

that would not have been true of any man in all the millions then alive. The world very foolishly reproached him because he did not tell the usual epitaph-monger's lies about 'Franklin, my loyal friend.' But the real tragedy of the business was that a man who had known Stevenson intimately and who was either a penetrating critic or nothing, had nothing better worth saying about him than that he was occasionally stingy about money and that when he passed a looking-glass he looked at it. Which Stevenson's parlor-maid could have told us as well as Henley if she had been silly enough to suppose that the average man is a generous sailor in a melodrama, and totally incurious and unconscious as to his personal appearance." Like Mr. Shaw, I feel that while we have learned the prosaic traits of Stevenson's character, we have never yet seen the real Stevenson. All his wonderful short stories, his stirring tales of adventure, his exquisite letters, his delicate and personal

criticism, are, it seems to me, less wonderful achievements than the splendid feat of his own life. Stevenson is his own greatest character. His was a brave heart, a bold front, a noble and a stimulating optimism. He flew bright signals of courage, of decency, of saneness, of kindness, of common sense, that brought all the young and brave and imprudent hearts of his generation rallying round him. Like Cyrano, he always wore his *panache*—the feather in the cap of courage. He carried his ill-health and penury bravely and wittily into far corners of the earth, through many strange adventures. "The medicine-bottles on my chimney," he once wrote to William Archer, "and the blood on my handkerchief are accidents—they do not exist in my prospect." It is Stevenson's great glory that the influence, not so much of his books, but of his life will always remain. "His flag still flies untattered."

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

Chapel Hill, N. C.

SOLVING THE LABOR PROBLEM.

BY HON. LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

"I SHALL devote the remainder of my life to solving the labor question," is a remark attributed to Hon. Marcus A. Hanna.

Was it possible for him or is it possible for any other person similarly situated to succeed in that attempt?

The labor problem will be solved when wage-workers get and keep all they earn. Then labor organizations will become purely social and educational, strikes will be things of the past, and class discontent will cease.

The solution of the labor question involves two steps:

First, to find the best workable plan.

Second, to carry out that plan.

That any successful business man past

the age of sixty years should originate a scheme capable of solving the labor problem would approach the miraculous. The whole current of his life has been in another direction; the thoughts and purposes which have filled his working hours, the fixed opinions which are now a part of his being, and indeed all his mental habits, combine to make a full and unbiassed investigation impossible to him. Many men, possessed of the first ability and impelled toward success by the strongest motives, have devoted the prime of life to the discovery or invention of such a plan. As the net result of the consecration of many noble lives to the one purpose, of their diverse conclusions few to-day are accepted as

true by any considerable body of supporters.

Any philanthropist, therefore, no matter how great his ability, who has given his years of strength to the acquisition of wealth, will only waste time in trying to evolve a new project for solving the labor problem. His aspiration, however, if genuine, need not be a vain one, provided he is willing to abandon the rôle of inventor and become a student of what others have done. If prepared to accept the less ambitious task of electing between plans already formulated, then it is possible for him to do a work of great usefulness, and even to reach the practical end at which he so laudably aims.

Before entering upon an investigation into the merits of the rival schemes, the rich philanthropist, in order to hope for success, must disabuse his mind of any prejudice he may hold against them. He must, indeed, assume a teachable spirit, be ready to question, and, upon sufficient proof, to abandon cherished views and long-established convictions.

With the ground thus cleared for arriving at an unbiased judgment, a single year should suffice for him to determine between the propositions which lay a reasonable claim to being a solution of the labor problem.

The schemes which need engage his attention are but two in number,—the one associated with the name of Karl Marx, the other with that of Henry George.

Either plan, in order to be accepted must stand the tests: Is it equitable? Is it speedy? Will it be effective?

Should both projects be found to possess these requisites, it must then be decided which of the two has them in the greater degree.

STATE SOCIALISM.

State Socialism means the assumption by the government of all large businesses which are now in private hands. It would make the public the owner of all

the means of production and distribution—of the land, of the mills and machinery, of the stores and goods, of the railroads and cars, and so on. It seeks to abolish the private capitalist and to substitute for him government-ownership, supervision and operation.

Socialism has one doctrine, and but one, peculiar to itself; confute that and the whole structure falls to the ground. The essence of that doctrine is: Interest belongs to the public. The argument for it is that tangible wealth, when used as capital—such as factories, stores, cars and machinery—is not the product of the individuals who now possess it, nor did it really belong to those persons from whom the present owners acquired it, but is the accumulated product of the past efforts of the human race as a whole. The logic is that without the combined efforts of practically everybody, of the many dead and the comparatively few now living, such wealth as mills and machinery could not be in existence. Therefore (it is argued) no one person has a right to claim over it a greater degree of ownership than another.

In answer to this reasoning it may be said that if a savage dug out a canoe by his own unassisted labor, the log being cut from common land, why should not he be the owner—instrument of production and transportation though it be? Just so, if several or many persons unitedly build a large sea-going vessel, do not they own it jointly? And may they not transfer the title to some one individual who then equitably becomes its owner? If these questions are answered properly in the affirmative, then no wrong is done by the private-ownership of capital. If not impossible, it certainly is difficult, to demonstrate that in order to satisfy the demand of equity, interest, which is the return to capital, must all go into the public treasury.

It does not, however, of necessity follow that the time may not come when it will be wise for the State to own and operate mills and stores, even though

by so doing private competition is rendered impossible. This would be State Socialism, but it would necessarily be arrived at very slowly, and probably only after a widespread and prolonged trial of voluntary coöperation.

And who can foretell the consequences of State Socialism, whether it will increase or lessen production, whether its effect upon the character of the people will be good or bad? These are questions which any impartial thinker will find difficult to determine definitely for himself, much more so to answer to the satisfaction of other minds.

In considering the practicability of State Socialism, it may be said that its adherents rightfully reject the term "reform" as descriptive of it, and proclaim it a revolution. Certainly it would turn topsy-turvy the statute-books of any state entering upon it to an extent which might properly be called revolutionary.

Applying the tests already enumerated, a candid examination leads to the conclusion that State Socialism would not necessarily be inequitable, that its practicability is not easy to vouch for, that under the most favorable conditions conceivable its acceptance by any American state can only take place in the very distant future. Even though circumstances should arise which would invite a violent revolution and make possible the speedy establishment of Socialism, the change in social conditions would be so radical that the effects cannot be foreseen. They might be beneficial and they might be highly detrimental to human progress. Only when society has taken some shorter step forward shall we have reached a height of civilization from whose vantage-ground we can view clearly and state definitely the consequences of Socialism.

THE SINGLE-TAX.

We can but think that at this stage of his investigation the wealthy philanthropist will be disposed at least to hold his decision in abeyance until he has ex-

amined the second plan of amelioration, which is lauded by its followers, not as anything revolutionary, but as a very simple though far-reaching reform.

The Single-Tax means free land. It would derive all public revenue from a tax upon land values, reaching that end by the simple process of exempting from taxation all else. When fully applied all ground rental values will go into the public treasuries and land will have no selling price. The market price of a house and lot would not exceed the cost of replacing the house; the market price of a street railway would just equal the cost of replacing the tangible assets, such as track, cars and power-houses; so of every other public-service corporation; so of all mines, forests, water-courses, water-fronts and other real-estate.

The doctrine peculiar to the Single-Tax is the common ownership of ground rent. Its adherents claim to demonstrate the truth of this underlying principle by the following line of argument. Since man is a land animal his natural right to life embraces and necessitates the equal right to land. If this statement be incorrect, and if an individual can own land, just as he owns a hat or a house, to use, abuse, lock up, destroy at will, or reap the revenue therefrom, then one man may ethically become the owner of all the land, and, by ordering off all others, annihilate the human race. This *reductio ad absurdum* can only be avoided by admitting the natural and equal right of all to the land.

Assuming, therefore, that the land was intended for all the people, it follows inevitably that land values are also theirs; for value is given to any piece of land no more by the owner than by any other member of the community. In fact the value which attaches to land, and which is measured either by its price or by its annual rental value, is created by the community and should be classed as the earnings of society, just as much as wages are reckoned to be the earnings of the individual.

If rent belongs to the community, then it follows that the appropriation of ground rents by an individual, as now recognized by law, is unjust, and that the wrong should at once be righted by the taking every year by the public of all ground rental values in the form of a tax—the rate to about five per centum upon the present selling price of land.

The legislation needed to put the Single-Tax into practical operation is very simple. It is only necessary to pass national and state laws substantially as follows:

All taxes shall be levied upon land values, but in no year shall the total assessment of any piece of land be in excess of its annual rental value.

The necessary corollary of such laws will be the exemption from taxation of all the products of labor. This means the refusal to tax incomes and inheritances; the abolition of tariffs, custom-houses and internal revenue; as well as the exemption of improvements and personalty of every kind. In practice it would necessitate an understanding between the nation and the state as to what proportion of rent each should take. Perhaps two-thirds to the state (including municipalities) and one-third to the nation would be an equitable division.

No doubt the first application of the Single-Tax will be in some state, in consequence of a law or constitutional amendment permitting it by local option.

So long as the national government chooses to derive its revenue as heretofore, it will remain within the province of any state, under the Single-Tax theory, to take the whole rental value of land, thus greatly increasing (about doubling) the total revenue it now collects. It is, therefore, within the power of any legislature at its next session, unless prohibited by the state constitution, to introduce the Single-Tax by the passage of a law of one or two short sections, exempting from taxation personal estates and improvements. This would necessitate of course a heavier tax than now upon

land values, in order to raise present revenues. Probably, very shortly after permission was given and accepted, cities and towns generally would increase their revenues up to the limit prescribed. Every step in that direction would lessen the price of land, making it cheaper and cheaper, until finally none could be found commanding more than a nominal price in the market, and for all practical purposes land would be free. It would then be unprofitable for any one to own land who did not put it to a good use, nor need any one who desired to own land, either for a homestead or for business purposes, go without. The candid philosopher who makes a full investigation of the Single-Tax will be forced to the conclusions: It is equitable; it is practicable; it is speedily attainable, and it will prove effective.

CARRYING OUT THE PLAN.

For the sake of argument, let it now be assumed that among the number of philanthropists who desire to expend their millions for the benefit of their fellowmen, one of them accepts the conclusion stated above, and decides to risk a small fraction of the sum he is giving away to bring about as speedily as possible the consummation of the Single-Tax. What steps should he take?

No better illustration of the best method of procedure can be given than that followed by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, when, upon the death of his grand-child in the summer of 1900, he sought to discover the germ which gives rise to "summer complaint" in young children. He placed the sum of \$200,000 at the disposal of Dr. William H. Welch of Baltimore, one of the most noted pathologists in the world, giving him *carte blanche* in its expenditure.

Although Mr. Rockefeller could not by his own research discover the fatal germ, he could and did discover a scientist who was most capable of conducting the work successfully. Dr. Welch was pointed out as the right man by the

consensus of the competent, which means by the agreement of persons engaged in the same pursuit.

In like manner the wealthy philanthropist bent upon solving the labor problem through the application of the Single-Tax, would find that every real reform has within its ranks expert agitators, men who, although for lack of funds compelled to make bricks without straw, yet have been surprisingly successful in what they have undertaken. He could get at the consensus of the competent among Single-Taxers by consultation with such men as William Lloyd Garrison and C. B. Filibrown of Boston; Lawson Purdy and Bolton Hall of New York; Louis F. Post and John Z. White of Chicago, and Judge James McGuire of San Francisco.

It is not within the scope of this article to indicate the steps which should be taken by the expert who may be entrusted with so momentous a task. Yet it is a pretty safe assertion that the major part of the sum contributed would be devoted to educating and arousing public sentiment in a single locality, either a

state or a city, under local option law. It has been said that Paris is France. With even greater truth the epigram would apply to the metropolitan city in several of our states. In such a case the thorough conversion of the chief city, whose press reaches every section of the state, would mean the conversion of so wide an electorate as to lead to the enactment of the requisite law.

No proposal for benefiting mankind can compare with the one here pointed out. The founding of libraries and the endowment of educational institutions are commendable; but it should be borne in mind that these fields already are well cultivated, while the direct amelioration of society as a unit has most woefully been neglected. Two hundred thousand dollars dedicated to the establishment of the Single-Tax in the manner suggested would do more for the human race than \$200,000,000 directed to the education of individual members of the community, in whatever way the larger sum were expended.

LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

Lonsdale, R. I.

JUDGE WILLIAM JEFFERSON POLLARD: A PRACTICAL IDEALIST WHO IS ACHIEVING A GREAT WORK IN REDEEMING DRUNKARDS.

AN EDITORIAL SKETCH.

I. A TYPICAL SELF-MADE MAN.

JUDGE William Jefferson Pollard of the Second District Court of St. Louis is the type of the self-made man at his best. America is the paradise of self-made men, but unhappily many of her youths have long riveted their eyes on the acquisition of gold, subordinating all else to the quest, and when they have achieved their desired goal they have done so at the expense of that which is finest and most divine in their natures. They have steadily exalted egoism and

subordinated altruism. They have permitted the lust for gold and the lust for power to choke out the love of justice, reverence for the rights of others, and the fragrant flower of sympathy. Hence while they may be considered successful from the superficial view-point, having achieved vast fortunes or gained places of power and honor, their influence is the reverse of helpful to the world. Indeed, it is frequently blighting in its direct effect and insidiously poisoning in its less obvious influence on the ideals and conduct of others.