, but it has to be cleared away. It is no part of the Socialist philosophy. The distinguished editor closes his remarks by saying that if Socialism is right there is

a way to formulate and present it, so that the Church and the world will judge it and approve or condemn it. We will admit that the church government is much in advance of the competitive system, and it is not reasonable to suppose that she will condemn a system that she has successfully worked under for twenty centuries. When this commonwealth is governed by the same co-operative system as the Catholic church, they will be dangerously near to Socialism. The Church can not but see that the competitive system is directly and indirectly responsible for seventy-five per cent of the present suffering and crime. One of the Church's grand teachings is brotherly love. You would find no more of the milk of human kindness in the competitive system than you might expect, relatively speaking, to drip from the soot sieves of Hell.

The founder of the Christian religion was more radical than the Socialist. The Socialist demands that which he himself earns; Christ said to the rich man, "Sell thy goods and give to the poor," and you say that the world will approve or condemn. Whatever they condemn, they cannot very well approve the present system, where statistics show that ninety per cent of men and women in commercial business have made a failure. A man may be in the shoe business or any other business. His neighbor may be across the street in the same business. Now, there is no man on earth who is a more deadly enemy than this neighbor across the street. The two will lie and cut prices and would cut one another's throats if they dared, and it is only a matter of time until some one goes to the wall. That is the result in all lines. You can take our two great daily papers in this city. By reading those papers you can see the deadly enmity more clearly, because they have the weapons to give their indignation more vent. And there is space occupied each day for the express purpose of throwing fresh and fragrant sewer bouquets at each other.

Every day, Mr. Editor, we see men and women who work hard eight to twelve hours per day. We see others who travel from place to place trying to find work. Every day we see young girls who leave home to find work in this city, where they have to work as waitresses in those restaurants, cafes and dives, where they come in contact with all kinds of degenerates and lustful brutes whose very presence is demoralizing and whose language pollutes the ears, and whose breath from strong drink and tobacco would stink a dog off a garbage wagon. Those young girls will be the mothers of part of the coming generation and should have some safeguard around them.

NECESSARY EVIL.

What are called necessary evils are another product of the present system. Dance houses, gambling hells and houses of prostitution are called necessary evils, and it is a noted fact that those institutions can not exist except where they are protected by the police. They would not be allowed on the outskirts of the city. They would not be allowed in the country or small towns. The people would rise and drive them out, and they would drive them from below the dead line if you remove the protection accorded them by the police.

The young man may live all his life in the outlying districts and it will not be necessary to commit crime. But when he comes to the city he finds these institutions licensed, protected and ready for business. Then it becomes a necessary evil. The lumber man comes in from the lumber camp; there are no crimes allowed there, but when he came to town crime became a necessary evil. The sailor comes in from a six months' voyage. The master would not allow any crime on his ship. The sailor got along all right without committing it until he got where crime was licensed and protected and became necessary. The miner came from the coal mine. The coal miners would not allow any degenerates around their coal mine. The miner would commit no crime while he was there. He would have to wait until he came to Seattle.

Now what is the result of the necessary evil on those men? They would return to their work with their manhood depraved, their bodies diseased and their pockets empty. Necessary evil *reducio ad absurdum*.

I heard the statement made that the city last year received thirty-six thousand dollars from the licenses and fines of fallen women. I do not know what fund that was applied to; perhaps to the school fund. Any way I suppose the taxpayers got the benefit. Now, Mr. Editor, do you know—can you conceive a man any lower than a man who lives off the earnings of a prostitute? I don't. How much better is the man that will rob her of the money that she sacrificed her soul and body for to pay his taxes or vote for such a policy? There are some apparently very good Christians who are beneficiaries of this fund and vote for that policy. They sit up in the front pews and thank the all wise creator for "Republican prosperity."

THE PRESS IN POLITICS.

Part of the press of this city have prostituted their columns with the support and brazen profiles of men whose

records on file at the court house if exhumed the stench would lower the social standing of a pimp or prostitute, if that were possible.

Now, Mr. Editor, this is what you will style more rubbish. The corrupt politician, the tireless and self-sacrificing manager and their hired tools do not want to have their game exposed. They want the Socialists to go on talking scientific economy that ninety per cent of the people do not understand, and that would be subject to their criticism to approve or condemn.

Mr. Editor, you pose as an educator and one of the great pillars of the Church, and your decision might have great weight with the people. But if you are no better posted on theology than you are on political economy, and as the Church is pretty heavy, she must not lean too hard on the "Progress;" it might not stand the mental strain.

WHY SOME MEN ARE SOCIALISTS.

We might support, vote for, and elect honest men and send them to Washington, but when they got there they would be decoyed by that false glare originating from foul gas generated in the aristocratic sewer of corporate greed and modern imperialism. They are taken in charge by the leaders, furnished with a dog collar and whipped into line, and you will not see one bill introduced in the interest of the laboring man, who creates the wealth of this country, in the whole length of the session. Their time will be taken up by such bills as the subsidy bill, trying to grab millions out of the treasury to give to the shipping trust, which is already such a large monopoly that foreign countries tremble in their grasp.

The present financial law on our statute books is nothing more or less than a three card monte game, and now, by the Fowler bill, they want to work Clancy on the little gamblers, by getting a percentage on all the games. These and other grafts will occupy their time for most of the session.

Now, Mr. Editor, I will give some reasons why some men are in favor of Socialism. In the first place they have learned by sad experience that something is radically wrong. In the next place they began to study the question and discovered that political economy was a science, just as much a science as mathematics, chemistry, physics, electricity or navigation, and they learned that all those sciences were conducted by men who are expert, and they learned that the men engaged in political economy were not experts and had not studied science, and that the government had never been run on a scientific basis.

SCIENTIFIC ECONOMY.

Now, Mr. Editor, those men do not claim to be students or experts of that science. There are many who have read a great deal on the subject, but could not be experts or scientific without practical experience. The same obtains in any other science, and it will remain a theory until it is put into practice. But that does not prove that the science does not exist. Mathematics would be no use if you did not put it into practice. You might read about it all your life. Mathematics has a base—the multiplication table—twice two are four, twice two cannot be three nor five, that would destroy the science.

Political economy, too, has a base. If a man works two days and creates ten dollars' worth and is paid four for it, that would destroy the science of political economy. You will say that he does not earn ten, but the statistics show that he earns ten and receives two. The laboring men being 100 per cent the producer and 90 per cent of the population, only gets 20 per cent of what he produces. That leaves 80 per cent of the production to 10 per cent of the population, and when that becomes more than they can squander it causes overproduction, or properly speaking, lack of consumption. This is a violation of the science or law of political economy. The result is the uneven distribution of wealth, and the ultimate result is that 83 per cent of the wealth is owned by 25 per cent of the population.

Now, Mr. Editor, for an illustration we will take the post-office, under government ownership. The net revenue from postage would represent the accumulated wealth of all the people. What the postoffice earns is appropriated to run that department and can be raised or lowered, according to income. That is no more nor less than justice to that department, and there is where scientific economy comes in.

Now, Mr. Editor, we have a water system in this city run by the city. That plant, under present water rates, earned \$36,000 the last year over and above operating expenses. The people who pay 75 per cent of this tax do not own the property, and this \$36,000 is turned to pay other taxes where that 75 per cent have no interest. Mr. Daulton, a councilman of this city, has tried to introduce some honest scientific economy by recommending that the water rate be lowered to the amount necessary to run the plant, but the power behind the council think that would be giving the common people too much.

THE PROSTITUTE FUND.

They do not like that scientific way of doing business. They do not like the Socialist because he talks too much about science and is giving away the graft.

Our schools, city, county, state and the national are under the Socialistic or scientific law to a certain extent, and the principal is all right, except when as in the case of the city water plant, it is disturbed by individual or selfish greed, or by dishonest employes. But government ownership will never be a scientific success until all departments and all business is done by co-operation. Under scientific management there will be no incentive to be dishonest or to be selfish.

You will say that you cannot make laws that will make man perfect. Granted. But you can take away his incentive to steal or be dishonest. Necessity creates 90 per cent of the criminals. The habit once formed, though necessity ceases, they will steal. There are some cases where it would almost seem justifiable to steal. Where a man has a family suffering for the necessities of life on one hand and extravagance and waste on the other. When a man made this first step, conscience gets strained to the full tension. This is the point where you will have to apply science to steer him through. The incentive to stimulate energy I referred to in a previous page, and we found that it was not necessary for any further stimulation of energy. The problem to solve is what to do with the over-production. In order to get a market for that immense accumulation, we make war on eight million weak and inoffensive people, who have struggled for two hundred years for their independence, that we may dump our over-accumulated wealth on their shores. A war that cost the taxpayers six hundred and some odd million of dollars, a great portion of which was stolen and squandered by men who do not believe in scientific economy. They do not believe in Socialism. No, Mr. Editor, they believe in manifest destiny. They believe that the gods of war are with the aggressor who has the heaviest artillery. The Japanese-Russian war today is not to seize territory, but to get an outlet for their surplus.

There is the business man that is worth all the way from \$100,000 to \$600,000,000. You will say they would not be satisfied if they were checked in their mad career. We might let them go on if they would ever get satisfied. But you see that the man who has the \$600,000,000 is making more desperate strides than the man who has not the wherewith to pay next week's board.

If the poor man should get broke and could not pay his

board the law of this state would put him behind the bars. If the man with \$600,000,000 should steal \$36,000,000, as in the Amalgamated deal, he would go scot free. You will say that all rich men do not steal. Neither are they satisfied. So you see that the present system is not sound. If a man is not satisfied with a just, scientific and economic distribution of his share of what he produces, he will not be satisfied at any stage of the game. Now there are a great many rich business men who work very hard in nerve and brain work, and pass sleepless nights. In fact, some break down their health, having more business than they can attend to. But that is injustice to themselves. The world does not ask it, nor under sound conditions would they need it. General managers and captains of industry get large salaries, not because they produce more themselves, but because they work other men harder for longer hours and less pay. And, on the other hand, force up the price of goods. This creates both over-production and lack of consumption, which in turn causes our periodical panics. Such men do not sacrifice anything for society. They only sacrifice their health, their honor, and their manhood. All society would ask of them would be to earn their living and adopt conditions that would keep them from taking what belonged to others, and can only be produced by co-operation.

People have a right to make laws that will protect themselves. Where that is not an injustice to others, but a benefit to them. A shoe manufacturer in Massachusetts told his workmen that he ran his own business, but they showed him that ten thousand men had something to do with a box of shoes, while his part was to take the lion's share of the profits when it got to the strong box. The same may be said of every line of business, great and small, under individual ownership.

WHY MEN ARE WEDDED TO THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

Some men are strongly wedded to the present system, expecting to leave their children each a fortune. Today there is no greater calamity for the country than rich men's sons. Of course, there are some exceptions. The men of today are self-made men, and the daughter of the poor man will be the mother of the coming generation. To depend on the rich man's daughter would be race suicide. Our great rush and nerve-wrecking chase for wealth is creating a degenerate race. You will find children in the shanty and small cottages, but very few in the palaces of the rich. The latest fad is when the father becomes a millionaire the mother goes to Europe and spreads her drag-net to catch a lord or count. If she succeeds she will come

back with something that is physically degenerated and morally bankrupt, decked out with cheap title, badges and old gold braid, looking like an organ grinder's monkey and with about as much brain as a chimpanzee.

Now, Mr. Editor, you know all the conditions we have cited are nothing more or less than subsistence. The most insignificant grub worm lives his allotted time, just the same as you or I, and when man's time is wholly taken up with merely supplying the wants of the body, he can be no better than the lower animal. Some are forced to that condition by the hard struggle for existence. Others, having too much of the world's goods, take all their time to look after them or in reckless dissipation. Now, there is a place between those two extremes where economic science will place him. Where the work he is compelled to do will be no more than will be necessary for good health. Then, Mr. Editor, he can get where he is destined to be; that is, above the animal. God has placed us above the animal and has given us a bountiful earth, which, governed scientifically, will give time to study the higher arts and the higher life. This will be life in the line of least resistance. All men are seeking happiness, but are seeking it in the wrong direction. We are looking down into the mud and slime of life, and can never see Paradise with a hell-diver's eyes.

Of all the sciences, political economy is that which to the civilized men of today is of most practical importance. It is the science that treats of the nature of wealth and the laws of its production and distribution. That is to say, the matters which absorb the larger part of the thought and effort of the vast majority of us—the getting of a living. It includes in its domain the greater part of those vexing questions which lie at the bottom of politics and legislation of our social and governmental theories, and even in a larger measure than at first supposed of our philosophies and religions. It is the science to which must belong the solving of problems, that at the close of the century of the greatest material and scientific developments that the world has ever seen, confronts all civilized countries, clouding the horizon of the future. It is the only science that can enable our civilization to escape the now threatening catastrophe. Important and surpassing as the science is, he who today would form clear and sure ideas of what it really teaches must form them for himself. For there is no one of accepted truth, no consensus of recognized authority that he may accept without question. In all other branches of knowledge properly called science, the inquirer may find certain fundamentals recognized by all and disputed by no recognized authority which he may safely take to embody the

information and experience of his time. Despite its long cultivation and the multitude of its professors, he can not yet find this in political economy. If he accepts the teaching of one writer or one school, it will be to find it denied by other writers and other schools. This is not merely true of the more complex and delicate questions, but of primary questions. Even on matters such as in other sciences have long been settled, he who today looks for the guidance of general acceptance in political economy will find a chaos of discordant opinions. So far, indeed, are first principles from being agreed upon that it is still a matter of dispute whether protection or free trade is most conducive to prosperity—a question that in political economy should be capable of a decisive answer. This is not for want of what passes for systematic study. Not only are no subjects so widely and frequently discussed as those that come within the province of political economy, but every university and college has its professor of the science whose special business is to study and teach it. But nowhere are inadequacy and confusion more apparent than in the writings of these men. Nor is anything so likely to give the impression that there is not and can not be real science in political economy. But while the discord shows that he who would really acquaint himself with political economy can not rely on authority, there is nothing in it to discourage the hope that he who will use his own reason in the honest search for truth may attain firm and clear conclusions.

In the supreme practical importance of political economy we may see the reason that has kept and still keeps it in dispute and has prevented the growth of accepted and assured opinions. Under existing conditions in the civilized world, and the great struggle among men for the possession of wealth, would it be irrational to expect that the science that treats of the production and the distribution of wealth should be exempt from the influence of that struggle? Macaulay has well said that if any large pecuniary interest were concerned in a dispute the attraction of gravitation—the most obvious of all facts—would not be accepted. What then can we look for in the teaching of a science which directly concerns the most powerful of vested rights which deal with rent and wages and interest, with taxes and tariffs, with privileges and franchises and subsidies, with currency and land tenures and public debts, with the ideas upon which trades unions are based and the pleas by which combinations of capitalists are defended. Economic truth under existing conditions has not merely to overcome the inertia of indolence and habit, but is in its very nature subject to suppression and distortion from the influ-

ences of the most powerful and virulent interests. It has not merely to make its way, but must stand continually on guard. It can not be trusted to any selected body of men for the same reasons the powers of making laws and administering public affairs can not be so trusted.

It is especially true today that all large political questions are at the bottom of economic questions. There are thus introduced into the study of political economy the same disturbing elements which have set men by the ears over the study of theology, writing in blood a long page in the world's history, and that at one time at least so affected the study of astronomy as to prevent the authoritative recognition of the earth's movements around the sun, long after its demonstration. The organization of political parties, the pride of place and power which they arouse, and the strong prejudices which they kindle, are always inimitable to the search of truth and to the acceptance of truth. And while colleges and universities and similar institutions, though ostensibly organized for careful investigation and the honest promulgation of truth, are not and can not be exempt from influences that disturb the study of political economy, they are especially precluded under present conditions from faithful and adequate treatment of that science. For, in the present social conditions of the civilized world nothing is clearer than that there is some deep and widespread wrong in the distribution, if not in the production of wealth. This is the office of political economy to disclose, and a really faithful and honest application of science must disclose it. But no matter what that injustice may be, colleges and universities, as at present conducted, are by the very law of their being precluded from discovering or revealing it. For, no matter what may be the nature of this injustice, the wealthy class must relatively at least profit by it, and their views and wishes dominate in colleges and universities.

While slavery was yet strong, we might have looked in vain to the colleges and universities and accredited organs of education and opinions in our Southern States, and, indeed, in the North, for any admission of its injustice, so under present conditions we must look in vain to such sources for any faithful treatment of political economy. Whoever accepts from them a chair of political economy must do so under the implied stipulation that he will not really find what it is his professional business to look for. Yet, if political economy be the one science that can not safely be left to specialists, the one science that is needful for all to know something of, it is also the science which the ordinary man may most easily study. It requires no tools, no apparatus, no special learning. The phe-

nomena to be investigated need not be sought for in laboratories or libraries; they lie about us and are constantly thrust upon us. The principles on which it builds are truths of which we are all-conscious and on which in every-day matters we constantly base our reasoning and our actions. And in its study, which consists mainly in analysis, requires only care in distinguishing what is essential from what is merely accidental.

IMPORTANCE OF THE TERMS USED IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Men may honestly be in ignorance of astronomy, of chemistry, of geology, of physiology, and really feel their ignorance; but few men honestly confess an ignorance of political economy. Though they may admit, or even proclaim ignorance, they do not really feel it. There are many who claim they know nothing of political economy, many indeed who do not know what the term means; yet these very ones hold at the same time, and with the utmost confidence, opinions on matters that belong to political economy—such as the causes which affect wages and prices and profits and the effect of tariffs, the influence of labor-saving machinery, the functions and the proper substance of money, the reason of hard times or good times, and so on. For men living in society, which is the natural way for men to live, must have some sort of politico-economic theories, good or bad, right or wrong. The way to make sure that these theories are correct, or, if not correct, to supplant them with true ones, is by a systematic and careful investigation. To such an investigation there is one thing so necessary, one thing of such primary and constant importance, that it can not too soon and too strongly be urged upon our minds. It is that in attempting to study political economy we should first of all and at every step make sure of the meaning of the words which we use as its terms, so that when we use them they will always have for us the same meaning. Words are the signs or tokens by which in speech or writing we communicate our thoughts to one another. It is only as we attach a common meaning to words that we are able to communicate with one another by speech. To understand one another with precision it is necessary that each attach precisely the same meaning to the same word. Words, however, are more than the means by which we communicate thoughts. There are also signs or tokens in which we ourselves think—the tablets of the thought drawers or pigeonholes in which we stow away the various ideas that we often mentally deal with by label. Thus we can not think with precision unless in our own minds we use words with pre-

cision. Failure to do this is a great cause of the existence and persistence of economic fallacies.

In all studies it is important that we should attach definite meanings to the terms we use, but this is especially important in political economy. In other studies most of the words used, as terms, are peculiar to that study, while the terms used in political economy are not words reserved to it alone. They are words used in every-day life which the necessities of daily life constantly require us to give to and accept for a different meaning than the economic.

The most eminent writers on political economy confuse themselves, as well as their readers, by the vague use of terms, such as wealth, values, capital, land, labor, rent, interest, money, and tools of production, international commerce, and a thousand other factors, which is like referring to all things that mathematics is applied to, to get the principle of that science. You can go to any library and load a dray with all kinds of theories, since Adam Smyth wrote "The Wealth of Nations" and John Stewart Mill wrote "International Commerce."

They have all tried to get a science out of a competitive system, but they have no base to work from. The very word itself means trouble. It means one man against the other all the way through. It means to get all you can, devil take the hindmost. That is not science, nor God's law. It is war.

THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Political economy is based on four cardinal principles: Truth, justice, the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion.

The competitive system violates and is diametrically opposed to all four. The competitive system, claiming to be an honest system, or science, is a plain lie on the face of it. That it is not justice is proved by the uneven distribution of wealth. That it is not the greatest good to the greatest number is evident when we find 83 per cent of the wealth of this country in the hands of 25 per cent of the people. The greatest good to the greatest number can be obtained only by the co-operation of the whole.

This is the most critical point of political economy, and we will have to feel our way carefully. Here is where all writers on political economy, as it were, left the track. To launch into this science we must have truth on our side. We can not stand on a false bottom, and we see that the old system will not hold water. It violates the first principle of political economy. It violates the moral law. Science must have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The next cardinal principle of political economy is justice. There is no end to the moral literature, and ethics, and law libraries on this subject, but we will simmer it down to "Thou shalt not steal." You must not steal a quarter of a mill. Why? Because it violates the law of political economy. That is not much of a steal, but it violates the principle. By the science of mathematics you could take all the wealth of this country in the shape of money and bonds and negotiable paper running up into the hundred billions of dollars belonging to twenty million people, in various sums from 10 cents to \$100,000,000, run it through a clearing house, and every one would get his share to a cent. If any one was short one cent the law of mathematics would be violated. Political economy can be worked on the same principle. When we get ready to apply it, the people can start at a given time and of all the wealth they will create in six months or a year each one will get his share. The books will balance to a cent. If they did not, as in mathematics, where it was short one cent the science would be wrongly applied, the books would not balance. The loss of one cent by the theft or error in the unit column might be overlooked, but if that figure was changed in the hundred column or in the thousand column or in the million column it would have to be all gone over. The book must balance to a cent or it would not be true mathematical science.

This science can be applied to political economy by the aid of mathematics, but this science can not be applied to the competitive system. We will have to adopt what is termed the co-operative commonwealth.

But you will say there are great objections to that system. Yes, that is true, but the objections come from the beneficiaries of the present system and men who are ignorant of political economy and expect some time to be beneficiaries. He expects some time to get into a position where he can live without working, by living off some one else's labor. Those are the men who are creating the most trouble at present. There is the tramp, the gambler, and all kinds of criminals and get-rich-quick men, all parasites on the laboring man. But a thousand such are not as big a load to the man who creates the wealth as one of those over-energetic captains of industry who will not be satisfied even when he gets to be a Morgan, a Rockefeller, or a Carnegie.

HOW SOCIALISM WOULD ARRANGE THE VARIOUS CLASSES OF MEN.

The next thing is to know what to do. In the first place

we will take all the men in this country and put them in four classes. For illustration, we will put the whole number at ten and we will make four divisions of that ten. The over-energetic man will be one of that ten. There will be seven laboring men, who are the main brawn and muscle of this country. There will be one weakling, who is of that class of men who always lag behind, and one, the tramp, crook and the like.

Now we have these four elements to deal with. How shall we work them? There is just one way the co-operative commonwealth can scientifically proceed, and that is to take the first man who is the most serious trouble. He will want to give vent to his great energy, and will tell you that the system is going to ruin his great incentive. He is one of those self-sacrificing men who want the earth. His whole ambition is to make a great show in the world, and if he will stop to look over the commercial records he will find that 90 per cent of the men and women who started out with his ideas have gone to the wall, and he will find wrecks and broken hearts all along the line; but he relies on his own cunning. That cunning that Mr. Roosevelt referred to in his speech two years ago at the Minneapolis exposition when, referring to conditions, he said that the time had come when we would have to shackle cunning as we once did power.

This man would have the place in the co-operative system that he was best fitted for. A place where he would not have to work hard, where every man would have to do his share, not to work more than four hours each day. The balance of the day he could spend in pleasure, or in a study of the higher life, and when he went to rest he could enjoy a peaceful slumber, knowing that his wants were secure and his family would be provided for even if he was called to where the competitive system never had any territory.

The next division is the laboring man. The class that produces the wealth. The class that carries all the burdens. The parasites will do anything in the world for him but get off his back. He is the man there will be the least trouble with. He has nothing to lose but his chains. He is ready to accept what is his due and throw off the leeches.

They are drilling in squads; they are forming new companies every day. There are sixty-three unions in this city today getting ready for the co-operative system. They are the power behind the throne.

The third division constitutes a class of men comprising 1 per cent. By common phrase they may be called men who do not hold their own. They may be physically weak, or they may

be mentally weak, or they may be both. They are not of that class who form unions, but more of what the union man calls scabs. In all large systems there is always some place where those men may be placed, where they serve as well as a first-class man. There are superintendents of railroads who would make very poor brakemen. There are children now tending machines that do work that was once done by muscular men and constant brain work. Alden J. Blethen, the enterprising editor of "The Times," has in his press room a Hoe press that will do as much work in one day, with one man oiling and one boy carrying off papers, as 6,000 men could do with the old-time press of fifty years ago. We have not so much need of that nerve and muscle as was needed years ago. Co-operation will care for those men and place them where they will support themselves and be useful to society. The competitive system crowds them out and leaves them to suffer and become dependents or criminals.

There would be places for the rest, and if they would not work, neither would they eat.

We will now take up the third cardinal principle of political economy: The greatest good to the greatest number. Its function is the even distribution of wealth, and it is opposed to all customs now in practice and all laws that create the uneven distribution of wealth. The greatest factor in the uneven distribution of wealth is the private ownership of land. All the way from a twenty-five foot lot to the Northern Pacific land grant, 17,000 square miles, equal in area to the states of Michigan, Delaware and New Jersey. To show to what an extent private or corporate interests may go, to what means they will resort, it will be necessary here to give a brief history of two trans-continental railroads, the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern railroads.

HISTORY OF THE NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Back in the sixties, after the Union Pacific was completed and it was demonstrated that our government could be worked for big subsidies, there was a plan concocted at Washington to build the Northern Pacific railroad. The deal was engineered by James G. Blaine and Governor Smith of Vermont. There were others, but these were the leading spirits. They tried hard to get a subsidy, but our members of Congress were a little scared, as they had done some coarse work on the Union Pacific. They finally succeeded in getting a grant of every other section of land twenty miles wide from Lake Superior to Puget Sound. They issued bonds and the deal was financed.

by Jay Cooke. The bonds were put on the market at 90 cents, par value \$1.00. The bonds were secured by road and rolling stock, or you could take land at \$2.50 per acre, par value, and the land was to secure the bonds in case anything might happen the road. Those bonds were considered gilt-edge all through the east. They sold to old men and old women and old maids. They flooded the country and got millions to build the road. In 1872 they built the road to the Red river. And the drawing of such a large amount of money from the east was one of the causes of the panic of 1873. With the failure of J. Cooke the money received for bonds was squandered and the road went into the hands of a receiver. There was then a company formed called the Lake Superior & Puget Sound Land Company. This was a wheel within a wheel. They sold the road and bid it in themselves. That let the bondholders out, but they had the land left. About that time General Hazen was sent by the land department at Washington to report on the lands along the line of the Northern Pacific railroad. His report was that the land from Lake Superior to the Red river was a howling wilderness and that from the Red river to the Rocky Mountains was a desert plain. The crossing of the Rocky Mountains was a physical impossibility. From the Rockies to the Cascades was a desert of sand and sage brush. That report knocked the bonds and down they went to 17 cents. The Lake Superior Land Company bought them up with the money they got for the bonds in the first place and had 73 cents left. That amounted to more than the road sold for at receiver's sale, so you see they had the road and the land for turning the deal.

HISTORY OF THE GREAT NORTHERN RAILROAD.

About that time J. J. Hill, now president of the Great Northern Railroad Company, who for energy and push has no equal in railroad circles in two continents, then in the employ of the Mississippi Steamboat Company, got the idea of the great amount of profit there was in the transportation business. He formed a partnership with Mr. Kitson of St. Paul, a man of some means, and built two boats on the Red river which ran from Fargo to Winnipeg in connection with the Northern Pacific railroad, which was a great success financially, and gave Mr. Hill his first start.

The St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba railroad was swept off its feet in the panic of 1873, and the false report of the territory through which it ran stopped emigration for about four years. The St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba railroad was

built to the Red river, but was only operated part of the way. Mr. Hill conceived the idea of picking up that wreck. He went to Montreal, laid the case before Donald Smyth and Stevenson, bankers of that city, who thought favorably of the scheme and furnished money to buy enough bonds of that road to give them control. At that time the bonds were selling at 12 cents. They equipped the road complete to Red river at a cost of one million dollars. They then built north to Manitoba and west to Devils Lake in North Dakota. The development of northern Minnesota and the Red River valley proved the absurdity of General Hazen's official report, and the sway of empire was once more westward. When the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba was completed to Devils Lake it cost the company seven millions of dollars. Through the immense emigration, the rich soil and the energy and thrift of the settlers and shrewd management of Mr. Hill it was enabled to pay 40 per cent on that amount.

At this stage Mr. Hill conceived the idea of a Pacific terminal. He went to London and laid his plans before some London bankers, who, like the Montreal bankers, thought well of it and loaned him twenty-one millions of dollars, which consummated Mr. Hill's sublime dream by tunneling the Cascades and under the City of Seattle. And by all reports it will be no more than justice to say that there is not a road of any note built in this country with as little misplaced energy, misplaced capital or misplaced confidence as the Great Northern.

This brief history of these two roads we will use for reference and giving us light on the present system.

WHO CREATES THE VALUE IN REAL ESTATE?

The third cardinal principle of political economy—the greatest good to the greatest number—is violated when we give to a corporation 17,000 square miles, or 10,540,000 acres of land. But the history of the Northern Pacific shows that it did not go to build that road, and the history of the Great Northern goes to show that it was not needed. That land was stolen from the people, and a great part of it has been sold back to them at prices ranging from two and one-half to one hundred dollars per acre, and they have enough left today in rich farming land, timber land, mineral land, and coal land to build the road twice over. Not only the Northern Pacific grant, but millions more in the hands of other corporations and individuals that were bought up at small figures, and when the farmer or laboring man want to use them the price is so high that if he can reach it it will take him years of profit to satisfy the land.

shark. The same with city property. The people are crowded up in blocks, while lots lay vacant all around. This is not the greatest good for the greatest number.

You will say that it is not wrong to own a twenty-five foot lot. It is wrong. It violates the law of political science. It is the wrong principle. It is the wrong base, and here is where we again leave the track. Stealing is wrong from a penny to a million dollars. Likewise the principle is wrong in the lot as well as a million acres.

A single germ of yellow fever will not affect the body, but the increase and the fermenting will cause death. You want to kill the germ before it makes trouble. You must not take the lot, nor the penny. The safest way is not to be exposed to the disease germ, and the scientific way is to have no such factor in our system. This has caused the trouble for ages. There is what Henry George calls the unearned increment. That is where a man purchases a piece of property for \$100 and sells it for \$1000. Less the interest and taxes, which we will say amount to \$100 more, this leaves \$800. To call that unearned is a misnomer. It has to be created somehow.

For example, we will take the Catholic Church property in this city on Third avenue, below Yesler way. We take that property for two reasons. One is that some of the fathers have taken a stand against the Socialist theory. The second is they will have a practical illustration, and as they have a keener conception of honesty than the average business man, they may see the situation more clearly. This property was bought or was donated to the Rev. Father Prefontaine, one of the first Catholic missionaries on this Coast, a man whose popularity is limited only to the number of his friends, a man whose long service has been in the interest of humanity. At the time this property was secured the population was about 400 and the lot was worth probably \$400. I am told that the property has been sold for \$70,000.

What created that \$69,600? The building will be moved away. The lots are not any larger nor the soil any richer. What created that value? Every man, woman and child in this city had something to do with the increase of that property value which increased as population increased. The population has grown to 140,000, so that every man, woman and child has created 50 cents each of that increased value of that particular property, and every other church property and all other property in Seattle. If every man, woman and child would leave here tomorrow the whole value would disappear. Eastern capitalists come here and carry away millions of money created by the increase of population and leave nothing in re-

turn. The church money will be spent here. The church will build a grand cathedral, the supervision of which, as well as the Catholic moral supervision, will be under the wise direction of the Rt. Rev. Bishop O'Dea, ably assisted by the Rev. Father O'Brien, whose greatest ambition would be to raise the morals of the people as high above their present plane as the spire of his cathedral will tower over the zero tide mark of Elliot Bay. There is no doubt but the people have received ample compensation for the use of the old church grounds so far. We will never know how much it has saved the city in criminal cases; how many men she has kept out of the gutter; how many children she has put on the right road, but that does not prove the right of private ownership. Private ownership offsets more than all the good the church can do. What more than anything else prevents the realization of the injustice of private ownership and stands in the way of a candid consideration of any proposition for abolishing it than the mental habit that makes everything that has long existed seem natural and necessary? We are so used to the treatment of land as individual property and it is so thoroughly recognized in our laws, manners and customs, that a vast majority of the people never think of questioning it, but look on it as necessary to the use of land. They are unable to conceive, or at least it does not enter their minds, society as existing or as possible without the reduction of land to private possession. The sacredness of property has been preached so constantly and effectually, especially by those conservators of ancient barbarism, that most people look upon the private ownership of land as the very foundation of civilization, and if the resumption of land as common property is suggested they think of it at first blush either as a chimerical vagary which never was and never can be realized, or as a proposition to overturn society and bring about a revision to barbarism.

REV. MR. GRAHAM ON HENRY GEORGE'S THEORY.

Some fifteen years ago I was keeping hotel at Grand Forks, North Dakota. A man came off the train and registered as Rev. Graham, Philadelphia, Pa. In conversation he said his business in North Dakota was to sell some land he had bought some four years before. He had bought from a man who had been in North Dakota and went back to Pennsylvania, got short of money and sold him the 160 acres for \$400. It had up to that time cost him \$600. He had a letter from a man in Nelson county, where his land lay, offering him \$1,600 for the tract. He asked what land was worth in that locality. I

thought \$1,600 was a fair offer for 160 acres. "What is land worth in this locality?" "From \$40 to \$100." "Why is it worth more here than in Nelson county?" "More densely settled." "Is this land any better?" "No." "Raise any more to the acre?" "No." "Any harder to cultivate?" "No." "Get any more for wheat?" "No." "Then I would think that land in Nelson county should be worth as much as this." "Yes, you would think so; but it is more thickly settled around here, that creates a demand. Fifty to one hundred miles west of Nelson county you can get land for \$1.25 per acre, or you can get a government claim of 160 acres by living on it." "Is that land as good as this?" "Yes." "As good as the land in Nelson county, as easy to cultivate, and price of wheat the same?" "Yes." "What makes land so cheap out there?" "Being sparsely settled. When McHenry county is as densely settled as this county the price will be the same."

Mr. Graham, in the course of a conversation, picked up a paper, the old Henry George "Standard," smiled and said: "I see you have the crazy Henry George literature out west, too." I said: "Mr. Graham, perhaps you do not understand Mr. George's land theory." We talked single tax for about an hour, but we could not agree. "Now, Mr. Graham, you say you bought 160 acres of land in Nelson county?" "Yes." "You say it cost you \$600.00, \$400.00 for the land, taxes and interest and time and traveling expenses amounted to \$200.00 more, and now you are offered \$1,600.00 for the land. Now, Mr. Graham, you are a minister of the gospel and must have a clear conception of honesty. Will you please tell what you will leave the people of Nelson county, what you will give this commonwealth in return for that \$1,000?" Well, he said that was the rise of value in the land. "Did you create that rise in value, Mr. Graham?" "My time and money did." "You got your money all back, with interest, and pay for your time in the \$600, but you have not told us what you give for this \$1,000. That \$1,000 was created, as we have seen, by the increase of population in the different counties not by any energy, time or money of yours. If emigration stopped when you bought or when your friend sold, the land would not be worth any more now than \$400. When you bought you gambled on the rise. With all the respect due to the cloth you wear, as far as that deal went, you are no better than any other gambler who makes gambling his trade. Yours is the worst kind of gambling, you tie up the land and make the farmer slave to the amount of the rise. Your \$1,000 is not a drop in the bucket to the millions taken from the farmers every year. You are of the class of men Mr. George is after."

There is a lot on the corner of Second and Cherry street that sold for \$240,000. Every man, woman and child created \$1.75 of that value. If you do not think so, you move the people of Seattle all across the Sound, say to Eagle Harbor, and the lot on Cherry street will not sell for 240 cents. So you see it is the people collectively who create the value in land. Now, if the people create this value, why should they not get it instead of allowing one man to take it all; taking that which he did not create? Thus violating the science of political economy and the third cardinal principle of political economy.

There is no preacher, priest, pope or president who can refute that science.

THE TARIFF.

The next most important violation of the third cardinal principle of political economy—the greatest good to the greatest number—is the tariff. There has been so much said on this question that it is almost stale, and it is no nearer solution than it was twenty years ago. And the question, “Is it right or is it not?” still continues.

The best that any logical reasoning can figure is that the science of tariff is to lift yourself by the boot straps. It is the science of taxing yourself rich. My first experience with tariff was forty years ago down in the Province of New Brunswick, with an old homestead on one side of the line and our principal trading post, Calais, Maine, on the other. There is where you can get a practical illustration of a protective tariff. There is where you can see it in all its deformity, in all its scourge and brutality. There was not a man or woman on either side of the line who was not bitterly opposed to it and would violate that law every chance they got, except, of course, the manufacturers, and they would smuggle everything they could except their own product. Men who would not steal a postage stamp would not hesitate to defraud the revenue department of ten, fifty or a hundred dollars. There was tariff both ways, about all the products from the province were shut out and most all from the other side were taxed to come in. There was 50 cents on a barrel of flour. Fifteen cents would carry it to Liverpool and ad valorem all along the line. In North Dakota I lived for twenty-six years. The principal export was wheat. The price at Liverpool governed the price the world over. Everything the farmer used was raised by the tariff from 20 to 50 per cent. The only thing that Dakota got protection on was four cents a pound on wool. Four cents on all the wool of the largest crop ever raised in North Dakota did not amount to \$5,000.

The tax on the manufactured woolen goods that the people used amounted to \$500,000. The farmer was on the wrong side of the ledger.

UNIONS' EFFECT ON PRICE OF LABOR.

It is claimed that the tariff raises wages. Supply and demand govern wages except where unions interfere to hold them up. I have seen it in Dakota, when wheat was \$1 per bushel, men were plenty and could be had for \$1.50 per day. Then, when wheat was 50 cents and men scarce, we would have to pay \$2.50 per day.

By tariff you shut out foreign goods; that shuts down foreign manufactories, and the foreigner comes over and takes the American's job. That does not protect American labor. This enables the manufacturer to get men cheap, and the tariff enables him to get high prices. That is not the greatest good to the greatest number. The logical conclusion of the tariff would be back to primitive man. If a tariff is a good thing between nations it must be a good thing between states; if it is a good thing between states, it must be a good thing between counties; if it is a good thing between counties, it must be a good thing between townships; if it is a good thing between townships, it must be a good thing between sections; if it is a good thing between sections, it must be a good thing between lots. Now we are down to primitive man, where every man built his own hut, killed his own game, made his own clothes and cooked his own food. It is between nations as it is between men. A carpenter would not make his own shoes nor clothes. He could buy more of those things for what he could earn as a carpenter in one day than he could make in two. Some countries are adapted to lumbering, some to stock-raising, some to fruit-growing, and some to mining. The lumberman can save energy by selling lumber and buying fruit, and so all along the line. True science of commerce knows no lines. It will go where and as far as it is profitable. That is the only law to regulate commerce. There are very few men sent to Washington who have experience in commerce. When one such gets to Washington he is led around by some corporation lawyer to make special laws in favor of some big corporation. Not a law of the greatest good for the greatest number. In North Dakota the McCormick Machine Company charges the farmer \$75 for a seeder. They sell the same machine in Manitoba for \$45, and all other machinery the same way. That is what the people get for voting them protection.

Take off the tariff and they will sell you the same as they

do to the foreigner. Steel rails that sell for \$28 in this country are sold abroad for \$19. The same condition exists in all other lines.

Any man who has a logical brain who reads John Stewart Mill's work on "International Commerce" will see the absurdity of a protective tariff. That work educated the English people and made them the greatest commercial people of the world and for years supreme on land and sea. She will never appreciate Sir Robert Peel until she adopts American protection.

As a source of revenue it is unjust. It takes one million dollars from the people to get two hundred thousand dollars in the treasury. Take the fifty-eight millions that was raised from sugar—the widow with ten boarders will pay more of that tax than a millionaire who has a small family because she uses more sugar. The tax is mostly on staple goods that the poor have to use. It is a tax that no man or woman escapes.

The protectionist will tell you this is the greatest country in the world because of the tariff. This is a great country, not because of a high tariff, but in spite of it. The tariff enables manufacturers to raise prices. The rise of price curtails consumption. The curtailing of consumption curtails labor. The curtailing of consumption and labor causes panics. The tariff interests and influence have completely corrupted our government at Washington. Protected industries donate large sums of money to the campaign funds. In 1896 the Republican campaign fund amounted to fourteen million dollars, used to buy up and elect representatives of the people and use them, not for the greatest good of the greatest number, but in the interest of corporate greed. A corporation or individual can afford to give a million to enact a law whereby he can make ten millions. This money is not paid to get just laws; it is to get unjust laws passed that gives them advantage over the people at large. It would not be necessary to buy men to make just laws. The tariff forces join with all other grafts, saying, "If you vote for my steal I will vote for yours."

HOW WASHINGTON AFFECTS OUR REPRESENTATIVES.

When a man is elected to Congress or the Senate the chances are that he has been elected by the help of the campaign fund. He is already bought. He gets on his dog collar and gets into line. He has nothing to do with making laws against a tariff or on any other important law that is in the interest of the people. He sold that right when he accepted.

the money that elected him to office. There are men elected and sent to Washington without the aid of the tariff campaign fund, but such a one finds he is up against a strong combination. He will not get what honestly, in the way of an appropriation, belongs to his state unless he votes with the corporate interests that are already strongly entrenched. If he should fail to get what honestly belongs to the state the subsidized press would point the finger of scorn at him and his own state would have no more use for him. State legislatures and city councils are on the same plane, only on a smaller scale. Any law passed by any of these legislative bodies in the interest of the greatest good to the greatest number would be liable to be set aside as unconstitutional by some corporation judge. I think it logical to say that a protective tariff is diametrically opposed to the cardinal principles of political economy. The competitive system can not be systematized in any logical form.

LAND, LABOR AND TOOLS OF PRODUCTION.

The fourth cardinal principle of political economy—the greatest result from the least exertion—will now take our attention.

The greatest violator of this principle of political science is what is termed capital. Under the competitive system there enters four factors—land, labor, tools of production, and capital.

Under scientific political economy there are only three—land, labor and tools of production. The fourth, capital, is an illusion and does not exist. A false god, a disturbing element. In that science it is negative. We are leaning on something that has no intrinsic value; we are trying to build in the air. You never can run on a scientific basis if you let that factor enter science. Let it out altogether. In the competitive system it is pretty nearly the whole thing. The whole commercial system has almost settled down to one thing—money.

GOLD THE BASE OF ALL VALUE.

Every man you meet talks money; he has no interest in you if you do not. He will sell anything he has in his possession for money. He will sell the homestead where he was born and raised, and his father before him. He will sell the family Bible. There is nothing too sacred. He will sacrifice his honor. He will sanction a law that will take a prostitute's money to pay his taxes. He will sacrifice his health and his

soul. There are several kinds of money in circulation, but they are all based on gold. Since the gold standard law took effect all the world's wealth is measured by it. It is the measure of all commodities; man's day's work is measured by it.

The amount per capita in circulation affects all business. Draw out a few millions and business will be depressed; put a hundred or two millions more into circulation and business will boom, but if you owned all the gold in the world and had it in your cellar it would not feed a canary bird over night. Did you ever stop to think of what a damnable folly the civilized world was a-straddle of? The gold of the world today is manipulated in Wall street and Lombard street by gamblers, who loan out or call in as it suits the game. They can raise prices or they can lower prices, as they see fit, by such games as we read of in "Frenzied Finance." Sage, a man 85 years old, the other day dealt a hand in New York. He called in twenty millions and created a panic on Wall street, which resulted in a rush to cover shorts. That created a demand for money and he loaned out the twenty millions at 4 per cent and cleaned up \$30,000. A nice afternoon's work for the old gent. That is not scientific economy, but it is what we call business; not business for the greatest number, but to rob the greatest number in the interest of the gambler. That is the fourth factor in the competitive system, that is its especial function. It disturbs the other three.

It is estimated that every dollar in gold takes twenty days' work to produce it, when a quarter of a cent in the shape of promise to pay would do just as well. Can you estimate the amount of energy and toil that would save the human race? Can you estimate the amount of energy, labor and time that is wasted on the gold we are getting out of Alaska? See the amount of men there are up there; see the ships employed; see the thousands of tons of freight; see the railroads building up there. There is nothing else produced there, so it must all be charged up to gold. Under the cardinal principle of the greatest result from the least exertion, all that could be saved and life in the line of least resistance is demonstrated by the science of political economy. The money question has agitated the human race as far back as history can be traced, and with all the knowledge and science of today, it is no nearer solution than it was two hundred years ago.

MR. GEORGE'S THEORY A FALSE ONE.

Mr. George in his noted work, *Progress and Poverty*, theorized with four factors: Capital, Land, Labor and Tools

of Production. Mr. George's theory of land ownership was correct, and the single tax, as it were, gave a ray of light, and the propaganda spread all over this country and Europe. Clubs were formed all over the country, but when they tried to harmonize it with the other three factors, it would not work. Under the competitive system, land and labor could not work without the tools of production, and the money question mixed them up still more. The press was not slow to show up the inconsistency of the theory, and today there is very little interest in single tax.

FALLACY OF THE COMPETITIVE SYSTEM.

The theory of public ownership was sound, but the private ownership of production was not sound. To work scientific economy it must be all sound. The four cardinal principles of the economic science must be applied. Mr. George's campaign demonstrated that the people are all ready for a change.

The fourth cardinal principle of political economy is also violated by our present mercantile system. Take a glance along the four principal business streets in this city, each one a mile long. You will see that every twenty-five feet is occupied by some business or store of some kind, and from ten to six hundred of each kind. Those stores are paying from \$50 to \$500 per month rent. They will have from one to three hundred clerks. Some of those clerks may not have to work more than one-third of the time, some may work half the time, and some work hard all the time. Some stores are making money and some are losing money. Some sell at one price, some at another, and they all despise the other fellow in the same business. They will lie about each other. They will mark up goods today and down tomorrow. They will charge one man one price and one another. They will mark down goods to show that the other fellow is robbing the people, then mark them up and say the other fellow's goods are no good. They all have various quantities and qualities. Some buy the same goods at the same price and some at another price. Some pay cash, some buy on time. Some sell for cash, some sell on time. Some are honest and will pay for their goods, some will fail and put the money in their pockets. Some will set their stores on fire and burn them up for the insurance. Some will trade their stock for some other property. Some will sell out and quit the business. But it is the history of the merchants that ninety per cent. go to the wall, and that is one of the causes of the uneven distribution of wealth. It violates the law of the

greatest result from the least exertion. It is not in the line of least resistance. It is not scientific economy.

No safe or sane business man would conduct his business in this manner. He would at least have the different branches under one head in one department, instead of three hundred different heads and departments. But you will say that is a trust, a monopoly. But it is the greatest result from the least exertion. It is science. It is the law of evolution. You cannot stop it.

It may and will become oppressive. The oppression is no part of the science, and science will reach out further and stop the oppression. Great centralization of the production of wealth under one head is the science of political economy, and it has no limit.

The science is not complete until every blow struck, all wealth produced, all land and all sea, belonging to this country, is under one head. You will say that is one grand monopoly, one great trust, and will be oppressive. Yes, it could be, but we will not stop there. Science will take the man as it did the product. The laboring man who creates all the wealth of the world in his battle for existence has no perfect organization. He is like the general who would go out with 100,000 men and tell them all to go on their own hook. What kind of a fight would that general make? A captain with one hundred well drilled men would drive him off the field. But now they are organizing and drilling in squads all over the world, and in time they will come up solid under one head. There will be ten to one with ballots or bullets in favor of the working man. Mr. Bryan, it is safe to say, is one of the most honest and conscientious that ever mixed in politics. To whom you may well apply that high compliment, he would rather be right than be president, has always opposed the combination of large corporations. But there is no just law, no scientific law, that should stop a system that is in the line of the greatest result from the least exertion.

W. J. BRYAN ON PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

The combination of wealth is the law of self-preservation for the corporation, just as the organization of labor is the self-preservation of labor. Mr. Bryan lately is advocating the state ownership of railroads. So far so good. That is the principle of Socialism, and if it is sound policy to apply to railroads, it is sound to apply to all other tools of production. The people have the same right to the land. There we have the three factors necessary to production. That will be true.

justice. The greatest good to the greatest number; the greatest result from the least exertion.

In the great ocean of human events we are at sea without a rudder. The ship of state has no pilot. There is no compass aboard the ship. Every other science has its professors. They are rewarded according to their ability. Lionized if they make new discoveries, they have all made wonderful progress. But this great science of political economy that is useful in everyday life and should be used in everyday transactions is never applied. We are about as helpless as a boy who did not know the multiplication tables trying to straighten out a bank account, and we must commence at the twice one are two. We must learn the $a b c$, and the way is to go back to primitive man and see where he first left the track. We must be careful and go slow.

MAN IN THE PRIMITIVE AGE.

When primitive man built his own hut, made his own fire, killed his own game, tanned his hides and made his own clothes, and cooked his own grub, he had no trouble, and the system was perfect. No man got one cent's worth of what he produced; his neighbor did the same thing. But in the course of human events they discovered that some men were better at some particular kind of work than others. Another thing they learned, that the more a man worked at one thing the more proficient he became. The old way was as simple as it was honest. But it was not in the line of the greatest result from the least exertion. And primitive man proceeded to apply the first science.

Now we will keep close to the cardinal principles of political economy and see where they were first violated, and where primitive man made his first error and left the track.

We will commence our example with one man representing each factor in the simple life of that age. There was the hut builder, the hunter, the tanner, the tailor, the shoe maker, the toolmaker, the cook, the fisherman, the boat builder and the grave digger. The hut builder would build all the huts and would exchange his work for one-tenth part of the other nine. The hunter would do the same, and so with all the rest, and one man, to be fair to all the others, should take and consume his tenth from each one. As long as they did so the plan worked all right. But in the course of time some one got hurt in the hunt or got sick, or some one became demented, another had a large family. In case of the disabled man, he

could not produce his share. In the case of the man with a large family he would have to have more than his tenth from each one. Here is where they should apply that cardinal principle, the greatest good to the greatest number. There is where they should have formed co-operation. A little more from each one would have taken care of the feeble and the large family. But they violated the law of science, and they violated the law of brotherly love.

CAPITAL AS A DISTURBING ELEMENT.

Some one more shrewd and more selfish than the rest, fearing that want might overtake him, conceived the idea of saving part of his share of the product, or what is now called curtailing expenses. He would not take the full tenth from each one in produce. He would take their promise to pay, less the amount that he was barely forced to use. That balance might be one-third of one-tenth from each one. That one-third is what is called capital, and where it first showed its head. That is the idle capital that lays in the banks. It was conceived in iniquity and born in sin. In the first place it was a crime against himself by depriving himself of the necessities of life. He became what we call a miser. He did not feed himself properly nor clothe himself properly. He would drop out of society to save expenses. He was not fair to the community. He caused overproduction. He caused lack of consumption on his own part and curtailed production on the part of his neighbors. He then takes the capital or promises to pay that he prostituted his manhood to accumulate and loans it to the destitute or the man with the large family, at his own terms, and those terms, as in the case of all shylocks, are not favorable to the borrower, who in time becomes his slave.

WHAT GIVES VALUE TO GOLD OR SILVER.

There came another disturbing element to the body politic which was worse than the first. Man found, in groping over the earth, what is known as precious metals and precious stones. These were of no value at first, but were used as ornaments, as there was no intrinsic value connected with them, but in time a demand was created on account of their beauty. False pride gave them a value, and they came to be exchanged for goods. But gold and diamond buyers were not consumers. They, like the miser, caused lack of consumption. Another cause that gave them value was when the tribe was conquered.

by some other tribe. All their belongings would be taken, but the gold and diamonds could be hidden or carried away.

As population increased, the hunting ground became in greater demand, and kept the tribes in a turmoil, one being in possession today and another tomorrow, until there was nothing safe to base a value on except gold or precious stones. It then becomes a factor in the body politic. More especially in modern civilization and its functions, in the hands of unscrupulous men, its damage to the human race cannot be estimated.

Gold and silver get their values from their scarcity, and it has always been the policy of the manipulators to keep them scarce. All panics can only be accounted for by the scarcity of money. There never was a time in the history of the world when over-circulation of money caused any trouble, but the scarcity of money always gave the money changers big interest, and they, being the manipulators, took every precaution to oppose any theory that would interfere with big interest. All money questions are referred to the bankers.

Money changers got control of the gold and made it the standard of measure, and that was only 17 per cent. of what was necessary to do the business of the country. And then not for any length of time could it be a standard. As measured per capita, money drawn out of circulation shrinks the measure, and prices will fall to that extent. Throw \$200,000,000 into circulation and prices will rise. So you see it is not a standard or a measure for any length of time. Back in the fifties there was a great emigration west to Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota. There was the state banking law at that time, and the banks issued money on farmers' collateral. They opened up farms, built houses, roads, bridges, schools and churches, and business in all branches was flourishing. But the money changers in Wall Street were not getting rich out of that deal, and word was sent out that state banks were not sound, and the whole business was stopped and one-half of the people returned east. That was a case where the people were doing business with their own money and had all they wanted. They claimed that the trouble was no gold behind them. But there was farm lands and farmers' improvements. They had intrinsic value.

BANK OF VENICE.

About 1750 the Bank of Venice, then the financial center of the world, was at its height. All large concerns in Europe

did business through credit at the Bank of Venice. At that time the high seas were overrun with pirates, and outlying districts were overrun with brigands, and it was not safe to carry treasure, so all treasure was sent to the Bank of Venice and credit extended through that bank. Millions of dollars' worth of business was done on the strength of the immense wealth that was supposed to lay in the vaults of the Bank of Venice. But while the world was doing business on the bank's promise to pay, the gold did not lie idle in the vaults. It was used in making Venice a blaze of grandeur such as the world had never seen. When Napoleon captured that city he made a dash for the bank, but the vaults were covered with dust. There had been no gold there for years, and the world had been doing business on the bank's promise to pay, which was just as good, while Venice made a gorgeous display with the gold. The using of the gold and the promises to pay doubled the circulating medium, hence the glories of Venice.

This shows what the wealth making power could do if it ever got the money changers off their backs.

ENGLAND'S RAKE-OFF IN THE DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

England was one of the powers behind the demonetization of silver. She wanted cheap silver. She could take 53 cents, buy our silver, make it into rupees and do business in India, where we would have to pay 100 cents. This gave England a 47 per cent advantage with 275,000,000 population in India. Then, to add still more to their power and profit, the money changers influenced the English government to close the mints of India to the coinage of silver. That closed most of the silver mines in India, as it did not pay to work them, as in the United States. That destroyed one of India's industries and forced them to take the 53 cents at 100 cents in the shape of the rupee, with the stamp of the realm, that they claimed gave it the extra value. They bought the natives' silver at 53 cents and forced them to take it back for services or produce at 100 cents. The money changer always jealously guarded against any move that would make opposition in his line.

PANIC FAILURES OF '93.

The statistics of the mint and assay offices show that from 1793 up to 1893 the coinage of gold and silver were pretty near even, two million and some odd thousand being in favor

of silver. There never was a time in that period that there was any trouble from too much money, but all panics in that period were caused from scarcity of money. The most depressing times in the last century was from 1845 to 1849, when gold was first discovered in California. From that time up to 1893 that state produced from \$1,000,000 to \$35,000,000 in gold each year. Montana, Colorado, Nevada and other states produced large quantities of gold and silver, but the rich silver mines of Montana, Colorado and Nevada caused alarm in the camp of the money changers, and they determined to suppress that opposition. That silver was demonetized, and how it was done, is well known to those that have closely watched the financial question. Although it had been coined for twenty years, under the supervision of John Sherman, who was the hired tool of Wall and Lombard Streets, a man who was the leader in all financial moves at Washington, a man who was a traitor to the best interests of his country, with the help of Grover Cleveland's safe and sane policy, did much to demonetize silver as well as to disrupt his party.

In the spring of ninety the Sherman bill, limiting the coinage of silver to \$4,500,000, was repealed, and the greatest panic of the last century occurred. Banks went down all over the country, thirteen in one week failing in Minneapolis alone.

The Hypotheek Bank, of Spokane, a branch of the Loan & Savings Bank of Holland, loaned on farms and city property in the States of Washington, Idaho and Oregon \$12,000,000. This was loaned on a one-third valuation. The contracting of the currency by one-half by demonetization of silver caused the price of produce to fall to the same level. That left no profit to pay the mortgage. This caused the value of the farm to shrink until it would not sell for the mortgage. The money changer built better than he kenw. They discovered that they could not get their money back. The Bank of Holland offered to settle with the directors of the Hypotheek Bank for \$9,000,000, but at that time they could not raise \$1,000,000 at Spokane. They therefore foreclosed on perhaps 75 per cent. of the property, and the men who had owned hundred thousand dollar blocks were glad to get a job as janitor, and I believe you had the same experience in Seattle.

The excuse made by the money changers for demonetizing silver was that there was too much money, and they told about the "sound dollar." They said that if one-half of the money were thrown away the other half would do the business all right. It would be better for the banks and the people, too. It was certainly better for the banker, but ruin for the man who had debts to pay. But we must have sound money.

It was like a man who had cornered all the wheat in the country. He would tell you that all else that man used for food was not sound, and would get a law passed excluding all other food. He could then get a good round price for the wheat.

Another reason, and a proof that there was too much money, was that when the times were hard there was the most money in the bank, and that too much money was the cause. Money naturally rushes to the bank when any disturbance causes prices to fall. A man will not buy land or build houses if prices are going to fall. He will want to put it out on interest. It is put in the bank and checked out to some one who will give good security. That comes in competition with the banker, and he feels the reaction of his own squeeze. It works like an endless chain. The ultimate result is to destroy all values. The money changer then lays back.

The producing power will start at any pace and produce wealth, and the inflow of gold will stimulate prices, but the money changer, like the vulture, will be ready to light on fresh carrion. The gold is not a sound basis, but he lives off carrion. Gold could not be made the measure of values. On the other hand is the fact that if there was no limit it would take a ton to buy a sack of flour. There is no way to make a just measure for a man's day's work. There is no measure, no fair measure, of a man's day's work but the fair day's work of another man. Who ever tries will waste his time in trying to solve it.

Capital and the private ownership of land and land values are two disturbing elements.

There are ten thousand twenty-five-foot lots in this city, which can make ten thousand parasites, who will take from society all the way from a bare living to \$5,000 a year on Western, First, Second and Third, between the tide flats and Queen Anne Hill. The value is created by the people collectively. If you do not believe that, let all the people move over to, say, Eagle Harbor, take six miles square over there that is now worth \$10 an acre, and you will transfer the values, and Seattle will be worth \$10 per acre. So you see the people create the value, and not the private owner, and it is just to give the value to them who create it, and when a man wants it he wants what belongs to another. This is science. This is political economy.

We have gone over the situation carefully and we cannot apply science to private ownership, no more than we can use gold for a measure of value. Science will not allow it. It violates the four cardinal principles of political economy,

truth, justice, the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result for the least exertion.

Some people have a horror of the idea of **Socialism**, Communism or Co-operation. But we do not observe how near all wealth is to community interests. A man may own business blocks and dwelling houses, they will be all rented to the people. He may own mills and manufactories, they are producing for the people. He may have a farm, the crops are for the people. He may have ships at sea, shipping goods over the world to those who want. He has money in the bank. Everyone can use it that will secure the bank, except 20 per cent that the banks are compelled to hold. All interests at large are protected by the people. Those various interests are controlled by various persons, and are spasmodic, and therefore cannot be systematized. Under co-operation they could be regulated under the law of the greatest good for the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion.

SOCIALISM SELF-CONDEMNED BY J. SEFTEN, S. J.

An article in the Catholic Progress of November 4, 1904, termed "Socialism Self Condemned. Socialism labors under the disadvantage of having placed itself on record touching social, religious and economic questions. An able paper based on authentic utterances of exponents of this impossible system."

"The articles I have so far published on the subject of Socialism have brought me some private letters from Socialist leaders, among their associates personally well known—meaning men as far as I can judge who have deceived themselves as to the real purposes of the party to which they belong. They tell me I do not understand Socialism, and they claim naturally enough that they know more about their own society than outsiders are likely to do, yet an outsider may have studied the writing of their acknowledged leaders more thoroughly and closely than thousands among the Socialists. If I have misunderstood these writings I wish to give my correspondents and other gentlemen of their class an opportunity to point out my mistake. But the main purpose I have in writing this paper is to disabuse those imagining that Socialism is on the whole a just and beneficent system of government. I maintain on the contrary that it is inconsistent with morality and sound sense, and it is subversive of Christianity and all religion of the family and the state. To prove this I will let the leading Socialists speak for themselves.

First, Socialism is destructive of all Christianity, and in fact all religion.

James Leatham, a prominent English Socialist, wrote in his work, "Socialism and Character," 1897: At the present moment I cannot remember of a single instance of a person who is at the same time a really earnest and intelligent Socialist and an orthodox Christian. Those who do not openly attack the church and the fabric of Christianity show but scant respect to either one or the other in private, and all are thus indifferent to the church. Many of us are frankly hostile to her. Marx, Lasalle, Ingalls, Morris, Beach, Hindman, Geosde and Bebel are all more or less atheists."

When the writer makes the statement that Socialism is opposed to all religion he begs the question. There are 1,200 Socialist votes in this city; 1,900 in this county; 7,000 in this state, and 1,000,000 in the United States. Will the writer tell us what he knows about the religious belief of those million voters? How many has he interviewed in regard to their spiritual affairs? I am personally acquainted with more good Catholics who are Socialists than you have mentioned in your list, and they do not see anything in Socialism to conflict with their faith. Socialism is based on the four cardinal principles of political economy—truth, justice, the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion—and there is nothing in the Catholic church that condemns those cardinal principles. This is the base of Socialism, irrespective of any religion; it takes in all Christendom, all Gentiles, all Buddhists, all Mohamedans, all Atheists, all Spiritualists, all Materialists, all white men, all yellow men, all black men, all God's human race. And when any one tells you they don't, you tell them they do not understand Socialism. And when you say they are opposed to the church you do not understand Socialism. If you will take Webster and define the word you will find that he says it is a social state in which there is a community of property among all the people of a state. That is Socialism. Nothing more nor less, as governed by the science of political economy. Science is knowledge. Is there any crime about this? I can not discover any crime there, and I have studied it for fifteen years.

The trouble with the writer is that he is judging Socialism by some bad Socialists he has happened to hear from. If we should judge Christianity by some Christians we would have a bad opinion of Christianity. James Leatham would not be authority on all the English Socialists' spiritual convictions no more than you could be in this country. Spiritual convictions are one thing and politics is another. If all the English Socialists were Atheists, that would not mean that Socialism was wrong, nor that it was Socialism that made them Atheists.

for they never lived under that system. If the system of the government had anything to do with making them Atheists it must be the present system.

Wilhelm Liebknecht wrote: "It is our duty as Socialists to root out the faith of God with all our zeal, nor is any one worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of Atheism.'

The irrational, unnatural, unscientific philosophy that science is opposed to religion is as false as it is dangerous, and demoralizing as the blasphemy of Liebknecht, and all that school of philosophy taught by Hagel and other spiritual degenerates.

SCIENCE A WORD MUCH ABUSED.

Science is a word much abused just now when all sorts of pretenders to special knowledge style themselves scientists and all sorts of poorly verified speculations are called science. Yet it has a well defined meaning which may be easily kept in mind. Literally, the word means knowledge, and is used to distinguish a particular kind of knowledge that is the highest and the deepest kind.

THE FOUR SCHOOLS OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

There are four schools of modern philosophy—sensualism, idealism, skepticism, and mysticism. Each one of those schools is voluminous in detail.

Sensualism admits of no theory, no reasoning, no philosophy, beyond sense impression. What you can not see, feel, smell, hear or taste do not exist. This is the result of Materialism and Atheism.

Idealism was first advocated by Hume, an English philosopher of the fifteenth century, who wrote that noted work called the "Origin of Ideas." This, too, dispensed with God, as he could not formulate a cause outside of matter. Agnosticism originated from the Philosophy of Spencer and Huxley. They could not discover God in material objects, to sense impression, gravitation and vibration, and decided there was nothing beyond. If that is not God, what the devil can it be? Those three schools merge into one another. Their advocates were some of the brightest and ablest men of the three last centuries—Humes, Locke, Scoupenheur, Speniza, Kant, Voltaire, Tindall, Hagel, Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and a thousand lesser lights. They were men of large reasoning and perceptive quali-

ties, deep students in material science, and unlimited command of language. Their deep scientific research in the material plane gave them a profound air of great knowledge, giving them prestige, as it were, over the common people. Besides their theories came in conflict with the teachings of the church, which called the attention of the Christian world to their philosophy, and all ignorant and weak in their faith were swept off their feet or became indifferent. This is what created Atheism, not Socialism. Sixty per cent of the American people belong to nor church, the result of these schools of modern philosophy.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF THE ABSOLUTE.

In our search for substance, in our search for reality, we employ two factors—the subject and the object. For the object we will take a square piece of material. It is white. It is heavy. It is hard. We have reduced the square to qualities of the subject, but there is no relation between qualities and subject to create any change that is perceptible. There is no relation between white and hardness, nor between hardness and weight that creates substance or reality. The color is conveyed to the mind by vision. No one has ever yet discovered or can explain vision. The weight is conveyed to the brain by the power of gravitation. That power is likewise a mystery to man. Hardness is conveyed to the brain by touch. Hardness is caused by vibration. We do not know what vibration is. When we are asked as to reality or matter which fills up the empty outline we can reply in one word that this matter is experience. Experience means much the same as given and present fact. But the alleged independence of reality is no fact, but a theoretical construction, and so far as it has a meaning contradicts itself and results in chaos. And since it seems that what appears must somewhere certainly be one, and since this unity is a not to be discovered phenomena, the reality threatens to migrate to other worlds than ours.

The purpose of philosophy, as has been pointed out, is to know God, which is to know things in their truth. To see all things in God; to comprehend the world in its eternal significance.

Suppose the purpose capable of being achieved, what method is open to its attainment?

There is on one hand the method of ordinary science in dealing with its objects. These are things, found, as it were, projected into space, before the observer, lying outside one another in prima facie independence, though connected by a

further finding with each other by certain accidents called realities and relations.

Among the objects of knowledge there are included by the somewhat naive intellect, that accepts tradition like physical fact, certain things of a rather peculiar character. One of these is God. The others, which a historical criticism has subjoined, are the soul and the world. And whatever may be said of the reality or existence of the world, there is no doubt that God and the soul figure, and figure largely, in the consciousness of the human race as entities, differing probably in many respects from other things, but still possessed of certain fundamental features in common, and thus playing a part as distinct realities as amongst other realities.

Given such objects, it is natural for a reflecting mind to attempt to make out a science of the soul just as other things. To these a system-loving philosopher might add a science of the world (Cosmos). It was felt, indeed, that these objects were peculiar and unique. Thus, for example, as regards God, it was held necessary by the logician who saw tradition in its true light to prove His existence, and various arguments to that end were at different times devised. With regard to the human soul similar it was considered essential to establish its independent reality as a thing really separate from the body organism with which its phenomena were obviously connected. To prove, in short, its substantial existence and its emancipation from the bodily fate of dissolution and decay.

With reference to the world the problem was rather different. It was felt that the name suggested problems for thought rather than denoted reality. How can we predicate of the whole what is predicated of its parts. This or that may have a beginning and a cause, may have a limit and an end; but can the totality be presented under these aspects without leading to self-contradiction? And the result of these questions in cosmology was to shed, in the long run, similar doubts on rational theology and rational psychology. Practically, this metaphysical science, which is so called in dealing with the province or provinces of being, beyond the ordinary or the natural physical realities, treated God and the soul by the same terms or categories as it is used in material objects. God, e. g., was a force, a cause, an end; so, too, was the soul.

The main butt of Kant's destructive criticism of pure reason was to challenge the justice of including God and the soul among the objects of science, which you may know, as we may know, as plants or stars. To make an object of knowledge in the strict sense, is to make a thing the perceived. Rand urges that perception is space and time. Without a sensation, and

that sensation as it were laid out in place and duration, an object of science is impossible. No mere demonstration will conjure it into existence. With these requirements, the old theological psychology, which professed to expound the object, God and the subject soul were ruled out of order in the list of science and reduced to mere dialectical exercises.

The circle of the science therefore does not lead beyond the region of space and time. This has nothing to say of a first cause or of an ultimate end.

Such was the result that might be fairly read from Kant's criticism of pure reason, especially if read without its supplementary sequels, and above all if read by those in whom the feeling was stronger than thought or who were by nature more endowed with the craving for faith than with the mind of philosophy. The criticism of pure reason has been described by its author as a generalization of Hume's problem. Hume, he thought, had treated this on the relation of ideas on their bearing upon matters of fact, mainly with the isolated case of cause and effect. Kant estimated the inquiry so as to comprise all the connective and unified ideas which form the subject matter of metaphysics. In his own technical language, which has lost its meaning for the present day, he asked our sympathetic judgments, a priori, possibly, a question which in another place has been translated into form. Is the metaphysical faith of man sound and is metaphysical faith possible? By metaphysics he meant in the first instance the belief in a more than empirical reality, and secondly the science which should give real knowledge of God, freedom and immortality. A science whose object would be God, the world and the soul. From a comparatively early date, 1764, Kant had been inclined to suspect and distrust the claims of metaphysics, to replace faith, and to give knowledge of spiritual reality, and he had tried to vindicate for the moral and religious life an independence of the conclusion, and the methods of the conclusions and the methods of the metaphysical theology, and psychology of the day. But it was not until some years later, in 1770, that he formulated any very definite views as to the essential conditions of scientific knowledge, and it was not until 1781 that his theory on the subject was put together in a provisionally complete shape. What then are the criteria of science? When is our thought, knowledge, and of objective reality? In the first place, there must be a given something, a sense datum, an impression, as Hume might have said. If there be no impression, there can be no scientific idea, no real knowledge. There must be the primary touch, the feeling, the affection, the contact with reality.

Second, what is given can only be received if taken by the recipient, and in such measure as he is able to appropriate it. The given is received in a certain mood. In the present case the sensation is apprehended and perceived under the forms of space and time.

Perception, in other words, whatever may be its special quality or its sensuous material, is always an act of dating and localization. The distinction between the mere lump of feeling or sensibility, and the perception, is that the latter implies a field of extension and mutually excluding parts of space and a series of points of time, both field and series being continuous, and so far as inexhaustibility goes, infinite.

Third, even in the reception of the given there is action and spontaneity. If the more passive reciprocity be called science this active element in the adaptation may be termed intellect. Intellect is a power or process of choice, selection, comparison, distinguishing and dividing analysis and synthesis, affirmation and rejection, remuneration of judgment, and doubt of connection and injunction, differentiation and integration. In general aspects Kant sometimes described as judgment. The act of thought which correlates by distinguishing, sometimes by apperception, and the unity of apperception. It is an active unity and a synthetic energy. It unifies, and always unifies. It links perception to perception; correlating with one another, interpreting one by the other; estimating the knowledge value of one by the rest. It thus apperceives. It is the faculty of association and consociation of ideas; but the association is an inward and ideal union. The one idea inter-penetrates and fuses with the other, even while it remains distinct.

Kant's work may be described in its first stage as analysis and a criticism of experience. The term experience is an ambiguous one. It sometimes means what has been called the raw material of experience, the crude and undigested mass of poured-in matters of knowledge. If there be such a shapeless lump anywhere, which has to be considered presently, it, at any rate, is not on Kant's view, properly entitled to the name of experience. The given must be felt and apprehended, and, to put the point paradoxically, to be felt it must be more than felt, it must be perceived. In other words, it must be projected, set in space and time, let out of the mere dull inner subjectivity of perception. But, again, to be perceived it must be appreciated. To be set in time and space it must first of all be in the hands of the unifying consciousness, which is the lord of time and space. For, in so far as space and time mean a place and an order, in so far they mean more than an

empty, inconceivable receptacle for bulk of sensation. In the same degree do they presuppose an intuitive synthetic genius, which is in all its perceptions one and the same—the fundamental original unity of consciousness. This analysis of experience is transcendental, beginning with the assumed datum—the object of the experience—it shows that this object, which is supposed to be there, to exist by itself and wait for perception, is created by and in the very act which apprehends it. Climbing up and rising above its habitual absorption in the consciousness of the philosophic observer and analyst, sees the thing in the act of making and watches its growth.

Things are petrified thought, bodies are solidified intelligence.

In our search for reality, in our search for substance with the science of metaphysics we predicate experience. There is limited and unlimited experience, the finite and the infinite experience.

Infinite experience is the absolute. The absolute is not substance. It is not reality. It is not personality. It is not individuality. The absolute is a condition, a condition of united attributes, omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, all knowledge, all truth, all justice, all science, all art, all splendor, all harmony, all unity, all purity, all love, all space and time.

The absolute is not in the universe, nor outside the universe, nor behind the universe. The absolute is the universe; and just as much as man is of these attributes, just so much he is God-like. The finite mind can not comprehend the absolute only to the extent that he comprehends his attributes. As far as we apply those attributes to our daily life so far will our work be perfect.

If we leave out truth and justice, two of the cardinal principles of political economy; if we leave out science of the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion, we violate the attributes of truth, justice and science. So you see that Wilhelm Liebknecht's blasphemy leaves out Socialism as well as God.

The writer in "Catholic Progress" of November 4th quotes Professor Herron in the work of March 30th, 1902, as saying: "Christianity today stands for what is lowest and basest in life." Professor Herron's degenerated spiritual ideas no more disprove Socialism than the outlaw Tracy's conduct disproved the moral law. The same might be said of Carl Marx, Angel and all the rest.

It is a wrong course to dig up abnormal spiritual conditions of a few degenerates to prove or disprove a political

science. If Socialism will succeed it will not be because of men of these ideas, but in spite of them.

These men are the result of conditions of the temporal power of the church, as the tramp is the result of our present commercialism. The various sections of the Christian Church, like commercial interests, come in competition with each other. The more members they can get to join their particular church the stronger they are and the more favors they can claim. These selfish interests are liable to make them discern any variation there may be in the different churches.

To illustrate I quote from a magazine called "Christianity in Earnest," speaking of a Methodist convention in Philadelphia:

"MISSIONARY CONVENTION, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

"October 14th, 1903.

"Difficulties at Home in the World's Evangelization.

"Address by James King, D. D.

"What are some of the obstacles which inject difficulties into the solution of the problem of the world's evangelization? Before enumerating some of the difficulties which will be patent to all in the way of evangelizing this home land, I desire to speak plainly concerning what I esteem to be one of the chief obstacles, if not the chief barrier in the path of the progress of evangelical Christianity, and I propose to speak the more plainly because of what I esteem to be the excuseless sensitiveness upon the subject. I mean the first difficulty—an emasculated, hypnotized, compromising and cowardly Protestantism, in the face of Romanism.

"Protestantism is either an abiding protest against the mummeries of the blasphemy and assumption of Romanism or it is stealing an heroic history and pregnant name as a guise of respectability to which it has no honest claim.

"The recent fulsome eulogies of the late Leo XIII. by Protestants, and notably by Methodist preachers, have furnished both an amusing and nauseating spectacle. The attacks on Protestantism, and especially on Methodism, in Rome and in Italy by the pope are notorious, and the seekers after popularity and notoriety have secured the end of their reach by putting obstacles in the path of honest and trusting believers.

"The eulogized pope claimed to be the vicar of Christ on earth; claimed infallibility, and was absolutely, from childhood to death, under Jesuit education and control, with a reign as intolerant as any of his predecessors for a century. The papal religion means bondage, degradation and bondage. The

Protestant reformation, warring against anti-Christ, purchased for us all our civil and religious liberties at a cost of blood and martyrdom.

“The papacy perverts the Gospel and the pope heads the perversion. It is not the province of Protestantism when it remembers its heredity to take to its bosom a serpent and warm the viper into life that it may use with vigor its deadly sting.

“This evident ignorance of our cowardly compromise with Romanism is one of the principal obstacles in the way of evangelizing this new home world. It robs Protestantism of its courage and aggressive power and gives the rank and file of Protestant believers and adherents to understand there is no distinct and irreconcilable differences between a pure and a false faith, and thus paralyzes individual service and arrests individual sacrifice. Let the representatives of this difficulty in the path of the world's evangelization at home get out of the way, and be honest enough to go to Rome, where they normally belong. Leo XIII., whom these Protestant preachers eulogized and virtually adored, is supposed to be struggling in purgatory, but Pius X. will accept of their adorations and graciously permit them to practice osculatory office upon his sacred ecclesiastical toe.

“Oh, my brethren, is the Protestantism of our times bereft of reason? Is it ashamed of its hereditary? Let us pray for the baptism of self-respect, of common honesty, and common sense, and while we exercise charity toward all men let not our charity furnish a mantle to cover sin or to provide a dagger for the assassination of Christian faith.

“If the utterances of many Protestant ministers are true, then let us be honest enough with our missionaries to Roman Catholic countries and tell the people whose money we have taken for missionary work in these countries, that we have defrauded them, and promptly return their money to them. This will be simply common honesty. But if the Roman Catholic Church has been in history and is today a politico-ecclesiastical conspiracy, against the liberties of mankind, let us say so.

“Let us have some authoritative and clear statement of the distinctive difference of doctrine between Protestantism and Romanism. Unquestioned belief in something vital and necessary to salvation is indispensable.

“The kind of Christian faith that sees no difference between Protestantism and Romanism possesses no virility in conviction, and consequently no spirit of sacrifice. The laudation of the work and character of Leo XIII., with all he represented, is the result either of ignorance or a spiritless concep-

tion of genuine Christianity. What an admirable basis for aggressive missionary work to save a lost world this kind of stuff furnishes."

Methodists, as a class, are as intelligent as any class of people in the country, and perhaps have more love for one another than the average sect, and probably are a little prejudiced towards other sects, but jealousy exists between all religions, though they believe in the same God and Saviour; have the same Bible, the same Ten Commandments, and all believe in the Christ who said, "Love thy neighbor." Nevertheless, there are times and places that hatred is so intense that one would almost suppose one worshiped God and the other worshiped the devil. This is one great cause of 60 per cent of the people being outside the churches. One thing is noticeable: the most strict member of any church is most liable to be prejudiced, and one result of the 60 per cent is that it keeps a check on the prejudice.

Remove the competition and you remove the prejudice. The present system of running churches is not fair to the members at large, or the ministers. The ministers, except in some wealthy parishes, where they have a stipulated salary, have to take what they can collect from the people, and one-half of those are not willing to pay for the protection that the influence of the church throws about them.

WHY EVERY MAN SHOULD SUPPORT THE CHURCH.

Established churches draw immigration, and that raises the price of real estate. But the real estate man will say: "I do not belong to any church, I will not support it." Then the services of the minister are paid by what the members of the church, individually, think they ought to give him. Some will give liberally; some will give more than their share, and some members, very "good Christians," are perfectly willing to let some one else pay for their salvation. They take the old man's advice to his son: "Get money; get it honestly if you can, but get it." They think their Heavenly Father does not care how they get salvation as long as they get it. It is not fair to expect a man to live on what people individually feel like paying him. It makes a man feel like a beggar to live off what people think they ought to give him.

If a minister joins the army and becomes a chaplain he has a rank and draws his pay with every other officer. He does not pass around his hat from soldier to soldier to get a nickel or dime, or perhaps the horselaugh.

CHURCHES AND MORAL TRAINING PROTECT SOCIETY.

Why can there not be some plan in civil life, so that these most needed members of society may subsist without going from door to door or passing around the hat? We meet men every day, physically and mentally good men, and some of our best business men, who will be proud to tell you that their fathers and mothers were devout Catholics or strict Presbyterians, or dyed-in-the-wool Methodists; but they themselves do not take any stock in the old style religion. They have studied the noted and distinguished works of Spencer, Tom Paine, Bob Ingersoll, or "Huckleberry Finn." These men are not aware that they owe their good physique, their mental and business ability, to the moral training of their good parents. Their children may not look back with pride on them, nor have the physical and mental vigor of their grandparents. This leaves the burden of all the moral teaching on about one-third of the people, and in a great many cases on those who are least able to bear the burden. There is no money expended that the public gets so much returns from as that spent for moral training.

It makes no difference what laws you place on the statute books if they are not enforced; no good can result.

For example, I will cite a case that came to my notice.

MRS. TOUTENBAUGH.

About six years ago a man and his wife came to my place from Colorado, Mr. and Mrs. Toutenbaugh. They had a child, a boy 7 years old, his disposition as bright and sunny as his golden hair—a beautiful seal on the most loosely contracted matrimony. They had not been long in town when a woman, a divorced widow, some relation to Mr. T., called on them, and called very often. She appeared to be very much interested in Mr. T. and occasionally would be seen parading the streets and eating in the restaurants with him, and Mrs. T. was left out. After standing that for about a year, Mrs. T. became almost a physical wreck and silently packed her trunk and with her child went back to Colorado. Mr. T. was working for a firm in Seattle and could be seen any evening with the divorced widow, flaunting their brazen conduct on the streets. About this time the firm he was working for gave him to understand that he would have to take care of his wife if he continued in their employ. Thereupon he sent for Mrs. T., who came back to face another year's hell. For weeks at a time he would stay with the widow and finally told his wife he did not

want her, but preferred the other woman, and she need not hang around him and could get a divorce, and if she troubled him much more she might get some cold lead. So she packed up again and went back to Colorado. She had been there but seven months when Mr. T. got sick, underwent an operation, and sent for his wife a second time, promising all kinds of good behavior. Mrs. T. returned, thinking there was a chance left to save her husband, who promised to be ever faithful. "When the devil is sick the devil a saint would be, but when the devil is well the devil a saint is he."

About this stage of the game the widow got desperate, procured a gun, and went out after some one. One night about midnight she went to the rooms where Mr. T. and his family lived and was going to shoot the whole business. Mr. T. was prostrate on his back and could not make any resistance. She told Mrs. T. to get out or she would kill her and her child, and, pointing her gun at Mr. T., told him if he did not send them back to Colorado she would shoot him, too. Mrs. T. left with her child and came to my place between 12 and 1 o'clock and got us out of bed. I advised Mrs. T. to call an officer, but she was afraid to. She said that Mr. T. always told her that if she ever called an officer he would kill her.

The next morning Mrs. T. ventured back. She nursed her husband until he got quite well, but was afraid to stay in the rooms, as the widow had threatened her life. She asked me if I would allow her to move to my place. I said that I did not think Mr. T. a very desirable roomer, but for her sake, if it would help her, I would rent her rooms.

The case up to this time had extended over five years. We had watched Mrs. T. through all her trouble. She had come to my wife with her troubles, who did all she could for her and sympathized with her. Mrs. T. was an exceptionally noble character, a royal good neighbor, a faithful wife, and a loving mother. Her only fault was in loving a man who was unfaithful to her and who abused her. She was advised to get a divorce, but she was not of the divorcing kind. She would talk of the disgrace it would put upon her child.

Mr. T. got well and they moved to my place, and Mr. T. went to work again. Things went smoothly for about two months, when Mr. T. and the widow were in loving embrace again.

About this time Mrs. T. was a fit subject for an asylum, and Willie, her little boy, from sympathizing with his mother and a continued dread of the widow's gun, grew pale and nervous, and joy and childish pleasure moved far from him. After the episode in their former rooms, Mr. T. warned the widow not

to go near his family again, but the widow was playing no sentimental game. One night she came around and, entering through the back door, got into the room where Mrs. T. and her child were sleeping with the light dimly burning. She drew her gun, and, pointing it at Mrs. T., asked her where Mr. T. was. About that time Mr. T. walked in at the front door and said: "I told you not to come here." The widow said: "Perhaps you will put me out?" at the same time turning the revolver and firing two shots at him, one taking effect below the first rib.

When I heard the shots I ran downstairs, found Mr. T. lying on the floor with the blood running from his wound, and his wife leaning over his prostrate form. The widow was at the other end of the room with the gun in her hand, and when the patrol came up she told the officer she shot him and would shoot him again.

Mr. T. was taken to the hospital, where he laid ten weeks, ever attended by his faithful wife. The widow was sent to jail for three weeks, when she was turned loose on straw bail.

When Mr. T. got well it was evident that he would not prosecute the widow. So Mrs. T. was advised to file a complaint against her for shooting her husband and threatening her life and the life of her child. I went with her to the prosecuting attorney's office. They very reluctantly allowed her to file her complaint. They told her that Mr. T. was opposed to prosecuting the woman. I asked the prosecuting attorney to listen to her story, but he was too busy. For six weeks Mrs. T. tried to get her case before the court, but they kept putting her off, and finally told her she had no case and she could get \$200 to settle or withdraw her suit. Mrs. T. said that would not save her life or the life of her child. The woman was loose and would not hesitate to kill her, but she got no satisfaction. I then advised her to see some other attorney. I went with her to the law firm of Kane & MacCafferty, as able and upright a firm as there is in the state of Washington. Mr. Kane listened intelligently, judiciously and sympathetically through her tears and hysteric sobs. He said: "Mrs. Tautenbaugh, have you any money?" "Not much." "Have you any property?" "Yes, we have a homestead in Colorado. It is in my name. Mr. T. has tried to make me sell it, but I knew if we did we would have nothing left." Mr. Kane said: "Sign no papers. Now, Mrs. Tautenbaugh, you say your husband is opposed to you in this case. This woman has a firm of attorneys after you. You say the prosecuting attorney will not move in the case and they are against you, and this woman is still at large. My advice to you is to take your child and get out of town."

That evening Mrs. T. packed her trunk, took her child and

went back to eke out a living for the two on a lonely ranch in western Colorado.

I relate this story to show that it makes no difference what laws we have on the statute books if the moral law is not behind them. Let us take the case of Mrs. T., where all the machinery, judicial, municipal and military of this city, and this commonwealth, which should be thrown around to protect the lives, property and freedom of the people. This woman, whose only sin was that she loved too well but not wisely, and her child, being run out of this city by a revolver in the hands of a prostitute furnishes a problem for this city and commonwealth to solve.

PROSECUTING ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

The county attorney's office in this city has been the hole in the wall for every bunco man, big-mit man, hold-up man, confidence man, crook, pimp and prostitute. If there have been any sent over the road you may be sure they had neither money nor political pull. The trouble with that office is that the system is wrong, especially for men of no moral character. There is an incentive to convict a criminal, but a great deal of the work sometimes to convict is wasted, the attorney's pay being the same whether he convicts or not, and if he is open for bribe there is a hundred chances to one that the criminal will be turned loose.

A man who would listen to Mrs. T.'s story, knowing that her life and the life of her child were in danger, and then would not act must be a hoary-headed perverter of social and moral law. I can only describe such a man in the words of Brand of the "Iconoclast:" "If he were sired by the devil, damned by Sicarocks and born in hell, he would be an insult to his parents and a disgrace to his country."

MINISTERS PAID BY THE STATE.

The strong desire for the separation of church and state arises from a desire to shirk responsibility through taxation. Where the moral teaching is a public benefit, it should be a public tax. It should be appropriated the same as a school fund, pro rata to each sect, paid as the divisions of an army is paid and supplied. This would destroy that jealousy that tends to destroy their influence.

If an ignorant person read the address of the distinguished Methodist at the convention at Philadelphia and hears the

Catholic preach that there is no salvation outside that church, he will probably feel like the darkey down South who heard his darkey preacher say: "Strait am de path and crooked am de road dat leads to damnation." The darkey said to the preacher: "Boss, if dat am de case, I reckon dis darkey will have to take to de woods."

We have some new sects which have sprung up in the last half century. There is Spiritualism, Christian Science and Theosophy. Some will say these are frauds, but Professor Hudson has said that those who say there is nothing to them are ignorant of the laws of psychic phenomena. Each is voluminous in detail beyond any space that could be given in this paper.

MARTIN AND MARTINISM.

There is a new sect that has lately appeared in the firmament of religion. We have heard no name for that star, but, as a Mr. Martin is the Moses who discovered it, we will call it Martinism. This man came to Seattle some seven years ago with the star of Bethlehem in his grip in the shape of a volume of Herbert Spencer. He holds forth at Christensen's Hall. You will see at his meetings Sunday evenings a class of people with the average intelligence and apparently well to do, with a large sprinkling of purse-proud Jews. He tells them that he has learned from the scientific writings of Herbert Spencer that Christ was not divine and that theology from stem to gudgeon is all a grand fake; that Mr. Spencer had traced history and tradition beyond the doom of Atlantis down through the twelve Egyptian dynasties through the Uphanashad, the sacred writings of the Hindoos, fifteen hundred years before the Christian history and down through the Vedanta, the New Testament of Buddha, six hundreds years before the Christian era, and had discovered that the twenty centuries of Christian religious instruction was all moonshine.

He talks about Christ as being a pretty good kind of a man, but he was no more to be compared to Mr. Spencer as a great shining light than a white bean in a coon ear could be compared to the earth's luminary. He would throw out the bold and defiant assertion that he defied man to show him where theology ever taught the science of evolution or natural selection. He would then call their attention to the closely defined line between the organic and inorganic law, as if there were any line of demarkation in the evolution of matter. And there was Moses. He knew nothing about natural selection, the survival of the fittest or how man came to be related to the

monkey. But the sheeney thinks that he has made a good trade when he got Martin for Moses—"he is all wool and a yard wide."

Mr. Martin contends that he is teaching universal religion, but that all other religions are universally damned.

This man gave one of his noted lectures at Christensen's Hall Christmas eve, Dec. 25, 1904. Speaking of what he terms the false possession and false doctrine of the Christian church, theology and theological dogma and its false teachers, he said, with all the vehemence and gesture of a political curbstone orator: "If you are in a business tangle you employ a lawyer; if there is anything wrong physically, you employ a doctor; if you want to laugh you hire a joker or go to the theater, but if your soul is sick you employ a hypocrite." If there is a Socialist on this side of the Atlantic or the other side I would like to hear from him if he can beat that Martin. He preaches evolution but theology does not evolve.

We could have universal religion as well as universal education. From primitive man that worships an idol to the man that gets his inspiration from the highest philosophy is the same in kind but different in degree. Space is not a factor in spiritual phenomena. He that is truest to his highest ideal will get the highest reward at the tribunal of the absolute. There are all stages of spirituality, from the savage infant to the Masarien. There are all stages in all ages. In universal education the student of the high school must not look down on the lower grades as inferior or demoralizing. The university graduate must not look back on the high school with scorn and condemnation. It is like unto a great structure where the man that is working up toward the crown mould looks down with scorn on the man that laid the mud sill or the man that builds the superstructure. Primitive man laid the foundation of religion. We are all working in the same structure. Man was not made for religion; religion is intended for man's spiritual guide.

At the same time we must allow every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. I simply mention these facts that the church press may see there are other elements, opposed to their way of worship, than the Socialist, which they have taken the trouble to search out in foreign countries.

The state has the same right and the capacity and the same wisdom to conduct and build churches as it has to build and conduct schools, universities and colleges, and can do it larger, better and grander, cheaper and faster, and make whoever gets the benefit pay his share.

That plan would stop that un-Christian-like practice of one misrepresenting the other. It would be justice to all; it would be the greatest good to the greatest number and the greatest result from the least exertion. That is why we would like to see Socialism.

THE GRANDEN FARM.

The day of the one-horse business is fast passing away. All farming can be done on a large scale. The Granden farm in North Dakota has 27,000 acres in wheat every year. They raise wheat at a cost of 35 cents per bushel. When wheat dropped to 50 cents per bushel all the small farmers lost money. The Granden farm that year earned \$125,000 over and above expenses. Every branch of farming can be worked on the same scale. That would be the greatest result from the least exertion.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

You ask the mail service what they will carry a package for, then ask the express companies what they will charge for carrying that same package the same distance. Everything can be done on the same scale when it is run by the government and out of the hands of the grafter.

You ask the Socialist, "Why don't you formulate some line of action?" You are like the man who could not see the town for houses. You are like the colt that swam the river to get a drink.

Do you see the street you walk on; do you see the water you drink; do you see the park; do you see the schools, universities, asylums and states' prisons; do you see the post-office; do you see the city, county and state government; do you see the army and navy; do you see all rivers and harbors; do you see our national government, and our relations with other governments? Now, if there is anything left that you can see it can be run on the same scale. Then I will ask you why can it not and why should it not be run by the government? The Socialists think it can, and it will. All these things I have mentioned are run cheaper and better than if they were run by individuals on the competitive, cut-throat plan. Every one is satisfied with the way these departments are conducted. No one wants to give them over to individuals to run.

“SOCIAL SWITZERLAND.”

(A work by William Herbert Dawson, wherein he describes the social movement in that country.)

Switzerland has a population of 177.10 to the square mile, while the United States has a population of less than 14 to the square mile. It may be well to glance at their social system, as it may be hard for Americans to comprehend the science necessary for subsistence where there is so dense a population.

Mr. Dawson says: “I do not think it needs any apology.” The investigation, of which it is a record, was undertaken in the hope and belief that the experience of Switzerland, in not a few directions of Social reform, would prove of assistance in our own country, by throwing light, not, indeed, upon any problems, for these are clear and plain to view, but on the treatment of them. Those who have taken the trouble to observe and inquire must have been impressed by the boldness and originality which the cantonal and municipal governments of the Swiss Republic have shown of late years in its manifold excursions into the field of social reform. There, as here and everywhere, new social ideas and forces are at work softening the human relationship in various ways between rich and poor; between employer and employed; between governing and governed. I believe we may learn much from the ameliorative movements which are going on so close to our doors. The conditions to some extent are different, but the problems themselves are the same. Therefore I place this record of other people’s doings in one of the most important departments of political and economic activity at the service of statesmen and social students at home, and of all who believe that the peace and happiness and the progress of society can best, nay alone, be obtained by the way of organic reform, trusting that it will at least reform where it need not stimulate.

THE LABOR LAW OF THE CANTON.

The existing federal factory legislation of Switzerland substantially dates from March 23, 1877, and was adopted by virtue of a clause introduced into the federal constitution of 1874, giving the confederation the right to enact uniform regulations upon the work of children in factories, upon the duration of the work of adults therein and for the protection of working people employed in unhealthy and dangerous industries.

The administration of these laws is in the hands of the

federal government, the cantonal authorities and the factory inspectors together. The last are three in number, and to them the country is divided into three circuits, as follows: First Circuit—Comprising the Cantons of Zurich, Uri, Schwyz, Obwalden, Midwalden, Glarus, Zug, St. Gaul, Greson. Second—Berne, Freiburg, Greino, Vaud, Valais, Neuchatel and Geneva. Third—Berne, Lucerne, Soleure, Balse, Urban, Bural, Sheaphausen, the Appenzello, Aurgan and Gurgan. For many years the factory inspectors had been Dr. G. Shuler for the First Circuit, Dr. H. Rausenbaugh the Second, and M. M. Chanpiche the Third.

To come to the factory act itself: According to its original terms the act applies to all industrial establishments in which a more or less considerable number of people are occupied simultaneously and regularly out of their dwellings and in a closed building. Such buildings were to be denominated factories for the purpose of the act, and when there was uncertainty as to the application of the covering clause the federal government was and has to determine the matter without reference to the government of the canton in which the concern was situated.

The obscurity of the definition of a factory soon led to difficulty and it was found necessary to resort to a more obvious description. In accordance with the wishes of the government June 3rd, 1897, the word is now accepted as indicating any industrial establishment employing more than five people or employing persons under 18 years of age and working with machine power or offering possible danger to the health or life of the employed, otherwise the requisite number of employes to constitute a concern or factory is eleven or upwards. In June, 1895, the number of factories amenable to the federal law was 4933. It now exceeds 5000.

The essential provisions of the act are the following: It is required that all work rooms and machinery shall be kept in such a state as shall not be injurious to the life or health of the work people. The light and ventilation must be ample; all dangerous parts of machinery must be carefully guarded and in general all measures be taken which science and invention suggest for lessening the risk and injury. When an accident occurs, whether fatal or not, the employer must at once report it to the local authority, competent in the matter, who shall institute an inquiry into the whole circumstances and inform the cantonal government of the facts. The legal liability of the factory owner in regard to the incident extends to all injuries sustained by the employees which have been caused the latter in the discharge of their duties, or by the fault of the

managers, overseers or other representative officials, unless it can be proved that the accident was due to unpreventable cause or to negligence of the victim. In the latter event the employer does not necessarily escape scott free, but the compensation awardable is proportionately reduced. All factory regulations as to the conditions and hours of work, payment of wages, fines, etc., must be submitted to the cantonal government, which first takes the opinion thereon of the work people. In this connection it is laid down that no fine may exceed half a day's wages and the sum thus retained by the employer must be used for the benefit of the work people, and particularly in provision for sick relief. Deductions from wages for defective work or waste of raw material do not, however, count as fines. In the absence of a written agreement to the contrary, at least 14 days' notice is necessary to the event of determining employment on either side, though it is often longer. It is especially laid down that employers shall see to the due observance of good manners and regard for the proprieties in their work rooms. Employers must in general pay their work people at least once a fortnight, in legal tender, and on the factory premises.

The law fixes a normal day of ten hours, and that period must elapse between the hours of 5 a. m. and 8 p. m. in the months of June, July and August, and 6 a. m. and 8 p. m. during the remainder of the year.

Women are afforded special protection by the law. In their case Sunday and night work is forbidden under all circumstances. Also, when they have household duties to perform, they may leave half an hour before noon, unless the mid-day pause be an hour and a half. The provisions affecting women in childbirth are in themselves rigidly enforced. A close time is laid down, before and after childbirth, extending in all eight weeks, which shall be observed, during which they shall not be allowed to work, nor may they be admitted to the factory without proof that six weeks has passed since confinement. Moreover the Federal Council reserves the right altogether to prohibit the employment of pregnant women in certain branches of industry. As a matter of fact these provisions are a dead letter as far as relates to the period before confinement. Women so circumstanced generally insist on earning money as long as possible, and only when a slight payment is made to them during absences, are they willing to stay away. Children under the age of 14 completed years may not legally be employed in factories, and in the case of those between 15 and 16 years of age the time required for education and re-

ligious instructions may not be sacrificed to work in the factories.

The form of expression observed here is significant. In regard to child labor indeed Switzerland continues to occupy a unique position. The federal labor delegate to the Berlin Labor Congress of 1890 strenuously endeavored to string the rest of the states there represented up to the same year, 14, but in vain, and 12 years was declared by the congress to be a fitting age at which to introduce a child to factory life, though 10 years is the case in southern countries. Notwithstanding that the law is so decided and solicitous, cases are occasionally found in all the circuits, of employment of children under the protected age. A careful lookout is kept, however, by the inspectors and their assistants and the offenders are strictly dealt with. Again, no juveniles under 18 years of age can be employed at night or on Sunday, though in the case of industries requiring intermittent work, boys of from 14 to 18 may be so employed, if it appears to be indispensable to both the work and the technical training of the boys themselves. But here the Federal Council lays down special regulations as to the number of hours and the health of the young workers.

Finally any and every infringement of the law renders the aggressor liable to a fine of from 5 to 500 francs and in case of repeated infringements of the law to imprisonment up to three months.

The census elucidated a further noteworthy fact: The steady and rapid tendency towards centralization of industry. This takes two directions, says the report. On the one hand large concerns employing 500 or more work people gain more and more ascendancy. Their number increases every year, and to a large extent they swallow up the dependent business of all kinds. The large embroidery manufacturer has his own lithographer, his own bookbinder, and his own cabinet maker. The printer includes in his business every possible branch of the polygraphic arts and has, too, his type founder and his bookbinders. This tendency is visible on all hands and tends more than anything else to drive everything to special industrial centers and especially to the towns. This is a factor which cannot be ignored if one would understand the course of development which Swiss industry is following more and more.

The wages paid to the Swiss working classes fall much below the standard common in this country in spite of the longer hours worked. That there is great room for improvement here is proved by the fact that quite lately the silk ribbon weavers of Basle struck work for minimum wages of 3s and 4d

per day. The coopers of Lucerne struck for minimum wages of 3s and 9d per day, and the masons ask for 4s per day, while the carpenters and builders of Berne threatened to strike for a normal pay of 4½d an hour or 3s and 9d per day, which was amicably conceded.

The success of such strikes in Switzerland, where there are not the powerful trades union organizations which are found in England, would be far oftener uncertain than is the case were it not for the influence of the democratic spirit prevalent, which seems to cause the public to take sides with the strikers almost as a matter of course, and sometimes without regard to the right or wrong of the dispute. As a strike oddity may be mentioned an incident which occurred during a strike of watch-makers in the canton of Soleure in the spring of 1895. When the struggle was at its height the communal assembly of one village affected voted £20 a week to the support of the strikers. The employers appealed to the cantonal government, which ruled that the commune was within its rights so long as help was not withheld from other destitute or needy persons not concerned in the dispute.

It would be wrong to conclude, however, that industrial difficulties are commoner in Switzerland than elsewhere. Some figures on the duration of service in the third circuit recently prepared by the factory inspector attest not only friendly relationship but the attachment of the Swiss workman to his home. Of the employees in the cotton spinning mills of this circuit 10.3 per cent had worked from 20 to 30 years in the same concern, 3.6 per cent from 30 to 40 years, 1.3 per cent from 40 to 50 years, and .3 per cent over 50 years. In the cotton weaving mills 17.4 per cent had worked from 20 to 30 years in the same concern, 3.8 per cent from 30 to 40 years, .8 per cent from 40 to 50 years and .2 per cent over 50 years, and equal percentage was shown in other industries.

It ought to be stated that there is on the part of the working classes, especially in the larger industrial centers, a certain dissatisfaction at the manner in which some of the provisions of the factory acts are disregarded by the employers, and secret committees of the operatives exist in a number of towns charged with the duty of watching the act. Cases of infraction are reported to them and they in turn communicate either with the factory inspector, the workmen's secretary or other competent officials. Sufficient has been said to demonstrate that the dissatisfaction is not altogether groundless.

In the new constitution of Gaul, adopted November 16, 1890, there was introduced the clause: "The state shall protect the labor power, particularly that of women and children

which are employed in such trades and industries as do not come under the federal legislation." Yet the canton has not done more to give effect to so excellent a principle than has some canton which lacked the spur and encouragement of a constitutional revision.

The second part of the clause applies to shop assistants and public house employees. As to the former, no restriction of daily hours of work is made, except that ten hours of uninterrupted rest shall be secured to them. Similarly there is no prohibition of Sunday trading beyond the requirement that employees who work on Sunday shall be given an equal amount of free time during the week. The employees of the public refreshment houses do not fare even so well as this. No limitation is placed on their hours of work save that they may be allowed eight hours of unbroken rest, and that in return for Sunday service they shall have half a day free during the week. For the rest they may be employed in the evening to the legal hours of closing. Girls under 18 years of age who do not belong to the landlord's family may not be employed in regular service.

SWISS WORKMEN'S SECRETARY.

The Swiss Republic has no Federal Department of State answering exactly to the labor department of England or the department of the United States. There is a department for industry and agriculture, but it does not profess to concern itself particularly with questions relating to the laboring classes, whether these belong to the factory, the handicraft or the land. In the lack of such a distinct ministry of state the official or rather semi-official institution known as the Swiss workmen's secretary was called into existence ten years ago, and though working under the difficulties which are inseparable from private action, it has supplied the vacancy with no small measure of success. The workmen's secretary is a unique creation, without parallel in any other state, and the history of this functionary deserves a prominent place in any record of Swiss experiments in social reform. In August of 1886 the central committee of the Gruttliverein by formal petition requested the Federal Department of Commerce and Agriculture to subsidize a labor agency, which it proposed to establish, and to work in connection with the association, and with the petition was forwarded the proposed organization of the same. It was no innovation, for the government already contributed towards the salaries of the secretaries who had been appointed.

by private organizations to protect the interests of agriculture industry and trade. The committee at the same time gave the assurance that the money which might be voted would not be used in defraying the administrative expenses of the Grutliverein, nor be put to political purposes, but would be employed solely in the study and furtherance of the economic interests of the working classes without regard to political or sectarian parties and motives.

The petition was received in a friendly and indeed a cordial manner by the department, which nine days later signified its perfect approval of the object avowed by the Grutliverein, and assented to its request for state help in their furtherance.

Between that time and the meeting of the Federal Assembly in autumn the scheme of the central committee expanded. The idea took hold of the working classes generally throughout the land; other labor organizations joined hands with the Grutliverein and it was determined that the projected labor bureau should partake of a national character. To this the government also agreed and before the end of the year the desired subvention had been sanctioned and the amount for the first year fixed at 5000 francs. The government, however, laid down the conditions that for the management of the bureau a committee should be formed representative of all associations of Swiss workingmen proportionately to their membership, and that the secretary should be chosen by this committee. These conditions were agreed to and forthwith candidates for office were invited, the test of fitness being the preparation of the best drafted program of work for the new agency. That of Herman Greulich, a statistician of repute, of Zurich was accepted and it was duly submitted to the government for approval. A congress of labor delegates representing 142 organizations and 100,000 workingmen, and all the cantons, was held in Aargau in April, 1887, under the presidency of the central president of the Grutliverein and by this congress Herr Greulich was elected for a term of three years, and the definite organization of the Sekretariat was formulated—a work in which Herr A. Sherrer, advocate of St. Gaul, took a prominent part. The new official was by statute made subject to a permanent representative organization of Swiss labor.

For the common representation of the economic interests of the laboring class in Switzerland ran the first resolution adopted by the congress and the labor associations of the county formed a union known as the Swiss Workingmen's Federation. Any and every association devoted to the interests

of labor, a majority of whose members were bona fide Swiss workmen was qualified for affiliation and all federated associations were to bind themselves to co-operate with the central organization in all its operations. The organs of the Federation were the Swiss Labor Congress, the Council of the Federation, the Executive and the Workmen's Secretary.

To anticipate, the Federations and its sections continue today as formed. The congress meets every three years and is elected by the allied associations, each of which has the right to send one delegate, though his right depends on his representing 250 members, which necessitates the grouping of the smaller associations with a view to the voting power.

The council consists of 25 members chosen by the congress for a period of three years. They must be Swiss citizens and at least two-thirds workmen. In the constitution of the council regard has to be had to due representation of all the languages spoken, and the chief industries carried on in the country, and the council must meet at least once a year.

The executive consists of three members of the council resident in the same town or locality, and it likewise is elected for three years.

The Workmen's Secretary is elected by the congress for the same term. He must be a Swiss citizen and must work-subject to the instructions of the council, and more especially to the executive. The statutes of the Federation also provide that the state subsidy shall be applied exclusively to defraying the cost of the secretary and his work. All other charges, such as those connected with the holding of the congress and the general administrative cost of the Federation, are defrayed by the Federated Association.

The program which Herr Gruelich drew up, and by virtue of which he was elected, placed in the first rank of questions to be advanced by the new agency the introduction of a comprehensive system of industrial accident insurance as a preliminary to which the Workmen's Secretary shall prepare wages, statistics, a return of the benefits conferred by existing sick funds in case of accident and an enumeration of the factory and industrial population. The secretary must, however, further the economic interests of the labor world in general, investigate industrial conditions in all directions, and facilitate the realization of the needs and desires of the working classes in so far as they are of an economic nature, and fall within the rightful province of legislation.

The work itself describes the work of the secretary as essentially scientific, while upon the Federation rests the duty of assimilating and using the result of his investigations as presented and published from time to time. Neither the secretary

nor the Federation regard public agitation as part of their work; this is left to the affiliated associations and unions. Thus by keeping aloof from agitation they are able to maintain an independent position to reserve complete freedom of action and to view questions from a moral aspect. Only on rare issues does the Federation pretend to come to the front and make a decisive and open stand, and is inevitably a weighty step owing to the immense force which is behind it.

The Workmen's Secretary formally entered his functions on June 1, 1887. His first proceedings were to place himself in communication with the various cantonal governments of the country, as well as the labor departments of other states, and with private association concerned with industry-commerce, agriculture and social reform in Switzerland; between all and with the secretary there has been a regular change of ideas when necessary. The first statistical work undertaken by him was a preparation of an exhaustive return of wages paid in the republic. A good beginning was made, answers were forwarded by a large number of employers all over the country, but these after all were found to afford but partial results and in the absence of means of enforcing the contribution of information the scheme had temporarily to be abandoned. Better results were achieved in the preparation of statistics of accidents, on which subject two instructive publications were issued in 1890 and 1893 at the request of the federal department for industry and agriculture. His other publications have included a monograph on the institutions of the Paris municipal council for the protection of the working classes—the result of a visit made in 1889, another on Swiss labor movements and strikes since 1860 and a paper on the industrial legislation of foreign states. Though each annual report concerns itself with a specific phase of the labor question, the secretary has acted several times on committees appointed by the federal government to investigate matters affecting the interests of the working classes. He is constantly appealed to for advice on labor organization and individual working men who find in him a convenient intermediary between themselves and the local authorities and the inspectors of the factories, particularly in the case of the transgression of the factory acts.

More than once has he mediated with success in disputes between employers and employed and he has on several occasions prepared statements of the views of the working classes touching industrial questions pressed upon the attention of the federal government for legislation.

In 1890 an agitation sprung up in French Switzerland for the establishment of an independent workingman's secretary for the French speaking part of the country. The special in-

terests of these parts had indeed for some time been in the hands of French adjuncts, working in the same office with the secretary; the separation was happily overruled and a compromise was effected and now there are French agents both in Beel and Lausanne, though they are subject to the absolute control and direction of the workingmen's secretary.

So far equivocal though the position of the workingmen's secretary is, in that he is a private and exclusive advocate of the interests of labor in the pay of the government, a state paid agent without official standing, the relationship has worked harmoniously, and the working classes, at any rate, have reason to be satisfied with the arrangement. So indeed the federation would appear to be, for since 1888 the subsidy has increased from £200 to £1000 in view of the really useful national service which he has rendered. Nor is it likely either legislature or government will lightly venture to disturb the understanding now existing. Both know that at present, at any rate, the institution, irregular though it may be in principle, is popular with the great masses, and that the withdrawal of the subsidy would be made a test question at the elections. An official labor department may indeed be established in time and the general opinion of those best able to judge is that there is plenty of work for one, for excellent as is the work of the workmen's secretary his influence and his usefulness are seriously restricted owing to the entire lack of legal power, but it will exist side by side with the remarkable institutions which now hold the field.

Said Herr Greulich when plied upon the point, "We have come to stay."

SWISS ARBITRATION.

In Switzerland legislation regarding arbitration between employers and employed is left to the cantons individually, and during the last few years a number of them have passed either compulsory or permissive laws on the subject. As a rule the boards and tribunals created to discharge these mediatory functions have done excellent work, though here and there, as was perhaps inevitable in so democratic a country, prejudice in the work people's favor has been alleged. The only real failure of any moment has occurred in the town of Zurich. On the other hand, the experience of the other three large towns of the republic, Basle, Berne and Geneva, has been thoroughly satisfactory.

Industrial courts of arbitration have existed in the urban cantons for seven years and they have just passed through the

probation stage. They were established in consonance with a law of April 29, 1889. The law provides that disputes in civil law which arise between the owners of industries, trading and manufacturing business and journeymen, apprentices and laborers employed by them concerning the condition of service, shall be finally determined by industrial courts of arbitration insofar as the amount in dispute does not exceed the sum of 30 francs, and both parties do not demand a decision by the ordinary civil courts.

Ten courts of arbitration have been formed for the following groups of industries and trades: 1, textile industry; 2, earth and building works; 3, wool works; 4, metal works; 5, clothing and trimming; 6, foodstuffs and the liquor trade generally; 7, paper industry and polygraphic industry; 8, chemical industry; 9, transportation system; 10, trade shops and other callings, banks, insurance offices, and employments connected with literature, art and science. The employer and the employee of every group choose six judges each. These are appointed for three years, but they are always eligible for re-election. Managers of concerns, if responsible, rank as employers for the purpose of the law. All male employers and employed of the age of 24, resident in the canton, who come under the law, may elect and are eligible to election to the courts, but no one can belong to more than one group.

A court of arbitration is formed of a president of the civil courts and two of the elected judges, one an employer and the other a workman. The president in every individual case nominates his colleagues from the judges of the group to which the disputing parties belong, having always regarded the nature of the dispute and selected the judges as equally as possible. The disputants must in general appear in person before the court, except in case of sickness and unavoidable absence from home or other proved hindrances, they may be absolved; in such events the expenses of a deputy cannot be charged to the other side. Appeal to the regular courts of law is permitted on question of competence. In the event of issues being raised during the hearing of a case which lie beyond the competence of the court, the latter nevertheless has to decide on the main question and execution will be deferred until the ordinary civil courts have decided on other points in dispute. The courts must meet in an hour of the day which is most convenient to the judges and the disputants—as a fact the evening is invariably chosen. Sittings are held all the year round as required. The judges are paid the nominal sum of two francs per sitting. No fees are, however, payable to the courts of either side.

Referring to the recent operations of the courts, I find, from

the official report of 1895, that the judges at the end of that year numbered 102, a reduction of six in a year. There had been an increase in the number of disputes which came before the courts, principally from the groups for clothing and trimming (5), transportation (9) and retail and miscellaneous trades (10). The total number of cases had been 758 against 504 in the first year 1890, five having come from the previous year; 751 cases had been adjudicated upon and seven were carried forward.

Courts of industry charged with the duty of conciliating industrial disputes and deciding between their claims, where conciliation is impossible, have been in operation in Berne since the beginning of 1895. They may be said to have been established by the express wish of the employers and employed equally. No sooner had the cantonal decree of February 1, 1894, upon the organization and procedure of courts, been published than the municipal council issued inquiries to all the commercial and labor organizations of the city, as well as to private representatives of the principal industries, asking their opinion as to the local need of such a method of preventing dissension between capital and labor. Not only was there no objections to the establishment of courts of industry but without a single exception the replies urged the council to lose no time in calling them into existence. Thus encouraged, President Muller and his colleagues at once formulated a scheme suitable to the peculiar circumstances of Berne and after being duly endorsed by a vote of the citizens, 2985 to 179, it came into operation January 1, 1895. For the purpose of the courts of industry the trades and occupations of the city have been divided into groups. For each group 16 referees or assessors have to be elected triennially, consisting of half employers and half employed, all of course belonging to the trades concerned and chosen by their peers. The number, however, can be increased to 18 or 20 if the municipal council should be advised that this is desirable. An assessor is disqualified from serving if he fails to follow his calling a whole year; if he passes from the position of employer to that of a workman or vice versa; and if he ceases to possess the eligibility; also if he permanently removes from the district and if he is guilty of improper conduct. When the members of a court are reduced for any reason steps are taken by election to fill the vacancies. The assessors elect a president and two deputies, who may not be either employer or workman. In addition there is a general secretary, whose salary may range from £40 to £80, as the municipal council may from time to time determine. The president conducts the sitting of the various courts and also all plenary sittings, but in

the event of two or more courts sitting together, his deputies share the work. It is the duty of the general secretary to receive applications for the service of the courts and to take the necessary steps to give effect to them as well as to the promulgation of all decisions. The members of the court are paid for each sitting, the president and deputies 5 francs each. The municipal police are charged with the preparation of the voting lists for the various groups and the carrying out of the elections.

The right to appeal within three days is allowed in the following cases: First, when the sitting at which judgment was pronounced was not made known to the appellant and he did not attend. Second, when the court was not legally constituted. Third, when the appellant was refused a legitimate hearing. Fourth, when the unsuccessful party was not capable of conducting his own case and had no representative. Fifth, when more was awarded to the successful party than was claimed. Should the appeal be found reasonable the case is again sent to the court, but tried before other judges. It is also provided that a case can be reopened by the defeated party if it can be shown within one year from the award that new and material evidence has come to light.

This paper is merely a glimpse at that distinguished work, "Social Switzerland," by W. H. Dawson, one of the most noted economic writers of the nineteenth century. The Swiss laws as shown in this work make it the most scientific government in the world. If Switzerland should adopt the laws of the United States it would annihilate two-thirds of her population by death or emigration. Seventy-five per cent of the laws of this country are conglomerations of vicious ideas created in legislatures and voted on by men too ignorant to comprehend their nature.

A contest between the vicious and ignorant and the honest and intelligent might be close and one man whose ideas of statesmanship and his knowledge of the English language would enable him to say "Yaw" would make the bill lawful and scientific. The Swiss system would dispense with 50 per cent of the lawyers and law courts of this country.

THE WEALTH LABOR CREATES.

(A clipping from the Seattle Daily Times, December 4, 1904.)

"Recently the Central Federated Union of New York City put forth the following as a part of a declaration of principles:

"Labor produces all wealth, and, therefore, the worker is entitled to the full product of his labor.'"

“The Philadelphia Record, which is undoubtedly the ablest edited journal published in the Quaker City, thereupon comments upon this declaration as follows:

“As an abstract economic proposition this is entirely true. As a reason for distributing the entire output of a factory among the operatives it is entirely untrue.

“Labor, unaided by capital, is represented by a man turned loose upon the soil to get from Nature what his bare hands can wrest from her. Doubtless he is entitled to all he gets, but it would not satisfy any civilized or semi-civilized man.

“The man who made the tools, who invented and built the machinery, who constructed the mill or furnace or factory, the man who conducts the process of production and the man who markets the product are all workers, and all entitled to portions of the product.

“The distribution is mainly effected by the general commercial forces represented by supply and demand. So far as these have been modified by law or combination the modification is mainly in the interest of the operative.

“Doubtless the distribution is not affected in accordance with absolute justice, but there is an approximation toward it, and if the above quoted maxim means that the entire output of a factory should be divided among the persons who tended the machinery, the result would be far more unjust than those resulting from the natural laws of trade.

“When it is said that labor produces far more than in former years it is only meant that there is more machinery and it runs faster; not that the individual is more productive. But the individual gets a large fraction of the value of the output, so that if he be receiving less than his share there is at least the consolation that with the progress of industry he is advancing slowly toward his rightful dividend.’ ”

The Record puts a misconception on the declaration of principles of the Central Federated Union of New York City. Their principles did not mean to take the wages of the man who made the tools, nor the man who invented the machinery, nor the man who constructed the mill or factory, nor the one who conducts the process of production, nor the man who markets the product, and the Federated Union includes them in their declaration of principles. They also include the wear and tear of tools and cost of raw material. What they demand is the wealth they produce outside of this.

The Record refers to the man who made the tools. Tools of production are made by the workingmen, who get part of

the profits, the rest the tool man claims for himself for bossing the job. And when the tool man, as the Record writer calls him, or boss, can take what he thinks is his share he is very liable to take more than his share, for at present the workmen are not getting their share. That is what the Central Federated Union wants them to get, not as the Record would have us believe.

This tool man is the man who causes the uneven distribution of wealth. This tool man is the man who comes out like Carnegie, Rockefeller, Morgan, Schwab, Harriman, Gould, Sage, the Vanderbilts and thousands of others who grasped more than their share from the workmen. Those men do not know what to do with their wealth, while a great many who belong to the Central Federated Union would not know what to do for something to eat if there was a 90 days' strike. A paper that will make such a statement is either the prostitute tool of corporate greed or a mental degenerate.

The Daily Times says the Record is the ablest edited journal published in the Quaker City. It may be ablest in what the city and state is noted for—political corruption.

POWER OF THE EDITORIAL.

(By the Seattle Daily Times, Dec. 26, 1904.)

“Everybody knows that from the very beginning of the founding of great newspapers in the United States till long after the close of the Civil War those newspapers were the chief instrument in formulating opinion in this Nation.

“James Gordon Bennett established The New York Herald in 1835—and wrote the first editorial leader therefor upon a board stretched across the top of a flour barrel in a basement.

“Horace Greeley was an accomplished printer at that time, and did not succeed in the editorship of The New York Tribune until six years later—or in 1841.

“It was long after that when Wilbur F. Story founded The Chicago Times, and it was after the close of the Civil War before Joseph Medill became the leader of formative opinion in the Central West.

“Along that stretch of time intervening between 1835 and 1880 a number of men made themselves great by forming public opinion through the editorial columns of leading newspapers which they themselves created.

“Godwin and Godkin, of The New York Evening Post, were among that number. Samuel Bowles, of The Springfield (Mass.) Republican—and Henry J. Raymond, of The New York

Times—and A. K. McClure, of The Philadelphia Times—and many other men now famous in history, were aiding in formulating public opinion as editorial writers upon great newspapers—whose greatness was the result of the personal endeavors of those editors.

“Within a few years, however—certainly within the last decade, if not within the last quarter of a century—the opinion has prevailed that editorial utterance has failed of leadership—and without apparent objection that attitude has been assumed to be the correct one.

“But there’s a young man down in Atlanta, Ga., editing The Evening News, who takes issue with this acquiescence, and declares that editorial leadership has not departed, but still exists.

“Mr. Graves has contributed an article to The Editor and Publisher of New York City under the above caption, in which he says:

“I have no sympathy with the belief that the power of the editorial is a departed glory in American journalism. Wherever a really great man finds an arena in which to labor, his personality is impressed and his influence becomes great whether expressed upon the hustings, in the forum, or in the editorial sanctum.

“Who does not remember dear old Elder Stone, of The Journal of Commerce, who for twenty years wrote only one editorial a day, but compressed into that editorial all the truth, all the honesty and all the character that pulsed in his noble heart?

“And who does not remember that The Journal of Commerce exercised such influence upon the business mind of America that its decisions took the place of arbitrary tribunals in business affairs, and became as standard almost as the statutes of congress or the findings of the courts?

“Who does not remember how Henry Grady projected his beautiful personality upon the American public through the editorial column? How in the South he inspired a despairing agriculture, purified political policies, awakened industry and molded the heart of a great people through the power of the tenderness and heartfulness that pulsed in his ringing editorials?

“When men lament the early death of Henry Grady they forget the fact that he was being swept from the impartial attitude which was his throne, into the maelstrom of politics, in which, with a hundred rival daggers whetted for his side, he could have lost much of his power in the suspicion of a selfish interest in public discussions.

“In our own day we have come to see the editorial pages of the New York American solidify and lead the masses of American labor, and formulate policies which have organized the successful protest of the industrial classes against excessive instances of corporate greed.

“But, in my judgment, the power and force of the editorial in future will rest more and more upon the disinterested character and motives of the man behind it.

“The editor who comprehends the situation—the man who grapples the elementary facts, who seizes the day’s events, explains their meaning, points their philosophy and applies their significance—the man who grasps the elements and molds them with a master purpose and a master policy and with impartial truth, to the great ends of civilization and to the great uses of humanity, will have and can have no superior among the mental forces of his time.

“I believe that the editorial page will be again the genius and the power of the newspaper. I believe that the editor is the great man of the future. He has the enginery of human omnipotence in his hands. He carries the last appeal to the minds and the wills of man, if he but know his tools; if he but comprehend his power; if he but magnify his calling; if he shall always tell the truth, and if, while he looks with shining eyes upon magnificent opportunity, he be sober always with the solemn sense of his splendid, vast responsibility.

“For behind all theory and back of all ideas and beyond all editorial pages stands the man. The man is the basic fact. He must be brave, he must be unselfish, he must love humanity, he must love the truth, he must concentrate his aims, he must measure his heart-beats in equal pulse with his brain-throbs, and he must be ready always to subordinate the selfish purpose to the human end of service and to the welfare of the State.

“No great editor should be an aspirant for personal preferment at the people’s hands. He is a teacher and a leader. He is a teller of the truth, and he cannot be fair and free and fearless in these high lines if he is dependent upon popular opinion or an applicant for popular approval. He will inevitably follow the tides of the opinion which he should direct.

“He will inevitably truckle as the politician to the prejudices which as an editor it is his duty to dispel. He is greater in station and in influence than an officeholder. He does not need office to dignify him, and he undignifies his own high station when he alloys with the suspicion of a selfish interest the pure gold of his righteous advocacies of the disinterested force of his editorial pleas.

“I submit the proposition that a strong, brave man who

can convince the public by an unselfish life of his personal sincerity and his patriotic purpose, who thinks bravely and honestly, who gives good reasons for the faith that is in him, and ask no personal favors for himself—can rally and hold a larger and more permanent following in a great editorial leadership than in any other public station of the time.' ”

The editor of the Daily Times has a very high appreciation of the power, sanctity and influence of the press. He has a very fine ideal of what an editor should be and that is a long way towards a high idea, and the editor may be all that goes to make up the ideal. We do not know of any reason why he should not be.

I cannot agree with the editor that the newspapers were the chief instruments in formulating opinions in the nation before or after the war, but I will agree with him that they are the chief instruments in reflecting opinion, so far as they reflect correctly.

I have been a constant subscriber for your paper for six years. I have searched the columns closely and I think your paper has not always reflected public opinion. Some time ago the people of this city voted by an overwhelming majority for a lighting plant for the reason they were in the grasp of an octopus, and since the city voted that measure the octopus has dropped on his cinch prices one-half. Now, Mr. Editor, you never missed an opportunity to throw cold water on that necessary public enterprise. Now it would look like sacrilege to say that a man of such high ideals would be plugging for the octopus, but it looks funny to a man up a tree.

There is no doubt there is and has been great men in the newspaper business, but you will excuse us if we do not fall to worship your alleged omnipotence.

It is perhaps safe to say that 75 per cent of the papers in this country are under the influence of or owned by corporations and politicians, controlled by trusts, and they reflect and advocate opinions at the dictation of the trusts, to the detriment and injustice of the great working classes who create the wealth of this country. Those corporations never miss a chance to misrepresent the actions of the workingman and advocate every unscientific economy to keep him in ignorance.

If you would apply scientific economy to the Philadelphia Record she would be in debt for the collar button that holds her four-story collar in place.

The Hearst newspapers, it may be said, are one editorial institution which is too large to be controlled by any corporation, party or country.

Senator Conklin once said of President Arthur that he was the stalled ox of American politics. The stalled press of the American Trust is jealous of the Hearst unparalleled success and calls it yellow journalism.

A man asked the Arkansas farmer what made his corn so yellow. The farmer replied that he planted the yellow kind.

If Hearst is reflecting yellow journalism that is the kind the people formulate. The secret of his success is to reflect, and not create public opinion. The green-eyed monster reflects his pages with the wrong color. The people may have had a glance at the astral plane where the oral of human character is visible in their varied hues and seen the green far below the spiritual golden yellow, but they prefer the yellow kind. They can see the yellow, golden sunrise of the twentieth century. The green-eyed monster is gazing on the stink; he can't see paradise with helldiver's eyes.

The Hearst papers are the only papers of any magnitude that champion the cause of the man who creates the wealth of the country; that advocates municipal ownership and state ownership of all public utilities, and boldly reflects the advanced public opinion of the twentieth century.

Mr. Hearst did not get the nomination for President for the reason that a strong element in his own party are opposed to his advanced ideas, especially the reorganizers of Clevelandism, who dethroned the Democratic party. Cleveland made enemies of all young men in the West; he made enemies of all reformers who joined the party in '92; he made enemies of life-long Democrats, but the Republicans and the Republican press and the Republican party admire him for the enemies he has made.

It must have been a political panorama to watch Grover's features after he awoke from his political debauch as he glanced down the column and read Roosevelt's majorities.

THE GROVER CLEVELAND PANORAMA.

Grover must have felt somewhat like the traveling man that was on his way from a traveling man's convention. He was laid over at an inland town, where there was no train out Sunday, so to amuse himself he sported around until the small hours after midnight. The next morning he got around about 10 o'clock. The only stir he could see in that quiet town was some people going to a Methodist revival meeting. He went in and took a seat. The preacher in his exhorting said: "All ye that are in favor of going to Heaven stand up." They all stood up but the drummer; he had fallen asleep. The preacher

looked over the congregation and found they were all standing but one, so he said, "I see all are in favor of going to Heaven but one man. Now I am going to see where he is in favor of going." He motioned and all sat down. He then said in a loud and shrill voice. "All ye in favor of going to Hell, stand up." The drummer awoke in time to catch the last of the sentence, "stand up," and he arose. He looked around stood up but the drummer; he had fallen asleep. The preacher so he said: "Mr. Preacher, I am not familiar with the question before the house, but it is very evident that you and I are in a hopeless minority."

The Presidency is an office that any American may aspire to. We have had men from the farm; men from the work shop. We have had men graduates from colleges and universities and graduates from law schools, but the people want no more graduates from the political slums of the city of Buffalo.

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE.

The Death of the Democratic Party.

"The Democratic party has been swept off the political board. It is true it remains in the South, yet it simply lives there as a makeshift barrier against negro domination and as a convenient crowbar for certain politicians to break into political fat jobs. Neither in the South or the North does it justify its further existence, for it has ceased to be the representative of the ideas of any economic class and nothing else can justify the existence of a political party.

When the Democrat was the representative of the slave power and the agricultural interests of the South as opposed to the manufacturing interests of the North it had a right to live.

However, after two attempts at the presidency under the banner of Mr. Bryan it was seen that a silver plank would never win the presidency, and the Democratic leaders decided to make a new move. The Hearst wing said, "Forward." The Hill-Belmont-Cleveland wing said, "Backward." The Hill outfit won, nominated Parker on the "sane and safe platform," sent out a gold brick telegram and backward the Democratic party went, so far backward, indeed, that it has gone completely out of sight.

On the other hand, Hearst, with his program of public ownership and denunciation of private wealth, could not have attracted a much larger vote. It is true, people are technically in favor of public ownership, and most of us will say it is a

scandal that Rockefeller has so much money, but we are not sufficiently exercised over the matter to organize a political party and express such views at the polls. Why? Simply because the Hearst program cannot be shown to lead anywhere. We have poverty amongst us. We see our country given over hand and body to the rich, but seeing all this does not make us see that denunciation of the rich or even the public ownership of the trust and railway will help matters much.

The people generally who are not owners of property of any kind will get absolutely no benefit from the Hearst program of public ownership.

Mr. Wilshire without doubt is one of the most scientific economic writers of the present century. Young and brilliant, a millionaire nine times over, he is sacrificing his time and his wealth in the Socialist cause and in the interest of humanity.

His magazine I have subscribed to and read every issue of for three years. It stands at the head of the list on political economy. If every man would read it, it would lift him out of the mire of the competitive system, which is the greatest favor that could be conveyed to man. Every man may help this cause by reading it and handing it around. It formulates public opinion.

With Mr. Hearst it is different; his papers reflect public opinion. His part of the program is not to create or lead. Reflecting is where his power and usefulness lies. If he should undertake to formulate public opinion his great circulation might drop to a four page weekly and that would destroy his usefulness. The formulator is the advanced guard and all right in his place, but he cannot take the fort without the main army. Those are led up slowly and gradually under the drill of public opinion, not led by Hearst's papers. It would be financial and political suicide for Mr. Hearst to come out openly and advocate Socialism. It makes no difference what his convictions may be.

People are not all blessed with the scientific mind of Mr. Wilshire. They will have to have a practical illustration and take over the public utilities gradually one after the other. A sudden change would cause a revolution.

The P.-I. of December 30, 1904, had an editorial,

“ANARCHISTS’ NATURALIZATION.”

“A bill has been introduced into congress by Representative Connell, of Pennsylvania, providing that no anarchist or nihilist shall be admitted to citizenship. If the present naturaliz-

zation laws were enforced according to their letter and spirit no anarchist, no nihilist and no socialist could be admitted to citizenship as it is. Every man in these three classes who obtains citizenship does so by perjury on his part and on the part of his witnesses. Under the Connell bill, if it passed, he could obtain citizenship in precisely the same manner.

“There is now required, as a condition precedent to the admission of any man to citizenship, proof by the testimony of disinterested witnesses that the applicant is ‘a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the constitution of the United States.’ It requires no argument to prove that a man who is an anarchist, a socialist or a nihilist is not attached to the principles of the constitution of the United States. The applicant is himself required to take an oath to support the constitution of the United States, an oath which no one belonging to these classes can take without mental reservations.

“What is wanted is not more laws intended to prevent the admission to citizenship of men who are opposed to the principles of our government, but a more rigid enforcement of the existing laws. Instead of the perfunctory putting of perfunctory questions to witnesses who may or may not understand their purport and meaning, there should be a rigid examination of the applicant and his witnesses, with precisely the same solemnity and formality that attaches to any other proceeding in a court of justice, and an adjudication of the matter by the court upon the testimony before it, with the same attention to the testimony, to the law, and to its meaning, as attends any other judicial determination by a court.

“If the law itself needs serious amendment in any particular, it should be, as suggested by President Roosevelt, in the direction of requiring publicity of the intention to apply for papers of citizenship. It might further be amended so as to permit of the withdrawal of citizenship, and the setting aside of the order of the court, when the decree has been obtained through fraud or perjury in any essential matter, with recognition of the fact that perjury committed as to the question of the applicant's good moral character or his attachment to the principles of the constitution of the United States is as serious as when the perjury refers merely to the length of time in which the applicant has lived in this country. The latter requirement is the only one to which any real attention has been paid in the past; yet it is but one of many requirements, all made essential by the law, to qualify a man for admission to citizenship in this country. From many points of view the other require-

ments are far more important than the minor question of the length of residence in the United States."

The present naturalization laws would certainly exclude anarchists, they are violators of the law; it would exclude nihilists, they are murderers; but the Socialists' theory is neither a violation of law nor an advocate of murder. The Socialist theory does not violate the constitution. It does not advocate a theory that would take one cent that belongs to another man, nor appropriate one cent in any way, shape or form that belongs to the man who produced it. The Socialists advocate public ownership. This city is building a lighting plant that is not appropriating the Seattle Electric Light Company's property, but has forced this octopus to come down one-half. If that is appropriating property then all that voted for this light plant should be disfranchised, according to the P.-I.'s idea of constitutional law. All who advocate the public ownership of the postoffice, public roads, schools, universities, colleges, water works, parks, penitentiaries, insane asylums, city, county, state and national government, army and navy, all who advocate the public ownership of these utilities are violators of the constitutional law. The man who demands the full value of what he produces less the cost of tools and raw material, according to the P.-I., is violating the constitutional law and should not be allowed to vote. If the Socialists' theory is unconstitutional then all these public utilities are unconstitutional and should, according to the constitutional idea, be turned over to some grafter so he could cinch the public as the Seattle Electric Light Company has been doing for the last ten years. If the P.-I. could disfranchise the vote of the Socialist, if she could disfranchise the vote of this city, the people of this city would be still paying \$2.00 for gas instead of one. The P.-I. is the hired tool of the octopus. When the P.-I. prostitutes its columns with the assertion of disfranchising people for voting for their rights you should put the P.-I. after the anarchist and nihilist in place of the Socialist.

The P.-I. does not like the Socialist theory. The honest scientific theory of Socialism would show the P.-I. that under a scientific form of government she would be a parasite on the man who produces the wealth of this country, to the last cent she grafts from the people.

FROM GOVERNOR MEAD'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

"The student in the higher educational institutions should receive wholesome advice and instruction in the duties and

obligations of good citizenship, and he should be taught to revere the form of government established by our forefathers. Any attempt upon the part of an instructor or the management of any of our higher institutions to arouse in the minds of the student body a feeling of prejudice or hostility towards the form of government which has survived for more than a century and has been the mightiest factor known to history in advancing the cause of civilization, or to influence the boys and girls of this state to believe that our system of government is based upon fallacious principles and should, therefore, ultimately be overthrown, will receive immediate attention from the executive department and the instructor engaged in the exploitation of such un-American ideas will receive immediate dismissal."—From Gov. Mead's inaugural address.

There was in the inaugural address of Governor A. E. Mead a plain intimation that he proposes to make a change in the faculty of the University of Washington. It may be that an intimation will be conveyed to J. T. Ronald, who will be the first new regent to be named, that this change would be acceptable to the governor, or the intimation may be made more plainly to all the regents.

Nothing save just that interpretation can be given the declaration in the governor's inaugural address that instructors who teach that the fundamental principles of this government are wrong cannot be retained.

THINKS SOCIALISM EXISTS.

Rightfully or wrongfully the governor believes that there is a small organization of Socialists at the State University and that they have been working among the students of that institution. It has been told him that Dr. J. Allen Smith, the professor of political economy, leans in that direction, and that several of the minor employes of the school have Socialistic tendencies.

Shortly after the last school election, when the Socialists carried the precinct in which the university is located, the story was carried to Mr. Mead that they had their strongest following in the State University among a small faction that had heretofore escaped general notice.

SYMPATHIZE WITH IT.

Some of the students sympathized with what was known as the theoretical Socialism and voted with the practical expon-

ents of the creed. According to politicians close to the governor he declared at that time that he would clean out the Socialist organization.

In his inaugural address, as the King county delegation recognized, he spoke strongly against Socialism. He did not mention the creed plainly, and those lacking in familiarity with the State University charges probably failed to realize what he meant by his denunciation of an instructor who talked against the principles of government in this state. But the intimation is clear enough to give a general idea of Mr. Mead's policy.

Dr. J. Allen Smith, head of the department of economics at the State University, when seen stated that he had no intimation of any charge being preferred against him, and would refuse to answer any charges not specifically presented by some one authorized to do so. As for his views on public questions, Dr. Smith stated that he had presented them in addresses and printed articles too frequently to need a restatement.

Dr. Smith came to the university in 1897 from Marietta college, where he held the chair of political and social science. Dr. Smith received his A. B. degree from the University of Missouri in 1886, and an LL. B. degree from the same college in 1887. From 1887 till 1892 he engaged in the practice of law in Kansas City. From 1892 to 1894 Dr. Smith was a student at the University of Michigan and was graduated from that institution with the degree of doctor of philosophy. The following year he went to Marietta college, where he remained two years before coming to the university here.

At the conclusion of the governor's address the following most extraordinary words were uttered:

"These enemies of civic righteousness and good government, bearing no commission from the people, no letters of marque to engage in political privateering, acting under no oath of office, worshiping only the god Mammon, cherishing no high ideals, will haunt the corridors of this capitol building from now until adjournment. They dare not fight in the open for they realize that, like the fatal basilisk, 'whose breath was poison and whose look was death,' their active, open espousal of any cause would damn it."

The distinguished Governor, in his inaugural address, said that the students in the higher educational institutions should receive wholesome advice and instruction in the duties and obligations of good citizenship and should be taught to revere the form of government established by our forefathers. I do not know Dr. J. Allen Smith: I do not know what he is teaching at the University. If he is teaching political and social sci-

ence and philosophy in its true sense, he is certainly teaching Socialism, and the students must be affected by it, and would naturally vote for scientific principles. When Dr. J. Allen Smith's honest and scientific political knowledge will be extended to other precincts the result will be a majority for Socialism as it was at the university.

The distinguished Governor, it is plain, does not understand the science of political economy. A man can take a few law books and go back into some country town and study law, and make a very fair second-class country lawyer, but political science takes years of study. It has to be theorized; there are no standard works to refer to.

Scientific economy does not conflict with the teachings of our forefathers, but it does conflict with the political graft of the present day. It conflicts with the theory that licenses crime and applies the proceeds on your taxes. It conflicts with court decisions which allow a man to steal \$7,000 of the county funds. It conflicts with the county attorney's office when it becomes a protection for criminals. It conflicts with selling senatorial plums to the highest bidder. It objects to the nomination of state officers by star chamber and private car conditions. It conflicts with all private ownership which creates the uneven distribution of wealth. Its cardinal principles are truth, justice, the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion. This working the modern political graft, and standing behind our forefathers, is too thin for even the longshoreman who has taken his first a, b, c lesson in scientific economy.

The distinguished Governor said that any attempt on the part of the instructors or the management of any of our higher institutions to arouse in the minds of the students prejudice or hostility towards this form of government, influencing the boys and girls of this state to believe that our system of government is based on fallacious principles, which should, therefore, ultimately be overthrown, will receive immediate attention from the executive department and the instructor will receive immediate dismissal.

The instructor is certainly very reckless, when he is in office by the grace of corporate greed, to teach that which is his solemn duty and which he is hired to teach, when it shows up the graft. He must remember that the days of Galileo are not yet past. We have only changed from ignorant superstition to corporate greed, and while he may not be imprisoned for a term of years, he will be deprived of a livelihood in the profession which cost him years of study, even though it may be one of the most essential of the human sciences. But he

will be a sacrifice to the cause. More boys and girls will investigate what Dr. Smith was fired for, and when they do, they will land where the university students are—in the Socialist party.

The distinguished Governor appears to be unduly alarmed at what he calls the enemies of civic righteousness and good government, bearing no commission from the people, no letter of marque to engage in political privateering, acting under no oath of office. When the distinguished Governor shall have emerged a little longer from obscurity and become familiar with modern graft politics, he will learn that this is a class of vultures that prey on rottenness that is sometimes a full crop around state legislatures. They scent from afar the fat that is being rendered that has an extra flavor this year at Olympia, of which they expect to pick up the crumbs which the gentlemen bearing the letters of marque and who take the oath of office may let fall.

Those gentlemen, too, may do some political privateering. One of those who took the oath of office and has a letter of marque, and is now gracing a seat in the state senate, made the proud boast on the streets of Seattle recently that if he thought he had an honest 5-cent piece in his possession he would dig it up and throw it away. There is not a man in King county who would bet a mill against a million that he did not tell the truth for once at least.

The distinguished Governor must not think that all who visit the capital are grafters, nor would they like to see the sign on the floor of the corridor, "Keep of the Grass." It is just as much public property as the streets or parks. The officers of the state house are public servants, not dictators. The officers must not think they are the whole thing and that the people are the center of the doughnut.

But this frightful basilisk, whose breath is poison and whose look is death, must destroy the blissful slumber of the distinguished Governor, and he will say, in the words of Hamlet: "Art thou spirit of health or goblin damned; bring thou airs from Heaven or blasts from hell?"

We cannot estimate the evil mystic powers of some people, but the way to break that charm is to have every one who enters the corridor uncover his head, put his hand on his breast, and say: "Peace be to the star-chamber-private-car's obscure production."

SOCIALISM AN EFFECT.

By Rev. Father Kirby.

“Socialism is one of the forms of organized social discontent. As such it must be classed with unionism, single tax, populism Catholic and general reform activity, municipal leagues, etc. Fundamentally the same psychological factors produce all, viz: dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, and an effective desire to improve conditions by reform. These forms of social movement are not differentiated primarily by their form of protest so much as by the plan of reform proposed.

KNOW IT AS IT IS.

“The elements that make reform movements are permanent in the human race. Hence to look upon Socialism as the arbitrary creation of lawless men, to look upon it chiefly as a form of atheism, to rest content with denunciations, is an inexcusable error. We priests must know it as it is; know it as an effect, understand the causes which produce it; discriminate in our dealing with Socialists, and understand that abuse and inaccurate information would expose us to merited ridicule and weaken our power.

“We cannot learn Socialism from academic books; we must go to the Socialists, to their propaganda literature and press, learn from them what they are and what produces them. We should give them credit for honesty and earnestness until we know that they do not merit such consideration. In this way we will know actually what Socialism is.

SOCIALISM IS AN EFFECT.

“It must be looked upon as an effect. Men are not Socialists until they lose confidence in government. Do the facts of political corruption—which none of us deny—warrant one’s despair? Men are not Socialists until they believe that honest human competition in industry is impossible. Who doubts the extent, variety of pernicious and villainous deception, adulteration, cheating and defrauding that go on daily?

“Men are not Socialists until they believe that the interests of wealth displace those of men as men in our institutions. Can we deny that appearances go to show that wealth is too powerful?

“When these facts of political corruption are marshalled; when by their side we place the facts and dishonest business

method universally met with; when we review the power of money in our institutions, we have before us a set of facts appalling in their magnitude, and disheartening in their significance.

EVIL SOCIAL CONDITIONS EXIST.

“We conservatives think always of what our institutions have done; many think always of what our institutions have failed to do. From among these come our Socialists.

“The hideous aspects of our moral, social, industrial, political life are heaped up in consciousness, and these men live in the presence of that despair begetting power. You may say that Socialists are lazy, or idle, or intemperate, or vicious. I care not. I wish to insist mainly on one point; that Socialism is an effect, natural, necessary, unavoidable in present historical circumstances. If we priests wish to deal with it in a way worthy of our power, we must take hold of the conditions which produce it. The Church must oppose it, for it is a menace, immediately, to our institutions, and remotely to our faith. But the clergy must stand squarely and face the facts which are making Socialism.

“Let us go to the Socialists, and find out sympathetically what are their feelings, their intentions. Let us face the evils which they rightly criticise, and make war on them. But let us never confine ourselves to resolutions or condemnations of organized Socialism.

“A body of public leaders who will vote a condemnation of Socialism and be silent about the deplorable phases of our political, commercial and industrial life, would not show the wisdom or perception that we may legitimately expect of those who attempt to direct public opinion.

“Of course, I do not underrate the force of the Socialistic propaganda, nor do I forget that men may be talked into it. In as far as this is the case, there is some good in resolutions, honest opposition and enlightened warning. But the main power of Socialism is in the evils which we see and the despair which they engender. This is particularly the case since education is universal, democratic equality of man and man is taken as an axiom, and the individual believes in his own value as never before.

HOW TO CUT THE GROUND FROM UNDER IT.

“The main emphasis in Catholic action should be laid on practical reform work. In Catholic Europe we find admirable

results. A coherent, timely philosophy of reform has been worked out and the clergy are actively interested in the material welfare of laborers. The Holy Father in his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, gives Socialism only secondary attention, while the main force of that splendid document is directed to reform. The principles therein contained are in accord with the best tendencies and wisest statesmanship of our time. We should master them, know their relations and limitations. We should then know the facts in modern life, be thoroughly versed in everything that bears on the whole organization of current social discontent. We must avoid hasty generalizations, inaccurate information, and immature judgment. Social discontent cannot be suppressed. It will yield to proper direction. But that direction must take account of all that is true in complaint and just in criticism today.

“Proper attention to social reform will deprive Socialism of its power, while more direct opposition to it accomplishes little.”—From *The Missionary*.

I must say that the Rev. Father Kirby's paper on Socialism is the fairest, most intellectual and Christian-like comment of all the Catholic clergy or Protestant ministers so far heard from. Not only among the clergy, but among other high professionals, are found ideas on political science which are painfully absurd, and sound like a man talking on a complicated mathematical proposition who does not know that twice one are two.

Father Kirby said that if proper attention was paid to social reform it will deprive Socialism of its power. Proper attention paid to social reform will not deprive Socialism of its power, but will build it up. The Socialists not only want proper attention paid to social reform, but they want social reform put in practice. The Socialists are paying strict attention to social reform and the study of the cardinal principles of political economy—truth, justice, the greatest good to the greatest number, and the greatest result from the least exertion. That is political science; that is Socialism.

The Catholic Northwest, a bright, newsy magazine of Seattle, full of solid moral and intellectual reading, edited by Miss Johnston, one of the brightest women in the state, made the assertion that the church was opposed to Socialism because it would take the children from under the paternal care. The school system is already under the Socialist plan, and little change would be necessary from what it has been for the last one hundred years. The present system has not taken the children from under the paternal care, as that lady must know, as

she taught school for some years. The editor, on the next page in her usual sympathetic way, described the condition of some 75,000 operatives who were thrown out of work at Fall River, Mass. I quote from her editorial along the same line: "Public attention of late has been called to a hideous condition of affairs prevalent in most of the Southern states, viz: child labor in the cotton mills.

The greed of wealth in the New England states and the poverty and avarice of the planters in the South have combined to produce a condition which is a foul blot on our much-vaunted high priced labor, the latter a home market for its cotton. While money is being squandered like water to educate the children of the heathen in the far off land and to pervert the faith of other children who are already civilized and Christian, a great army of children here at home, within our borders, are wearing out their puny, wretched young lives in the stifling atmosphere of the cotton mills of the South, to the end that the Yankee mill-owner may receive a larger dividend on his investment than he could get at home. Twenty thousand of those little unfortunates of six years old and upwards in South Carolina alone toil twelve hours a day for six days in the week. The brutalizing effect of this incessant toil effectually shuts out of their lives every vestige of spiritual or intellectual uplift.

There has been much felicitation of late over the rapid industrial development of the New South. They realize that the fabric of its boasted prosperity was reared upon the blighted souls and dwarfed bodies of children. It needs an awakened public sentiment in this matter to restrain the greed of capital and procure the legislation necessary to protect the child in its elementary rights."

The editor is quick to see the injustice of the competitive system, but she is opposed to Socialism, that will wholly remove those conditions. The Socialist theory would be to prevent the children working until they were fourteen years old; then it would be to learn some trade that was best fitted for them. The children in the South, and the children of the parents in the North in the Fall River district, and the old men and the old women, too, would be better under the co-operative system.

Outside of educating the children in a practical way, and placing them where they would be self-supporting, there would not necessarily be any control.

The church is afraid of religious prejudice, which will disappear under Socialism, as we will show further on.

WAS CHRIST A SOCIALIST, BY DR. TITUS AND THE REV. STANLEY.

A debate between Herman F. Titus and Rev. H. D. Stanley New Year's Eve at Carpenter's Hall, Seattle.

It was the contention of Dr. Titus that when on earth Christ could not have been a Socialist, but would be one if he were here now. Rev. Stanley took the opposition.

Dr. Titus opened the speaking. In part he said:

"I yield to no one in my reverence and respect for Jesus Christ, but neither do I yield to any one in my contempt for the church that bears his name. I left the established church in which I had worked for years because I found I could no longer remain a Christian in it.

"Unless Christ changed His methods He could not be a Socialist today. What was the main purpose of Christ's coming to earth and in His teachings? Simply this. These things: 'I command ye that you love one another.' He proved that what He taught; He believed, and He proved it better than any one has proved this teaching before or since.

"What was the method of Christ's teaching? He would discard His teachings now to a certain extent at least; because He would have too much sense not to take the only chance left open to Him upon earth and join the Socialist movement, where, when the movement is successful, there will be no more class, no more tyranny, and where universal brotherhood will prevail.

"Christ could not, in His day and age, have been a Socialist; that He could now, however, is affirmed. Were He on earth today the Socialist party would be His only home. Why could He not believe in Socialism in His day? Simply because in His day slavery existed as a fact. He could no more be a Socialist in His day than He could have been an electrician or a railroad engineer, for Socialism did not exist in His day. The modern idea of Socialism is impossible except in the modern era.

The Rev. Stanley said in part:

"The issue is simply this: If the principles of Jesus Christ were applied to modern civilization and to modern methods of business, they would drive out of Seattle every grafter, legalized or otherwise, in the city; it would solve in one blow the whole question of class struggle and everything else.

"Socialists attack the church. If we ministers find you trying to drive us out we will simply throttle Socialism. If Socialism is right it will live; if wrong it will die. If some of you Socialists would get a little nearer God you would get a little nearer common sense. In your argument you are try-

ing to save the world by Socialism. You might as well try to lift yourselves by your bootstraps.'

Two opposing elements were visible. One bitterly opposed to the church; the other as firmly opposed to Socialism. They were both right in their own theory, but wrong in the other. If they would join issues they would have perfection.

Dr. Titus is one of the ablest and most persistent workers and ablest debaters in the Socialist party of this state. He is sacrificing his whole life and energy in the interests of his party and the human race.

Rev. Stanley stood boldly for the cause and the principles of religion, but there is an element that is swaying the other way. It is estimated that in this country fully 60 per cent of the population are outside any church.

Has the exortoric power of the church, like the competitive system, lived its allotted time, and will it be replaced by exortoric theological science? Will some wise sage answer?

CONCLUSION.

At the commencement of this, I simply intended to answer the editorial of the Catholic Progress of November 4, 1904, in a short letter, but I drifted onward and feel now as if I could spend my spare hours for the next six months giving reasons why I am opposed to the present competitive system. I believe that any man who will go out with the average business man who is what we call successful and who claims to be a strict church member, will find that the successful "religious" business man is a hypocrite. The competitive system forces a man to be dishonest, or forces him out of business.

The world is a great amphi-theater—a stage where every human being plays a part. It is not so much the part you play, as, **Do you play that part well?**

The world is a kindergarten where we have models. Those models are not the man who can sway the people with oratorical power; it is not the successful candidate who goes to Washington and gets decoyed with that false glare; it is not the woman who wears elaborate dresses and diamonds; it is not the man who parades our avenues with epaulettes and gold braid, war paint and feathers, to remind the human race that there still exists in the human breast a desire to take human life; it is not the man who commands a war vessel and crosses the sea to destroy a foreign port or sink a foreign fleet, with combatitive and destructive factors so overdeveloped that they overheat the brain, and nothing less than the flying missiles of destruction

FEB 13 1965

can fan his heated brow. None of these models are what we should follow. There is another, that of a man who expends his physical and mental energies in the interest of the human race, that man whose power of exhortation, through his prayer and supplications pierces the wall of his sacred cloister, pierces the wall of his monastery, pierces the walls of the mountain ranges and vibrates o'er the universe, felt but not perceived by human eyes, which shines in a halo of light on the astral plain, that man of whom poets raved and sages wrote, that model, that pure life as it were, transcends the sublime, the monk and his beads.

J. K.

A
SOCIALIST'S
Answer to The
CATHOLIC
Progress

By JOHN KINAN

Price, Fifty Cents.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 272 903 7