

Vrooman and Holt seem alive to me, and still at work somewhere. Thousands of people called him "Henry"—and no more; he impressed everyone just as Felix Holt did; he went his own way; he talked with, drew out and aroused everyone he met. One Sunday about 1870 he was in a barber-shop in San Francisco—one of the smallest and cheapest, in an alley on the edge of Chinatown.

As he expressed it to me, "I began to talk to the boys who were sitting on the bench waiting, as I was: they were foundry-men, you know. We talked labor questions, better government and a freer ballot. At that time a workman could be given a marked ballot and watched every minute till he put it in the box. He had to hold it up between his thumb and forefinger!"

"All at once," Vrooman continued, "a little red-dish-haired man who was half-shaved, in a chair, sat up, thrust the cloth aside, and began to talk to us, especially to me. He urged us to read more, think more, get more education. Then he took me by the arm and we walked over the San Francisco hills all the rest of that Sunday. He was half-shaved, and I was not shaved at all. When we came back the barber-shops were closed.

"He explained to me then what I never had been able to understand—the true theory of wages—that labor is paid out of the value created by itself. I accepted that. He did not fully carry me with him in regard to his single-tax idea, but I saw the importance of it years later. I remember that he called me 'Henry' and I called him 'Harry' before we had been with each other an hour."

That is the gist of the incident, as told to me by Henry Vrooman when I was a boy in Oakland, California. It remains in my memory as truly illustrative of the nature of that thirty year old newspaperman of old San Francisco, Henry George: it gives a glimpse of his fellowship with, and influence upon plain everyday workers.

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.

\* \* \*

## WHO PAYS FOR ADVERTISING?

For The Public.

"Wasn't it Dr. Watts who said,

"When e'er I take my walks abroad

How many ads I see?"

"No? Well, it sounded like that anyway."

We were riding on a train, my socialist friend and I, and what prompted my remark was the fences of advertising that lined both sides of the track.

"Outrageous!" my friend growled.

"Look at that now!" he exclaimed a moment later, pointing to a full-page newspaper advertisement of a standard commodity. "Look at that and think of the enormous waste going on every day in advertising. All of it has to be paid for by the consumer and the cost of the goods correspond-

ingly increased. Why, only yesterday I was told about a man in Chicago who made \$100,000 a year in profits just placing advertisements. Do you wonder we are poor, eh?" And he glared at me as if I were to blame for it all.

"I deny the waste, in the sense you mean," I said; "and I deny that the cost of goods is increased by the expense of advertising. Just think a moment. You are the manufacturer of a standard commodity like this one advertised. Any one may make it. How much would it cost a man to make just one of these articles for his own use?"

"Perhaps \$20, counting time and materials," he replied.

"But, making them by the million, as you do," I said, "you can sell them at \$1 apiece and get a good profit, provided a million men are informed that you can supply them with this particular thing. Now, the advertising agent attempts to so inform them, and in so far as he succeeds in doing this he brings together the maker and those who want the goods. He is an essential factor in the co-operation and division of labor by which the goods are produced, and because of his aid each purchaser has saved the equivalent of \$19. Further than this, many men are enabled to enjoy the commodity who would otherwise have to go without it by reason of their inability to obtain the materials, or because of their lack of time or skill to make it. The man who advertises your goods is a producer just as much as you are or the book-keeper or mechanic in your factory. Hence he is as much entitled to wages as you or they are. And just as the wages of your employes do not come out of your pocket nor out of the pockets of your customers, neither do his. We, your customers, are not poorer by your work, the work of your employes and the advertising agent, but richer to the degree you have helped us to gratify our desires with the least effort. The real reason why we are poor—why anyone is poor—is another question."

C. F. SHANDREW.

\* \* \*

## GENERAL PROVIDENCE, NOT SPECIAL.

Herbert S. Bigelow in the Twentieth Century for February on "The Religion of Henry George."

Many in our day, sick with the world's sorrow, have found, in the pages of Progress and Poverty, a truth which has flooded with light the very darkest problem of man's life. A victorious faith has taken the place of doubt and dismay. They dare now to believe in God. The very poverty which staggered their faith has been turned to evidence of God's justice. The inspired pen of Henry George has traced for them, even in the dismal field of political science, the unmistakable outlines of God's providence. In the pages of this book they

have found a quickening truth which has rolled away the stone from their hearts and called to life again a faith that was dead. . . . With advancing knowledge, caprice gives way to law, and men find the highest proof of God in the established justice of a moral order that justifies increasingly the ways of God to men. . . . When a man begins to interpret the facts of life in the light of a general providence, when he sees that cities reap what they sow, and that floods come when public forests are rifled by private greed, his confidence in the integrity of the universe will be restored and he will cry out again, "The judgments of God are true and righteous altogether."

\* \* \*

## THE TWO MOST DEMOCRATIC COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD.

Frederic C. Howe in *The Outlook* of January 15, 1910.

Switzerland and Denmark are the most democratic countries in the world. They have demonstrated not only that the people can rule, but rule far more wisely than their betters. Representative government has shifted more completely to democratic government in these little nations than anywhere else on the globe. Switzerland is ruled by public opinion. It expresses itself through direct legislation. The people propose laws as well as amendments to the Constitution by petition. They vote upon their own proposals just as they elect men to office. In consequence, every man with an idea has a hearing. If he is right enough, and persistent enough, he achieves his end. Almost every great democratic reform in Switzerland has come through the initiative and referendum. Not immediately, it is true; but when the public was ready for it. By these means Switzerland abolished the sale of absinthe and took over the alcohol monopoly. After three attempts it nationalized the railways, and is now operating them better than ever before, and with the idea of service paramount. Through the same instrumentality, Switzerland saved her natural resources. She took control of the water power of the country in the interest of all the people. Private monopoly has been barred. The State itself is to become the purveyor of electric water power. It plans to run the railways by the white coal of the mountain sides, to supply all industry, to operate the street railways, and to light the cities. Not content with this, Switzerland plans to carry the electric current to the most obscure country district and to relieve the farmer and domestic industry of the drudgery of manual labor. Country roads and houses will be lighted by the streams from the mountain sides, while the motor will churn the butter, thresh the grain, pump the water, and even relieve the woman along with

the man of the most burdensome kinds of agricultural labor.

Switzerland has done more than this. Formerly she knew the boss. Direct legislation has taken his power from him. Formerly there was corruption, both vulgar and respectable. It, too, has passed away. And now the nation has destroyed monopoly and made the resources of the nation serve the people.

Denmark, too, is a democracy. She maintains a King, it is true; but he enjoys only the shadow of power. Denmark is ruled by peasants who own their own land. Ninety per cent of the farmers own their own holdings. And they work them like a market garden. The State owns the railways and makes them serve the peasant. The State educates the farmer, sends commissions of experts to foreign countries, and stimulates the production of fine stock. It loans money to the individual with which to buy a farm, and through co-operative agencies 90 per cent of the farmers save to themselves the full value of their dairy farms and purchase what they need at wholesale cost.

Democracy in Denmark has made the people among the best educated in Europe. There is no illiteracy there, and extreme poverty has been reduced to a minimum. Denmark is a free-trade country from conviction, in spite of the fact that her farmers were threatened with extinction by the wheat fields of America. The cost of living is low in consequence, and this little country exchanges its exports with all the world, and buys where it can buy to the best advantage.

---



---

## BOOKS

---

### EMMA GOLDMAN'S BOOK.

*Anarchism and Other Essays.* By Emma Goldman. Mother Earth Publishing Co., 210 East 13th Street, N. Y. City. Cloth, 277 pp., \$1.00.

Emma Goldman, "the best advertised woman in America," perhaps in the world, publishes this volume with an excellent portrait and biographical sketch. As might be expected, it is really a radical book and surprisingly temperate, but with no idea of the land question. The advertisement says: "The MS. has been refused by several publishers as 'too extreme.' Lacking the advertising facilities of the great publishing houses, we request your help in calling the attention of your friends to the work."

All democrats and idealists should understand what an Anarchist is. Miss Goldman uses the dictionary definition, furnished to the leading dictionaries by herself: "Anarchist—A believer in Anarchism; one opposed to all forms of coercive government and invasive authority; an advocate