

valuation and taxation, and are crying for Tariff Reform instead. They know too well that taxation of land values means, at no distant time, the land for the people.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE WORKING GIRLS' SONG.

Dedicated by Miss Harriet Monroe to the Women's Trade Union League.

Sisters of the whirling wheel
Are we all day;
Builders of a house of steel
On Time's highway;
Giving bravely, hour by hour,
All we have of youth and power.

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Fingers fly and engines boom
The livelong day,
Through far fields when roses bloom
The soft winds play.
Vast the work is—sound and true
Be the tower we build for you!

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

Ours the future is—we face
The whole world's needs.
In our hearts the coming race
For life's joy pleads.
As you make us—slaves or free—
So the men unborn shall be.

Chorus:

Oh, lords of the house we rear,
Hear us, hear!
Green are the fields in May-time,
Grant us our love-time, play-time.
Short is the day and dear.

+ + +

PUZZLE—FIND THE THIEF.

"Thou Shalt Not Steal!"

Every passenger who doesn't pay his fare steals.
Every conductor who doesn't turn in fares collected—steals.

—Car Sign.

"Thou shalt not steal."

Every street railway company that doesn't pay living salaries—steals.

Every street railway company that doesn't give transfers—steals.

Every street railway company that works its men over hours—steals.

Every street railway company that charges a fare for a standing passenger—steals.

Every street railway company that charges two fares to Coney Island—steals.

"Thou shalt not steal."

—Life.

+ + +

VAN CLEAVE, TAFT, GOMPERS, BRYAN.

An Open Letter for Such as Will "Read, Mark, Learn, and Inwardly Digest."

+

Austin Rotary Engine Company,
2nd Ave. & 8th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Oct. 3, 1908.

Mr. James W. Van Cleave,
President National Association of Manufacturers,
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Sir:—History affords no parallel for the wonderful unanimity on political matters you declare exists among "all the 142 national, State and local organizations leagued with the National Association of Manufacturers." One's surprise at the temerity of a perverse Congressional minority is increased by your assurance that the "great mass of the American people" were behind you at the Chicago convention. Your disclaimer, "there is no partisanship" in your association, is superfluous. Partisanship implies opposition. It is always the other fellow, he who opposes you, who is the "partisan." But the greatest surprise is: Why (with your assurance of this complete unanimity, 142 associations and the "great mass" of the people with you) does the national Republican committee maintain the pretense that there is a contest? Is it that Hitchcock needs the diversion before he enters the cabinet? Even so, why subject the ponderous Taft to an "undignified" emulation of his opponent's "demagoguery" of rear-car campaigning. Why bother about the votes of the minor fraction outside your "great mass"? Are there not other exercises less fatiguing and repulsive to the heir apparent? Or are you and Hitchcock cruelly deceiving him into believing that Bryan "has a show"?

Did you work up this Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us," from the party leaders in the "rock-ribbed" Republican States, so that those who are being fried on Sheldon's griddle may get their money's worth, by having the candidate "put through his paces" for their delectation? But why with this all-pervading "unanimity" should they be separated from their shekels? Why is the money needed? Seemingly some are so foolish as not to comprehend it is mere by-play. They squeal at the Sheldon touch in these "panicky" times. Is it wise to bare that sore spot? Why not frankly admit the fight is a farce, that only a

negligible quantity will vote for Bryan, the "142 organizations" and the "great mass" of the people being with you—and Taft. True, it wouldn't seem like a Presidential year. But think of the gain to the country from your announcement. You would bury that bug-bear, "Presidential campaigns disturb business." At once a Van Cleave-Taft prosperity would ensue, more "abounding," "amazing," "unparalleled," "unprecedented," "universal," "widespread," and "wonderful" than now exists.

You say, "alien heresies" were urged on the Chicago convention by enemies of the "party." As you assert that it not only voiced its own constituency, but that of your "142 organizations" and the "great mass" of the people, it is no longer a "party"; under the leadership of you and Taft it becomes "the people." Your admission is to be deplored. Without it, doubtless the "demagogue"—Bryan—would have seen the futility of tempting the fates—Van Cleave and Taft—and would have withdrawn, thus bringing peace and harmony to "business"—monopoly. I fear it affords an excuse to the vicious—the Denver convention and those outside of the "great mass"—to insist that a fight is on, and that their man "has a chance."

One entrusted with your great responsibility of speaking for the 142 organizations and the "great mass" of the people cannot be too careful. Because of your right thus to speak (a plebiscite is, of course, unnecessary, your intuition being an infallible guide) this admission may prolong the struggle. It is all the more regrettable, in that you say: "Our [your] victory marks a new epoch in the country's political development." It surely does. Your "unanimity" means the end of political contests. Never again will "business"—monopoly—"interests" be disturbed by political agitation. With the "heir apparent" succeeding to the throne; with the "demagogue," Bryan, getting a mere rump of a vote—where he is to get any outside of the "great mass" is a poser,—the country will be Morganized and Harrimanized into a calm and peaceful "business" condition—monopoly—undisturbed by labor agitators. One can only pray that after eight years of the serene and placid Taft, we may be favored with twelve—why not twenty—years of the brilliant Van Cleave!

Only the carping critic will insinuate that your "new epoch" means that you have driven the toilers—or those who would be toilers were it not for this "abounding" prosperity—to the support of Bryan. Only those who perversely refuse to see that "the ignorant and autocratic labor-bosses" have fallen into "discredit among the rank and file of their organizations" will attach any significance to the fact that a gathering of the officials of the organizations composing the American Federation of Labor unanimously voted to support Gompers, or that the United Mine Workers of America, and

nine out of ten of all the State bodies affiliated with the Federation—New York State on Sept. 23rd, and Indiana, Sept. 30th, being the latest—have taken similar action in support of those "demagogues"—Bryan and Gompers.

Your averment of "unanimity" should reassure the Crown Prince. Even his doubts of the outcome—due largely it is said by the vulgar to a feeling that he is outclassed by his opponent—can be eradicated by vigorous repetition. Every one appreciates the modesty of your claim that "business men have seen in the past few months, in a more striking way than ever before, the value of organization as a force in 'good' government." Only the hypercritical will say that they have long noticed how this "force" is used by the railroads and other monopolistic organizations for "good" government. Only those few outside the "great mass" will question the unsullied purity of your motives. Only the captious will declare that your action has solidified the labor organizations into supporting Bryan as the only effective means of getting relief from "government by injunction," and other seemingly cruel, but of course necessary measures if "labor is to be kept in its place."

Your further assertion that the "convulsion of 1893 was far more 'widespread and disastrous' than the 'setback'—why not financial lark or holiday?—of 1907, is most comforting. It will soothe and calm the doubting Thomases—and they exist even among your "142"—who avow they never knew such "hard times." It will make their "panic" losses easier to bear and blot out all remembrance of their financial tragedies. But why did you withhold it so long? If made earlier, it might have saved thousands from bankruptcy—and some from suicide. It would have stiffened many a toppling pillar, buttressed many a failing business, rescued many who believe they have been brought to ruin by a "Republican" panic. All we needed was "confidence," when our banks suspended, when we business men were harassed on every side, unable to withdraw a penny of our funds which the banks corralled, closing their doors in our faces. Who more competent to inspire it—and thus ward off the importunate creditor, drive away the rent collector—than yourself? Why for twelve months have you abandoned the slogans, "All is well," "Leave well enough alone"?

But get after R. F. Cutting, the president of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. Whoever suggests the need of such a body in a period of "marvellous" prosperity, should be hung, drawn and quartered. Although a Taftite, he is so indiscreet as to say, "not even in 1893-4 did the depression persist so long, nor was the suffering so widespread." Such "alien heresy" from within the Taft camp must be stamped out. Immerse him in boiling oil, or "Malmesbury" wine; make him recant; insist that he protest this is not a "Republican" panic, but is due to astronomical

derangements. Fortunately, as you have the "great mass" of the people with you, no serious harm can come from his revelation. Also nothing else was to be expected of Foraker. But were you not remiss in permitting Taft to publicly embrace him at Toledo in September, when on July 1st he had proclaimed "22,000 skilled workers are out of employment here in Cincinnati"? How wicked too of him at this time to reveal how Taft tried to have a prominent Standard Oil attorney appointed a Federal judge! This may stir the ribald to declare again that trust and railroad magnates generally land their men on the Federal bench.

Your letter to Mr. Bryan is so calm, dispassionate, serene, tranquil and unruffled in its tone, so unlike the "rantings" and "ravings" of "labor-bosses," that your declaration that "some of your members will vote for Bryan" disturbs me. It is the fly in the ointment of complete satisfaction at the political outlook. Accepting your assurance of June 30th, that not only "all" the 142 associations, but the "great mass" of the people were behind you, I deemed the battle already won. Your declaration causes disquiet, renews fears, suggests doubt, whether the "ignorant and autocratic labor-bosses" have been, as you claim, "overwhelmingly, ignominiously beaten" by the "solid, sane, conservative element" you lead so bravely. I would not question your infallibility. But the scoffer—he who neither understands nor appreciates how you have saved the country from "Bryanism,"—he may say, that in qualifying your assurance of June 30th by admitting that "some of the 142 are for Bryan," you lay your other statements open to question. Such will point out that while many workingmen have been convicted for "picketing," no manufacturer nor corporation has even been indicted for "blacklisting." It will be no satisfactory answer (to them) to say, that picketing is necessarily public, that it cannot be hidden or disguised, that hundreds participate, and thousands are cognizant of it; while "blacklisting," which robs the laborer of his all—his right to labor, to be denied which is to starve—is done in secret, known only by those who actually exchange lists or use the phone to suggest the boycott of workingmen; partners and stockholders preferring to leave this delicate matter to such as are discreet. Once your infallibility is doubted, sceptics will arise to maintain that while vigorously denouncing intimidation by strikers, you have yet to condemn, even tardily, the criminal aggregations of wealth for their crimes. For instance: The systematized and (through railroad agents) collusive espionage of the Standard Oil Company upon and the bribery of their competitors' employees; its rebates from and discriminative collusions with railroads; its 30 years of debauchery of public officials; its wholesale traffic in United States Senators—name one in the pay of organized labor or a

"labor-boss"; the arson and murder of its subsidiaries. But perhaps you regard this "American Beauty" rose as not too high a price to pay for the glory of having a Rockefeller. Again: Look at the suppression by the Steel Trust of all publicity of the fearful horrors daily enacted in its mills, hundreds of lives being needlessly sacrificed every year to the insatiable greed of this modern Moloch; the wanton destruction of life by the anthracite coal combine's refusal to obey life-guarding laws; the hourly killing or maiming of employees by the criminal neglect of railroads to provide law-directed appliances, the annual reckless and needless slaughter of life in mines and mills, and by the railroads, amounting to tens of thousands—nothing being so cheap to our "captains of industry" as human life; the debauchery by trust and railroad barons of legislatures, State and national, and boards of aldermen; their purchase of United States Senatorships; their wholesale bribery of administrative as well as legislative officials by passes—even Roosevelt accepting these favors to the tune of twenty-five special trains, with food, wines, cigars, etc., to the value of one hundred thousand dollars during the two years to Sept. 16, 1903; the looting of railroads like the Alton of \$60,000,000; the demand of the railroads for increased freights, yet willingly paying a tribute to the Steel trust of \$7 to \$8 a ton for steel rails over what they are sold for abroad; of the "gentlemen's agreement" between the Western Union and the Postal, so that telegraph tolls are yanked up 33% to 66%; the throttling of Congress by the Paper Trust, thus setting at naught the well-nigh universal demand of the newspapers for free wood-pulp, so as to limit that trust's extortion; and the coercion of employees by members of your association into voting for Taft, under the threat of closing the mills after the election if the men shall exercise the American right of an untrammelled suffrage, the while you are claiming to be for "freedom of contract" for labor. How proud Taft will feel if he is elected by such means. So much like the "Dear Harriman, you and I as 'practical men' \$260,000 fund," isn't it?

Was it not indiscreet of the New York "Times"—a Taft paper—to admit that the "leadership of Gompers is enthusiastically endorsed by the great majority of organized labor, and that the injunction issue is tremendously popular"—even in Indiana. If these admissions continue may not some of the "great mass" get away from you, stray after strange gods, even vote for the "demagogue"—Bryan?

Was it not also indiscreet for Roosevelt to threaten to veto the Oklahoma constitution because it provided for "jury trials in contempt cases"? And Taft, too! How unwise of him to stump Oklahoma, campaigning against the proposed constitution on the same grounds, when as the "father of injunctions," he was the prospec-

five candidate? And when you recall that Oklahoma rebuked Roosevelt and Taft by over 100,000, have you no anxiety that others of the "great mass" will get away from your apron strings? I confess I have.

And then the panic! True, with bounteous crops, unlimited raw materials (Morgan and Hill kindly monopolizing them so we shant use them too rapidly), the most intelligent, virile, progressive, and adaptable labor in the world, with an abundance of stored-up labor (capital), there was no honest reason why there should be a panic. Then why did it occur, why does it persist? Why the industrial blight? Why the depression? The cause is not difficult to discover. It is that the above named natural forces, those which unhampered would yield bountifully for all, are hamstrung by legislation conferring privileges upon the few. These privileges enable their possessors to "hold up" natural laws, to forcibly take from producers and consumers alike the produce of their toil. A panic in a period of bounteous crops and intensified production is an anachronism. But what if the crops had failed? Then, the "worst panic ever known," the most "persistent depression, the most widespread suffering," might have become a cataclysm—and this, too, under the "ablest, wisest and best President we have ever had." Does'n't the thought of such a possibility make you quake? Even Bryan couldn't have done worse, could he?

Bryan plans to minimize the effect of panics by guaranteeing bank deposits. True to the interests he defends and will continue to serve if elected, Taft opposes the people having their deposits guaranteed—most of them deriving no profit thereon—although the nation, the States and the municipalities demand and obtain it. While opposing this safeguard for the people, he would insure a "reasonable" profit to manufacturers. Force-pump and gas-inflation methods, a vigorous beating of tom-toms, a universal insistence that "things are all right" by "let us alone," "sunshine", and optimistic" leagues, may inject sufficient wind and gas into our industrial life to deceive the unwary until after election. But even if successful it merely postpones the day of reckoning. Of course the monopolists wish to stave off a crisis at this time. They hope under the egis of the complaisant Taft, by a further riveting of the shackles of monopoly upon industry, by increasing their power to subjugate the people, by greater solidity and more power to crush labor organizations, by a firmer control of government, national, State and local, to have the masses at their mercy when the economic evils they are creating bring the inevitable industrial cataclysm. The events of October-November last, prove their increasing control of government. A bold, arrogant, domineering, financial tyrant issues his orders like a despot. A meek, servile, complaisant secretary of the treasury summoned from Washington, comes meekly

into his august presence. Daily, aye, hourly the chief financial officer of the government, charged with the custody of an "imperial" nation's funds, is directed by the factotum of this autocrat how and with whom to place the people's money—the lion's share going, of course, to the dictator's own banks. Not content with this exhibition of his absolute sway over the nation's government, the tyrant sends his emissaries, Gary and Frick, to the White House to serve notice upon the nominal head of the government that he would brook no interference with his plans to get complete control of the largest of all industries; that there must be an unconditional surrender, a pledge that the Presidential cath to enforce the laws would be violated by agreeing neither to punish nor prevent the consummation of his illegal acts; the purpose to increase his monopolistic power by absorbing in brazen and contemptuous defiance of anti-trust laws his chief competitor—the Tennessee Coal and Iron Co. The abject surrender made, the defence *he* now offers, is, that *he* did it to avert a greater panic—an admission from the nation's executive that Morgan is the nation's master, that he can make or mar its industrial life, that its business destiny is in his hands.

Upon what meat has this our Caesar fed that he has grown so great? Special privilege! Through his monopolization of anthracite, of steel, and of steel highways, he and a few others have acquired their enormous wealth and this dangerous power, a power which menaces every business compelled to use coal, steel, or other trust products.

You say, it is base and cowardly for workingmen to cringe before "ignorant and autocratic labor-bosses." Where is the "labor-boss" with a millionth of this man's power over the business, aye, the very lives of others? What is to be said of the business men of the country—having larger opportunities, more leisure, greater comforts, a better education, than their employees—who submit to one man's assertion of his sovereignty over all business, insolently declaring that if any—even the chief executive of the nation—dares to interfere with his purposes, he will bring on an industrial cataclysm? What monarch has ever thus terrorized his subjects? What of the pusillanimity of business men before this financial despot? Is the game worth the candle? Is success worth while (to say nothing of the possibility of wholesale disaster) when purchased at such a price? Are the business men willing to permit this? Are they to bow down before this tyrant? Are the real business men of the country, those who ask a fair field and no favor—only an equal opportunity—prepared to pay this fearful price for what at most—if such power continues—can be but a temporary business improvement? Do the business men realize how opportunity is being more and more restricted? How every trust that is formed—and there are some 600 of them al-

ready—removes the possibility of their entering that line? How scores of thousands of business men have been forced to become employees of trusts and monopolies, 50,000 commercial travellers alone having been turned adrift because their employer's business had been trustified or bankrupted? How wealth and power is thus being concentrated, the tribute now paid to monopoly being not less than two billions a year? How in almost every case the trust is receiving rebates and other favors, ingenious trust managers and lawyers readily inventing new schemes for law evasion—the most recent being “accessorial allowance”? How the honest merchant and manufacturer is handicapped on every hand by trust control of railroads and banks, so that they have him at their mercy whenever ready to destroy him? How thousands have been destroyed by these unholy and unfair means? How there can be no relief from this condition, but rather it must become intensified if Taft is elected, for he is a defender of the system which has produced it, he stands for the status quo; whereas Bryan has openly, boldly, persistently, exposed and denounced them, and is pledged to extirpate private monopoly, thus restoring equal opportunity?

No further proof than the facts here recited is needed to show that Bryan is right—“a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.” Who can hesitate in the face of this growing menace to legitimate business? Who will willingly con-

tribute to the growth of such power, to the establishment of such a despotism? Let us free business from this thralldom! Let us unite to secure to everyone equality of opportunity, to secure equal and exact justice to all. Thus may each work out his own destiny, tyranny be overthrown, and liberty, freedom, justice be established.

ROBERT BAKER.

BOOKS

A PLEA FOR INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE.

A Little Land and a Living. By Bolton Hall. Published by the Arcadia Press, New York. 1908. Price, \$1.00.

The author of “Three Acres and Liberty,” which challenged all our feeble city souls, speaks again in praise of the soil. Get a bit of land, he says, an acre or less or more, enrich it, till it deep and often, plant and tend it mindfully; and lo! at the end of a year or two or five, there shall come forth life—not only a living, but health and freedom and fair leisure.

The book puts the ideals of a reformer into the persuasive language of a land-boom booklet, and then satisfies our objecting common sense with names and dates, with places and persons and figures which actualize the vision and hearten our

YOU Subscriber and Reader of The Public:

Dear Sir:

There are more ways than one to help THE PUBLIC to become self-supporting. One is to get all the new subscribers you can. Go over the list of your acquaintances, see which ones might possibly be interested in such a paper, and do not rest until you have either secured their subscription or their positive and definite refusal.

Another way is to secure advertisements. Perhaps you know some business man who would profit by being in touch with THE PUBLIC's constituency. If so, you will be doing him a favor, as well as THE PUBLIC a service, by calling his attention to the opportunity. Just see how many business men you can reach.

Then you can do much to make the advertisements already in pay the advertiser. When you are in need of any article you can give the preference to the one advertised in THE PUBLIC. Some very good work along this line has been done already. The following letter speaks for itself:

Fels & Co.,

Philadelphia, Pa.

FORT DODGE, IA., 9-14-'08.

Gentlemen:—Having noticed your advertisement in THE PUBLIC, I am now using Fels-Naptha and am well pleased with same.

Very truly,

MRS. J. D. BURKE.

Mrs. Burke sets a good example which the several thousand readers of THE PUBLIC ought to follow.

Cincinnati, October 8, 1908.

Yours very truly,

DANIEL KIEFER.

Digitized by Google