

all take America for granted because you were born in it. I, who have never crossed the Atlantic, and have taken nothing American for granted, find I know ten times as much about your country as you do yourselves; and my ambition is to repay my debt to Henry George by coming over some day and trying to do for your young men what Henry George did nearly quarter of a century ago for me.

G. BERNARD SHAW.

LONDON, ENG.

[Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, probably the foremost wit and certainly one of the foremost playwrights in the English speaking world, is also a well known Fabian socialist. The foregoing letter addressed to the Progress and Poverty Dinner in this city on Jan. 24th exhibits at once the defects and shortcomings of his philosophy of life and his political economy. Liberty, Justice, and Natural Law have no place in his creed; they are to him what he calls them, superstitions, shibboleths that stand for nothing in his theories of social adjustments. He would probably regard as a mere idle meaningless statement the contention that there is a natural order in the industrial world, that the law of competition is beneficent, and gives only to those who earn; and that co-operation under freedom from state control, when the path is finally cleared of obstruction, will give all the benefits, without the disadvantages of socialism. All these notions he imperiously rejects.

But how curious it is that men to whom these really profounder aspects of the greater economic problem do not appear, should accuse inferentially, if not always in set terms, those who do see them, of superficiality, of not going "far enough." Yet what can be more superficial than the made-to-order arrangement of society, with its ignoring of so many of the laws of economics? Is not socialism the more obvious, therefore the more superficial, therefore, too, the least profoundly rational solution of the great economic problem? Does not the untrained, the unphilosophic and childlike mind naturally revert to the State, as

"The infant crying in the night
And with no language but a cry,"

reaches out instinctively for help. But what of the man full grown, to whom years have brought the philosopher mind? Realizing that he is endowed with faculties the exercise of which depends upon his individual initiative, will not profounder reflection bring also a realization that there is a natural order of industry independent of artificial, man-made regulation? Will he not see that the law of competition, the law of co-operation are not mere meaningless terms, but dependent in their operation upon the same fundamental causes that determine the regularity and order of the material universe everywhere? Will he not then advance a step further, and discover the line that marks off those things naturally and properly subjects for state regulation, and those which may be left free of such control to the individual members of the community? Is not this view, because requiring far more prolonged analysis and keener scrutiny, and because it is not the earlier, but always the later aspect presenting itself, wrested as it were from philosophic travail, the profounder one, and socialism the more purely superficial?

In this light Mr. Shaw's letter with its curious though not ungenerous egotism becomes amusing. Does he imagine that those who accept the teaching of Henry George have not travelled the ground over which he magnanimously proffers his leadership?

"He saw only the monstrous absurdity of the private appropriation of

rent." Did Henry George see only this? Did he not also see the results that would follow its *public* appropriation? And does Mr. Bernard Shaw see it? And if he did, would he not cease to characterize as "eighteenth century superstitions" the watchwords of Liberty, Justice and Natural Law? To those eighteenth century philosophers of France, Rousseau, Voltaire, and their English disciples, spite of much exaggeration, civilization owes a debt greater than to the laborious German architects of artificial societies, with their theories of men as automata, and the State as the omnipotent scene shifter, theories from which the later school of English Fabian Socialists to which Mr. Shaw belongs have borrowed in diluted solutions.—THE EDITOR.]



CONCERNING HON. WM. F. DRAPER'S ARTICLE IN THE "OUTLOOK" ON TARIFF REVISION.

(For the Review.)

BY J. A. DEMUTH.

"Antiquity cannot sanctify that which is wrong in reason and false in principle."
—Galileo.

Because one speaks as one having authority is not a sufficient reason why his doctrines should be received without question, especially if one is propounding an economic theory which is not above reasonable suspicion of having been fathered by aims for personal profit.

Under such circumstances its weight is naturally discounted, and those who rise up to call its truth in question may at least be accorded reasonable grounds for doing so.

Thus it is that when Hon. William Draper responds to the question: "Should the Tariff be Revised?" we are free to express the opinion that his personal advantages are father to his conclusions.

When he is directly benefitted by the present high tariff it is human nature, and certainly *protected* human nature, that Mr. Draper should use his best arguments in his efforts to convince the masses, who enjoy only the indirect benefits of being taxed, that the present high tariff should stand. We have heard much various and varied arguments in favor of protection—its cardinal virtue being always the bulwark of American labor—"our wage-earners"—that we are not surprised when Mr. Draper tells us in one and the same breath that "our foreign trade has increased by leaps and bounds under the present tariff without injuring any of our producers" and that "To *increase* it further by a *reduction* of the tariff would mean that industries that do not now possess the home market would be placed at still greater disadvantage for the benefit of those that possess the home field and desire a larger foreign outlet. I wish these fortunate ones all success in obtaining it, if they can do so under fair conditions; but it is not fair to destroy other industries for that purpose."

In the next paragraph we are told that "our home market is immensely more valuable than any increased foreign market would be under absolute free trade." I have been experiencing some difficulty in harmonizing these statements. It is plain that the present high tariff has caused the foreign trade to increase by leaps and bounds. We know that. We know positively that we can sell sewing machines, agricultural implements, steel rails and numer