WASHINGTON.

Its Public Buildings and Monuments.

In pursuance of the design to review the great departments of the Government, as announced in the last issue of the ECONOMIST, it is probably best to give the reader first a general idea of the appearance of the Capital City, where these great engines of government are located, as there can be little doubt but every American will feel a pride in knowing that the capital of his country compares favorably with the greatest capitals of the Old World and far surpasses many others; not in the ostentatious display of wealth, but in beauty of design and the character of buildings which go to make up its homes as well as public edifices and commercial structures.

Washington, being the Capital of the Nation, would, for that reason alone, command a great degree of interest, not only from Americans, but throughout the civilized world, yet, setting aside this reason, it has claims upon the interest and attention of all, on account of the natural beauty of its location and the symmetry and elegance of its plan and design.

Although Americans may now boast of the splendor of their Capital City, it has not reached its present development and beauty without a long experience of doubt, trepidation, and bickering. A hundred years ago the question was first opened as to the location of the permanent seat of Government.

The Continental Congress had held its sessions in eight different places. The business of the Government was assuming large proportions, and it became necessary that a permanent location be decided on where it could be safely and properly conducted.

On the 23d of December, 1784, a resolution was adopted by Congress of the Confederation for the appointment of commissioners to lay out a district on the Delaware River, near the Lower Falls, for a Federal town, to contain the Government departments and offices. It was moved to substitute Georgetown, on the Potomac, as the site, but all the States except Virginia voted against the motion. However, the resolution was never carried into effect, and the whole matter rested until May, 1787, when an effort was made to take up a resolution for the erection of Government buildings at Georgetown, on the Potomac. This effort did not succeed, and nothing further was ever done in the Congress of the Confederation upon this subject.

In 1787, during the session in Philadelphia of the convention to revise the Federal system of government, it was proposed that the new Constitution of the United States should provide against the choosing, for the seat of the General Government, any city or place where a State government was located, fearing conflicts concerning jurisdiction. A motion was made by James Madison that the following clause be added to the enumerated powers of Congress: "To exercise exclusively legislative authority at the seat of General Government and over a district ten miles square, the consent of the State or States comprising the same to be first obtained." The motion was adopted.

The first Congress of the United States under the Constitution assembled in New York on March 4, 1789, and this Congress received memorials from almost all the principal towns of the Nation praying for the settlement of the question as to a permanent location for the seat of Government. Immediately a bitter contest began and was waged by the champions of various sections. The contest was especially bitter between the Northern and Southern States as to which section should secure the great boon.

After much wrangling and bitter contention a motion was carried to locate the Capital at some convenient place on the east bank of the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania. This created great bitterness between the Northern and Southern representatives and much ill-nature was exhibited. A resolution to appoint commissioners to select the site on the Susquehanna was passed. Three days were occupied by the Senate in discussing the matter, and on September 26, 1789, the Senate passed a bill locating the Capital at Germantown, on the Delaware River, in Pennsylvania. This bill was agreed to by the House after a stormy debate. This was done just at the close of the session and the Senate postponed action on an unimportant amendment made by the House until the next session. At the next term, late in the session, the Capital question came up again, in different form, and no one referred to the Germantown bill. Wilmington, Baltimore, and various other points claimed the honors, but nothing was decided. It was well known that President Washington's pet project was to have the seat of Government located on the Potomac, and he had the full support of the Southern members, but was unable to secure the necessary aid of members from the Eastern and Northern States. On June 28, 1790, a bill came before the Senate locating the seat of Government on the river Potomac. The Southern members all voted for it and two Senators from Pennsylvania, one from New Jersey, and one from New Hampshire voted with them, the vote being 16 to 9.

The House acted on the bill on July 9, after debating it for three days, and the bill as it came from the Senate was passed by a vote of 32 to 29. The bill provided that Philadelphia should be the Capital City until 1800, when the seat of Government should be permanently located on the banks of the Potomac.

On July 9, 1790, an act was passed permanently establishing the Capital at its present site and providing the ways and means of carrying the object into effect. It provided that a district not to exceed ten miles square should be located upon the Potomac. Three commissioners were appointed to select this district, to survey and define its boundaries. They also had power to purchase or accept such district and were commissioned to supply suitable buildings for Government use to be ready for occupancy in December, 1800. The President was also requested and authorized to accept grants of money for the purpose of constructing such buildings. The seat of Government was to remain in Philadelphia until the first Monday in December, 1800, when it should be transferred to the district chosen, which was accordingly done. Thus it will be seen that the choice of the present site for the seat of Government was made only after long and bitter contention, and was at the time of its choice almost in its primitive wildness.

The region chosen and now known as the District of Columbia was partially explored by Capt. John Smith in 1608, who was the first white man to sail up the Potomac. Fifteen years later an Englishman, Henry Fleet, in search of furs, followed nearly the same course pursued by Smith, and in his letters described the locality as "the most healthful and pleasantest region in all this country."

About forty years after Fleet made his trip to this section emigrants from Scotland and Ireland settled in the District of Columbia, and their descendants occupied it at the time of its adoption as the seat of Government. In 1663 what is now Capitol Hill was owned by Francis Pope, who called it Rome. At the time the seat of Government was located here Alexandria, seven miles below on the Potomac, was a thriving and metropolitan city having a large and profitable trade.

The three commissioners appointed by Congress entered upon their duties on April 15, 1791, and laid the first boundary-stone of the District with Masonic ceremony. They named the District the Territory of Columbia, and it retained this name for a number of years. They called the Capital the City of Washington.

The founding of the city seems to be exactly after the manner of the founding of the great cities of antiquity. A site was chosen in the wilderness and the city laid out before any building was begun. It was built for an object, and upon a thoroughly-digested plan suitable to that object, and owing to this cause the city has developed into the magnificence which it boasts to-day.

Clubbing Rates.

The regular subscription price of THE NATIONAL ECONOMIST is $1 per year. But clubbing rates have been agreed upon with the following papers, whereby both can be secured at reduced rates. Other papers will from time to time be added to the list:

	Regular price.	Club price of both.
"Progressive Farmer," of Raleigh, N. C., official organ of State Alliance	$1 00	$1 75
"Toiler," Nashville, Tenn., official organ Agricultural Wheel	1 00	1 65
"Southern Alliance," Atlanta, Ga.	1 00	1 50
"Dakota Ruralist," Huron, Dak., official organ Dakota Alliance	1 00	1 25
"The Forum"	5 00	5 00

THE subscription lists of THE ECONOMIST are growing at a rate to make newspaper men green with envy. Keep up the good work, send in your clubs and the time is not far distant when the voice of the farmers heard through THE NATIONAL ECONOMIST will be heeded and respected.

The National Economist

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE FARMERS ALLIANCE, AGRICULTURAL WHEEL, AND FARMERS UNION.

DEVOTED TO SOCIAL, FINANCIAL, AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.

VOL. 1. WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1889. No. 3.

Combination.

The balances are constantly vibrating between competition and combination. The conflict between these two remedies is perhaps now greater than ever before. In spite of the fact that the time is passed when ultraism and extremism is calculated to prevail, and that conservative views only are calculated to convince the thinking public, the tendency of nearly all writers on the subject is either to ascribe too much or too little power for good to competition. For several years past labor and farm literature has generally taught pessimistic views as to competition, and this attitude accords with the tendency of the times to organization, and harmonizes nicely with the efforts sought to be achieved by combining into organizations. As competition and combination are the exact opposites of each other, it follows that he who condemns competition advocates combination, and *vice versa*. The thoughtful may well hesitate, therefore, before condemning either. He will be loth to oppose combinations, if by so doing he realizes that he is, even indirectly, favoring competition as a universal remedy.

Organization is combination and combination is socialism, and socialism does away with all individual effort, individual reward, or individual franchises and powers; thus completely destroying any individual competition. Without individual competition and rivalry, what is there to emulate? The answer must inevitably be, nothing. The Sunday-school teacher offers a reward for the best-learned lesson, and a dozen pair of bright eyes grow brighter and snap with energy and zeal, and, inspired by the emulating effect of competition, they bring into activity the higher attributes of man and develop more rapidly their mental and moral natures by the contest for the prize; or the State fair may offer a big premium for the best stock. Men are but grown-up children, and competition inspires the best efforts with them also. In many places the Farmers Alliance gives a reward in cash to the member who gets the largest or best crop under named conditions. This has the same effect, and is commendable in that it stimulates man to effort. So, in every walk or occupation of life, examination will show that competition between individuals is the spur to individual effort. Individual effort recognizes competition as ever present, and realizes it as a permanent condition. And by it such effort is enabled to succeed on its own merits pure and simple; it is not compelled to build at the expense of others, because, under the free operation of competition, inherent merit must be successful. But the so-called competition between combinations is a misnomer; there can be no such thing as competition pure and simple between combinations.

Combination always aims at monopoly, and when only partially successful in combining all of a certain class or trade or business it may find opposition by a rival combination seeking the same object, and this may engender between such combinations what is sometimes designated competition, but it is not; it is a destructive warfare that will induce either one to part with the results of its effort at less than cost—something legitimate competition never does—and this warfare has for its object conquest. It is not a permanent condition calculated to emulate effort and secure reward for merit, but a temporary conflict waged for the purpose of rewarding power regardless of merit, and therefore emulates effort to secure power only, regardless of methods. Such conflicts, while they sometimes seem to benefit the public while the conflict is raging, are always followed by augmented benefits to the combination, which must be at the expense of the public, and more than compensate for the momentary extravagance during the conflict. Such conflicts, however, are to be condemned as deplorable, because they rob merit of its reward and blunt the moral sense by emulating effort to exert itself for power as the one thing essential.

Farmers of America, arouse and shake off this stupor as to trusts and combinations; brush away from before your eyes and minds the mists and confusion caused by a thousand arguments proposed by fools, knaves, and demagogues, and realize in plain, simple, homespun language that competition is the main-spring to emulate individual action and effort, but that combination is the function of government and government alone. A man can not be true to two or three governments at one time. If he loves his government, has confidence in it, and proposes to maintain it, he can have but one. If he is true to himself and family he can not afford to yield his individuality to more than one government at a time. Let the government be the embodiment of all the combined action society finds necessary, by saying that all kinds of business or effort susceptible of being monopolized shall be conducted by the whole society and not by a favored few.

In accordance with these doctrines it would become the duty of the various branches under this confederated form of republican government to each take charge of and control such essential lines of business or such natural opportunities as are susceptible of being appropriated by monopolies to oppress the masses. The General Government would be the only power to issue money, it would as now carry the mails, and should operate telegraph lines and the express business and any other branches that are essentially National. The States, being separate autonomies and complete jurisdictions within themselves, should conduct such State business as may be monopolized, such as insurance, the various forms of education, both literary and industrial, territorial telephone lines, canals, etc. And the cities should conduct their gas-works, stret-car lines, city telephones, water-works, and any other lines susceptible of monopoly. Under such conditions combinations or corporations for owning and speculating in land could not exist, because, land being a limited and essential element to the existence and life of the citizen, the Government must ever control the unused part, and hold a reversionary interest in same in trust for the benefit of the additions to population until all is used. This function of government is not now forced into activity, but it is only a question of time when it will be. No government could stand the strain that would be brought to bear if it should allow the increase of its population pushed into the sea to drown for lack of standing room on dry land, while part of its people held thousands of acres unused.

This argument in opposition to combination may, by many, be construed as an opposition to organization of any kind, and therefore unfavorable to the progress of association, organization, and co-operation among the farmers and laboring men of the United States, but such is not the case. Combination and organization are easiest effected and more successfully conducted by a small number or class. The farmers and laborers are the two largest classes of the Nation. Now while combination for the purpose of monopoly is wrong in the initiative, after all or many of the easiest organized and combined classes have already organized for that purpose, it may, and in this country has, become necessary for these two large classes to organize for self-protection. If the Government was adequate to the necessities of the times, if its powerful hand could always be depended on for conditions compelling justice between man and man, the necessity for organization would cease to exist and they would all disband.

The conclusions, then, are that the organization of aggressive combinations for the purpose of monopoly, by which it is intended to enslave labor, has forced labor to organize passive combinations to temporarily perform the functions of true government by resisting such monopolies, but that the better plan would be for government to do its whole duty and assume control of such lines of business as are essential to all and are or can be