

and that principle, not the desire to check the growth of the fortune, would fix the limit of the tax."

Prof. Jenks, like so many of these writers' just indicates a true principle only long enough to wriggle deftly out of it, for fear perhaps of the consequences. "Restriction on the method of accumulation," for instance, when the real meaning of these words are understood, or such restriction as we shall apply when we have got our bearings as to what methods of accumulation are ethical or expedient—that is indeed the crux of the whole question.

A recent novel written by a Single Taxer with the view of popularizing our philosophy is having a wide sale in Great Britain. Its title is: "The God of this world," and the author's pen name is John B. Middleton.

We have received through the courtesy of Fred Skirrow, of Yorkshire, Eng., a copy of pamphlet, just issued by a Socialist publishing house, containing the debate between Henry George and H. M. Hyndman in St. James' Hall, on July 2nd, 1889. "A word of introduction," by Mr. Hyndman occupies the first two pages, and in it he says of Mr. George that he "learnt how strangely limited his capacity was." He also says "Progress and Poverty is already almost a dead book." Years ago Mr. George told Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell—that bright and beautiful soul—after he had vainly tried to convert her: "It is no use, Mrs. Shaw—some people have the Socialist mind and others the Single Tax mind." This is indeed true, but to speak of Progress and Poverty as a "dead book" is evidence of something more than the Socialist mind. It presupposes a mind blind and deaf.

J. D. M.

#### THE RADICALISM OF HENRIK IBSEN.\*

Ibsen's radicalism had very little to do with actual politics, that is with the business part of politics. It was part and parcel of his entire mental attitude towards life. Just as true religion should become part and parcel of our attitude towards life, in contrast to the religion that splits hairs as to doctrines, and confines itself to church-service hours.

In the volume of his collected Letters, Ibsen for the first time allows himself a direct word to the public, whom he had always addressed thus far only through his works. As now this book must necessarily be the only thing in nature of an autobiography we can ever have of the greatest dramatist of several centuries, its value is tremendous. We hear Ibsen speak directly,

The Letters of Henrik Ibsen. Translated by John Nilson Laurvik, and Mary Morison. New York: Fox Duffield & Company. \$2.50 net.

in his own person, to us, and not only through the mouth of some one of his imagined personages. Just because Ibsen was so strong as a dramatist, did he become absolutely impersonal when forming and shaping the mind and character of one of his embodiments. He let his characters speak, he did not speak himself. It is therefore of the greatest interest to hear him speak himself, and to hear him formulate in his own person the thoughts and doctrines for which he has stood so bravely in his works.

The one great keynote of Henrik Ibsen's character was his allegiance to Truth. He did not split hairs with the theologians as to what Truth might be, he strove only to stand always for the Truth as far as he was able to see it. His moral and political creed were one and the same, \* \* \* a most commendable combination. \* \* \* Politics for him meant merely the putting into practice in public life, of the moral rules a man would lay down for himself in his private character. He could see no other consideration, such as those of "business" or party expediency, had weight with him for a moment.

Ibsen believed that the cornerstone of true progress lay in the absolute freedom of the individual. Through this alone could real reform come. The state, so-called, was of very little consequence to him. It was the individual that counted, and the nation as the aggregate of a number of individuals. Without freedom, true freedom for the individual, no nation could be healthy or strong in the right way. A nation without this healthy freedom of the individual was not a nation, but merely a state with subjects. The creed is good sound common sense, methinks. Once in a while Ibsen would write something about politics to his friends, but always in this same vein of perfect and absolute consistency of belief in true freedom. In a letter to Bjorntjerne Björnson, the following sentences occur:

"I am very much afraid that social reforms with us are still very far off. No doubt the politically privileged class may acquire some new rights, some new advantages; but I cannot see that the nation as a whole, or the single individual gains much by this \* \* \*

\* \* \* If I could have my way at home, then all the unprivileged should unite and form a strong, resolute, progressive party, the programme of which should include none but practical and productive reforms; a very wide extension of the suffrage, the statutory improvement of the position of women, the emancipation of national education from all kinds of mediævalism, etc. Theoretical political questions should be allowed to lie over for some time; they are not of great utility. \* \* \*

"The minority of our nation who possess all the political, communal and social privileges will certainly not voluntarily give them up, or share them with the unprivi-

leged. Hence I foresee the fate of the proposals to extend the suffrage. None of them will obtain the necessary number of votes. Such things are not given away by their possessors; they must be fought for."

How truly fundamental was Ibsen's understanding of what freedom and radicalism really mean, is shown by his lack of fear of unessential superficialities which are supposed to mean so much in the living out of one's doctrines. He writes to Björnson laughing gently at the latter's violent indignation that a literary man should accept "decorations from a monarchy." Ibsen gently chides his friend for inconsistency, and says that if a poet can accept a pension from the government, the festivities and social honors from those in authority, he does not see what harm a little piece of ribbon could do.

"From the Government of the day we accept money; royalty gives us a decoration because it respects a popular feeling of which it acknowledges the existence. \* \* \* If I had had any real desire for such finery, I should certainly have refrained from playing the part of "state-satirist." But if the finery comes my way, why then, no more ado about it."

These are the words of a man who understands fundamentals, something very rare nowadays

This indeed is what we chiefly glean from a perusal of the very interesting Letters. The opinion formed by a calm impartial reading of Ibsen's work is confirmed by a reading of these direct and personal expressions of his personality. We understand why Henrik Ibsen is one of the greatest minds of modern times. We understand that we are here in the presence of a mind which is capable of understanding *Truth* absolute. And capable of allowing no personal consideration to cloud his vision of what this comprehension of Truth compelled him to do in any case that might come up. Such a character seems cruelly pitiless sometimes to those who are swayed by a thousand personal considerations, by a million's "because" reasons when it comes to a question of what is the thing to do, the way to think. But the cold, pure clarity of such an understanding of Truth is a wonderful tonic to a world sunk in the power of the Unessential.

Henrik Ibsen belonged to no party in politics, to no sect in religion. But any political or religious creed which strives for the Truth may claim him for its own. Truth was his God, and he lived out his belief as few have ever done, in all the history of this world of many beliefs and many creeds.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

Mr. Louis Prang at 82 years of age, in all the freshness of youth, started last November, in the company of Mrs. Prang, to make a tour of the world.

## PERSONALS.

A cordial letter from A. D. Cridge, now of Echo, Oregon, apprises us of the fact that the son of the late associate editor of the *San Francisco Star*, with James Barry, is following worthily in the footsteps of his father. He describes himself as "a small-chip off the old block."

A recent visitor to this office from Moscow was Alexander M. Konshin, member of the Pedagogical Society of the Moscow University, of the Royal Agricultural Society of Moscow, and manager of the Publishing Society founded by Count Leo Tolstoy. He left a recent Russian version of Henry George's Condition of Labor. Mr. Konshin is of course personally acquainted with M. Nikolaiev, translator of *Progress and Poverty* and others of George's works.

Mr. A. C. Pleydell succeeds Mr. Lawson Purdy as secretary of the New York Tax Reform Association. Mr. Pleydell has a comprehensive knowledge of the incidence of taxation united with a very general acquaintance with the tax laws of this and other States.

From a private letter to Mrs. Julia Goldzier, we are permitted to extract the following, written by Moses H. Grossman, of the famous law firm of House, Grossman & Vorhaus, of this city; "You know I was at one time a great advocate of the Single Tax, and have not lost my enthusiasm for it."

Franklin K. Lane, well-known Single Taxer from California, is appearing for the Interstate Commerce Commission, of which he is a recently appointed member, in the Commissioner's inquiry now proceeding, which threatens to dissolve the relations existing between the Southern Pacific and the Union Pacific Railway systems.

The venerable Earl of Wemyss, who has been in Parliament since 1841, is one of the leaders in the opposition in his 88th year to the policy of land values taxation. In a recent speech he told his hearers, in rather neat phrase: "Liberty is being lost and public policy is made the apology for private plunder." There is something heroic in this octogenarian—almost a nonagenarian—making a last stand for the tottering fortunes of his brave old Toryism.

Geo. M. Wallace, the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for Congress from the Second Congressional District of Connecticut issued an address to the voters of his district in which after reviewing the growth of monopoly he said:

"Present day so-called socialism, consisting of the theories of Karl Max, is fallacious and economically immoral and so offers no solution of our difficulties.

But there is a democraticism fixed in the