

some soap on boardt, und you gry oud dru de streets: 'Soap fat!' 'Soap fat!' so dot vomens call you to de back gate, und gif you pots and pans full of fat for vich you give dem some soap.

"So you go round dru de day till de soap is all gone; und den you come home mit a push cart full of fat, und de more of it you haf, de more you vissel und sing as you go up de alley.

"Now, vot haf you done, pop? Ditn't you sell dose vomens soap und buy fat from 'em, und don't you every time find out dot dere is more dollars vort of fat, dan dere vos dollars vort of soap in your push cart. Ditn't you importet more as you exportet; und ain't you glat uf dis happens all de time to you. Uf you hat gift oud more dollars' vort of soap as you git back dollars' vort of fat, don't it be dot you vas gittin poorer, und is dere any diffrens uf more people do de same ding as you?"

Dot's de vay my boy sait it, und I am buzzed—dot broffessor say it von vay; und my Jakey brooft it just de udder vay. Don't you dink dot dot boy is right?

HERMAN V. HETZEL.

Philadelphia.

ANARCHY THE PROGENY OF DESPOTISM.

Of all the wild things that have been said about anarchy since President McKinley's assassination, quite the wildest are to be found in an article by Geoffrey Langtoft in the current issue of the *Fortnightly Review*. This writer not only maintains that "there is no essential difference between the teachings of anarchists and socialists," but he also declares that both "these noxious political growths are the progeny of democracy itself." He goes even further in suggesting that—

The problem of effectually dealing with anarchism may prove to be insoluble so long as democratic principles are permitted to formulate and dominate the policies of leading nations without adequate check from those higher and more stable elements of national life which are represented by proprietorship and intellect.

And later he says:

By democracy tens of thousands of people have been taught to believe . . . that not only are theft and murder not crimes but are positive virtues, provided they be committed in the name and to further the interests of some political cause.

There must be some people to whom talk of this kind will appeal, for it is extremely improbable that any individual—even Mr. Langtoft—is unique. But the mental constitution of such a person is certainly peculiar. Mr.

Langtoft avers that anarchy is "the progeny of democracy," and yet almost in the same breath he innocently remarks that "American anarchists are mostly foreign immigrants, Italians and German Jews being specially prominent." It is curious that he does not see how neatly this refutes his thesis. Anarchy "is the progeny of democracy," and yet in democratic America anarchy is not a home product but a foreign article imported from monarchical Italy and monarchical Germany. How Mr. Langtoft can take himself so seriously is a puzzle.

But why American anarchists should be "mostly foreign immigrants" is no puzzle. The reason is that anarchy is the "progeny" not of democracy, but of despotism. For anarchy is in large measure an expression of class hatred and, therefore, flourishes most where the gulf that divides the subject classes from the ruling classes is widest. In a country like Russia, where the governing power is wholly in the hands of a small circle, it does not seem unnatural that certain of the masses, thinking it impossible to get recognition of the needs of their fellows by lawful means, should resort in despair to violence as a method of frightening government into concessions. But in a land where every citizen is guaranteed by fundamental law an equal voice in determining the policy of the government, the motive for using violence is taken away, because the champion of any cause has in the right of free speech and the ballot box much more effective means of making himself felt. He sees that to secure the success of his cause it is necessary to persuade a majority of his fellow citizens of its expediency and that there is no more certain way of alienating the public sympathy, on which success depends, than by resorting to crime.

Men who have lived long enough in the United States to understand the American creed of democracy are not likely to become violent anarchists unless they are also fools. So it happens that our anarchists are, as Mr. Langtoft says, "mostly immigrants"—that is, men who have grown up in hatred of some callous government controlled by a few and come to our shores too late to learn the difference between a despotism and a government by the people. Their anarchy is the result of their ignorance of our people and our institutions, and those of them alone are incapable of reclamation who are too stupid or too blinded by animosity to understand their own interests.

So far, then, from anarchy being the progeny of democracy, precisely the opposite is true—democracy is the antidote of anarchy. The best way to prevent the growth of an indigenous race of violent anarchists among us is to perpetuate our government as a democracy in truth as well as in name and to teach the nature of democratic institutions to every citizen.—Chicago Tribune of November 3.

THE PLAIN LESSON OF THE OHIO ELECTION.

The political revolution in Cuyahoga county and the democratic defeat in the state teach the same lesson, and it is one both parties will do well to heed.

In this county the battle was made by the democrats on a single issue, that of equitable taxation. Under the leadership of Mayor Tom L. Johnson the local democracy made an aggressive campaign on that issue, refusing to be drawn or driven away from it into discussion of national questions that had no immediate connection with the election to be held, and studiously avoided appeals to partisan passions or prejudices. Unequal taxation bears with like injustice on republicans and democrats, and a campaign that had for its object the rectification of this common wrong appealed to men of all parties.

The local democracy showed their wisdom also in putting up a good ticket, one that could stand comparison with the rival ticket without loss. This left the independent voter—and that class is rapidly increasing in this city—free to consider the merits of the issue raised.

The republican managers could not help seeing the wisdom of the policy adopted by their opponents. They did their utmost to belittle the new issue and to distract the attention of voters from it by raising the old party cries. It was in vain. Unequal taxation is something the voters know and feel. They have learned by long experience that "voting the party ticket," just because it is the party ticket, does not touch the evil they are suffering from. They wanted to know whether there was not some remedy, and when Mayor Johnson invited them to come and listen to his explanation of the causes and cure of the evil they went, in spite of the urging of their leaders to "let well enough alone" and stay away from the classes of instruction in taxation.

The result is seen in the political revolution in this county. No fight was made here upon the republican party as a national party, or upon the republican state ticket except inci-

dentally. The one issue was taxation reform. The republican candidates against whom the issue was made were those in some way connected with the present unjust distribution of taxation, or whose offices, if elected, could be used to continue that injustice. Every one of those candidates was snowed under by democratic and independent republican votes. The only republican on the local ticket who escaped defeat was Judge Phillips, and he was saved only by a small majority, although there was at one time a disposition to allow his candidacy to be unopposed.

A clean ticket and a single live issue, appealing to everyone alike without regard to political differences, and an aggressive campaign on that issue—that is the story of the campaign in Cuyahoga county and of its magnificent success.

Now turn to the campaign in the state outside of Cuyahoga county and mark the difference, both in the methods and in results.

The democratic state managers rejected the counsels of Mayor Johnson to fight the state on the taxation question. They took the line marked out for them by their republican opponents. They were afraid of the taxation issue and preferred to fight on the old partisan lines. So the republican and democratic candidates and spellbinders went up and down the state mouthing the old platitudes, making pretense of fighting each other on old issues that are no longer live issues, and invoking the shades of the dead and gone to keep their party followers in line.

The result was what was to be expected from such folly. The republican state ticket has been overwhelmingly elected. The legislature is heavily republican, notwithstanding the solid democratic delegation that will go to Columbus from Cuyahoga county, and democratic losses are reported in democratic districts to offset the sweeping democratic victory in the republican county of Cuyahoga.

If Mayor Johnson's policy had been adopted and carried into effect throughout the state as it was in this county, there would be a democratic governor and a tax reform legislature at Columbus in the coming year.—Editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 7.

If even the Newtonian philosophy were not permitted to be questioned, mankind could not feel as complete assurance of its truth as they now do.—John Stuart Mill.

PUBLIC IGNORANCE CONCERNING THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF HENRY GEORGE.

An address delivered by Charles G. Helfner at the Henry George Birthday banquet in Seattle, Wash., September 2, 1901.

I honor the man who is willing to sink
Half of his present repute for the freedom
to think,
And when he has thought, be his cause
strong or weak,
Will risk t'other half for the freedom to
speak,
Caring naught for the vengeance the mob
has in store,
Let that mob be the upper ten thousand
or lower.
—Lowell.

This gathering is only one of many held to-night throughout the United States to pay tribute to the name and fame of Henry George—a man who thought, and dared to speak. Upon this sixty-second anniversary of his birth it is eminently fit and proper that students of political economy and sociology should seek to hold firm faith, and awaken new interest, in the teachings of one of the greatest and noblest men that the nineteenth century produced.

Henry George did not write for only one people, nor for any particular time; he wrought for all men and for all time. Truth is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, and Henry George spoke no word and wrote no line that he did not believe to be the truth. No Spencerian recantations are found in his writings.

He was brave. It requires a high degree of moral courage to speak the truth always. He formulated his own motto when he said:

I propose to take nothing for granted, but to bring even accepted theories to the test of first principles. I propose to beg no question, to shrink from no conclusion, but to follow truth wherever it may lead. If the conclusions that we reach run counter to our prejudices, let us not flinch; if they challenge institutions that have long been deemed wise and natural, let us not turn back.

If during his eventful life he ever deviated in the least from the high course thus marked out, even his opponents have not remarked it. And the best test of his fidelity to truth is found in the fact that the book from which I have quoted has been translated and published in the French, German, Italian, Dutch, Swedish, Russian, Japanese and Chinese languages. Few American authors have been thus honored or so widely read.

It is the most to be regretted, therefore, that so many of his countrymen are so densely ignorant concerning one of their greatest men, and know so little of the mighty truths which he uttered.

I think I do not do my fellow citizens an injustice when I say that a majority of them have no true conception of his purpose and teachings. The popular estimate of him both as a man and as an author is erroneous. He is frequently unjustly regarded as having been simply an agitator, as a man with only one idea, who sought to revolutionize society and existing property rights by urging the enactment of some impracticable, hair-splitting theory termed the "single tax," and the enforcement would result in absolutely destroying title to land, and in compelling those who have to divide with those who havenot. This estimate which, I submit, I have not overdrawn, could not be farther from the truth. He did, indeed, attack existing social and economic theories and conditions, but the remedy he offered took from no man what he had earned, deprived no man of the fruits of his efforts and labors, and prevented no man from accumulating wealth or achieving fame. Is there a man who wants more than he earns, who wants the results of other men's efforts and endeavors, who wants the wealth created by others or the community? If there be, him only has he offended. He held that the present system of taxation is unjust, that the lowliest child born into this world has an equal right with the child born in a palace to have air to breathe, water to drink, and land to live on, without paying tribute therefor; and that governments had no right in the sight of God or in the light of the teachings of Christ to give the control of those rights, advantages, or privileges, which nature or the community has created, into the hands of the influential few as against the claims of the undesigning many. Hence it was to overthrow entrenched wrong and unjust precedent which he saw everywhere around him, that he devoted his highest endeavors and the best years of his life; and he died as he had lived, clad in the armor of truth, his face toward the foes of justice, fighting "For the cause that lacks assistance, 'gainst the wrongs that need resistance."

He was a man of exceptional mental power, a careful observer, a close reasoner, cautious in arriving at conclusions on anything less than overwhelming evidence. He had traveled far and observed much, and from observations and study he concluded that the chief cause of poverty was to be found in the unjust and inequitable system of taxation prevailing not only in this country, but in almost all others. Now the power to tax one is of