

is not yet prepared to make further reductions, it must let Roosevelt's criticism stand unanswered.

There is little in the platform of the Progressive party to justify Roosevelt's claim that its policy would have been more effective than the Democratic policy. Weak and unsatisfactory as the Democratic tariff policy unquestionably is, it is, nevertheless, a step in the right direction. The Progressive party tariff policy, on the other hand, is reactionary, since it upholds Privilege in the form of Protection. Moreover, Roosevelt's well known predilection for militarism has justly or unjustly rendered the Progressive party subject to suspicion of being similarly inclined. Both Progressives and Democrats insist on futile restrictive legislation as the means of dealing with the trust question, and both would empower commissions to further delay a proper handling of the matter. Both lack the knowledge or the courage to advocate entire abolition of underlying privileges.

In both the Democratic and the Progressive party there is an element which is ready and willing to apply efficient remedies. A majority of the Committee on Platform of the Progressive national convention of 1912 favored a Singletax plank. Had this been inserted, Roosevelt's criticism of the Democratic policy would have had more justification than it now has. There is also a large radical element in the Democratic party. If the efforts of this element in Congress had not been opposed by the reactionary wing the party would be in a better position to successfully respond to such an assault as Roosevelt has made. Perhaps this fact will now be realized and the Colonel's criticism may have the beneficial effect of inducing the Democratic party to become more democratic.

S. D.

Monopolies and Monopolies.

Once more is it made manifest that an intelligent comprehension of economic principles is necessary to an effective handling of the monopoly question. Because monopolies have been found detrimental to the wellbeing of the state, careless thinkers and headlong reformers, are urging the supervision and control of various businesses merely because they are big. Thus, the great trading companies, particularly those known as "mail order" houses, and "chain stores," that have been able to undersell the local individual dealer,

have been condemned as agents of evil, and their suppression or restraint has been urged.

It must be apparent upon further reflection that this confusion of thought is due to an imperfect analogy. Mere size of a commercial unit has little to do with its merit. The small landlords of France and Belgium are as oppressive as the large landlords of England. Nor is the fact that the mail order house can undersell local dealers in itself objectionable. The displacement of hand weavers by the power loom may have caused temporary hardship to a few weavers, but it has been a blessing to the world at large, including, in the end, the weavers themselves. This is the history of all labor-saving inventions and devices. The very essence of progress lies in devising ways of doing a given thing with less labor; and though that device may displace some of the labor in that calling, it inevitably opens up opportunities in new fields.

The protest against mail order houses seems strangely inconsistent at this time, when so much is said about the high cost of living, and so many accusing fingers are pointed at the middle man. If the consumer in the small country town can buy cheaper of the mail order house than of his local merchant, the cost of living to that degree is reduced. If some of the local merchants are forced out of business, they can enter other lines of service where their labor is needed. The only harm that could result would come through the advance in prices by the mail order house, after it had destroyed the local merchant. But this cannot follow so long as there is impartial transportation of goods. The houses that are accused of destroying competitors by cutting prices are prospering to a degree that is inviting the formation of rival houses. For these to combine and advance prices would be to cause the formation of still others. The most efficient regulation possible comes from the competitors. If, as contended by some, the local merchant can sell as cheaply as the big trading company, he has it in his own hands to drive out his menacing competitor. If he cannot do so, then he should retire from the field, and permit his customers to enjoy the cheaper service. To lay arbitrary burdens upon the mail order house in order to preserve the local trader, is merely another application of the protective principle, which has already wrought such havoc in this country. Corporate bodies, or private agents, that have no effective competition, such as railroads, street cars,

telephones, etc., that exist only by special permission of the state, must be controlled by the state; but all free businesses, whether shoe-shining or the great trading companies, can have no other restraining influence so effective as the competition of their rivals.

S. C.

Organized Labor's Case.

Prejudice against labor organizations is by no means confined to monopolistic quarters. Even many workers for social justice, who realize that existing conditions are unfair, withhold their sympathy. They find cause for this in the misconduct of individuals connected with trade unions and in enforcement by the organizations of unjust and tyrannical regulations. That such evils exist is undeniable, but their existence is more an indictment of the system that forces laborers to organize for self-protection than of the labor organizations. So long as the number of jobs is less than the number of men anxious to fill them, so long must it be to the interest of laborers to organize. To make such an organization even partially effective, some if not all of the apparently absurd and certainly oppressive rules are necessary. Industrial warfare is as incapable of refinement as military warfare. Labor organizations can be rendered unnecessary for the protection of labor only through abolition of monopoly of natural opportunities. If that were done there would be jobs open to all and laborers could get their entire product without organization. As long as monopoly of Nature's resources is allowed to exist laborers will be driven to organize and to do much that is unethical in self-defense. These facts must be borne in mind in judging the labor unions' case.

S. D.

Distorting News.

The movement by Denver's so-called Law and Order League to recall Judge Lindsey is thus explained in the Chicago Evening Post of May 27:

The interview on Colorado which Judge Ben B. Lindsey gave the Post during his recent passage through Chicago reached Denver in a distorted form. Upon this inaccurate report Lindsey's old foes decided at once to start another movement for his recall from the bench.

This is an explanation that needs explaining. What news agency was responsible for reprinting the interview "in a distorted form"? It is quite possible for a correspondent to misunderstand spoken words and to unintentionally misrepresent what he has heard. But this does not apply to a report of a published interview. How can a

news agency which sends such a distorted report clear itself of suspicion of intentional coloring of news?

S. D.

Amortisation and Farm Tenantry.

Speaking of the increase in farm tenantry, so noticeable in Kansas and other States, the Omaha World-Herald of May 25 says: "This increase in the number of tenant farmers must be stopped and the only scheme that promises to do that so far advanced is the long time amortisation plan, which enables the landless to become landowners." What the World-Herald seems to overlook is that the introduction of a plan to encourage buying of land without discouraging speculation must further inflate prices. In order to succeed, the amortisation plan must be coupled with a plan to discourage withholding of land from use. There is an additional reason in so coupling it in the fact that such discouragement would probably make the amortisation plan less necessary than it now seems to be.

S. D.

Iowa's Lost Population.

Speaking of Iowa's loss of population the Chicago Record-Herald remarks, "how rising land values can drive out farmers who own their acres no one has explained." This may be because many of these farmers move out voluntarily. Congressman Vollmer of Iowa in a speech in the House on March 19 said: "There is not a town of any size in the Middle West which has not its quota of retired farmers who have grown wealthy by reason of the increase in the value of lands. In my home town we have one street on which the residents are mostly of this class." Of course some of these retired farmers must have been replaced, temporarily at least, by rack-rented tenants or mortgaged purchasers. Why these should sooner or later feel encouraged to emigrate must be evident, even to the Record-Herald. As land values increase universal experience shows that ownership of land becomes more concentrated. There is nothing particularly strange or surprising about Iowa's loss. A similar tendency is observable in Missouri's agricultural districts, and in other places also, though perhaps not to the same extent as in Iowa.

S. D.

The Poll Tax in California.

The Los Angeles Graphic of May 23, in arguing against the proposed abolition of the poll tax, says "the class that will thereby dodge about the