

his concept of spiritual substance. The basis of the articles was the spiritual and economic doctrine of service for service—that in normal conditions service, and service only, entitles any one to the service of others. One of them bore the title of "Privilege or Service?" It was published in the New Jerusalem Magazine (Boston), issue of February, 1893. One on "Sacrifice or Service" had appeared in that magazine for January, 1892. "Metanoia," the title of an earlier one, published in the same magazine for February, 1891, developed the thought that death is not a climax of life but that, with repentance in the true sense, we are eternally living but without it are eternally dying. Two other pamphlets by Mr. Mills were on the general subject of "Christian Economics," one being "The First Principles of Political Economy," from which we quote a substantial part in this issue of *The Public* in the department of Related Things. The other was "The Two Great Commandments in Economics." They were published originally in the San Francisco Star and The New Earth.

Mr. Mills died at San Fernando, State of Durango, Mexico, July 25, 1901.* His wife, Jane Dearborn Mills, having returned from Mexico to New England, still lives at Jamaica Plain, Mass.



An old-time San Francisco friend of Mr. Mills, Joseph Leggett, also a follower of Henry George, and one of Mayor Taylor's police commissioners in the city by the Golden Gate, writes of Mr. Mills that "he possessed in a very marked degree that high spiritual insight which enabled him to perceive clearly the advance of thought in the world." "Being a close scientific observer," Mr. Leggett continues, "and a marvelously clear thinker, his conclusions were singularly accurate and definite. He was intensely democratic in the highest and truest sense, but had little use for either the Democratic or the Republican party. He regarded Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Henry George as the four great American democrats, and it grieved him to note how the first of these men had been ignored by the people of his own State and of the country at large. 'Hasn't his part of the work of establishing real political freedom been strangely overlooked?' Mr. Mills asked me once in a letter, in which he went on to say: 'The real democrats have been strangely neglected or damned by faint praise. Lincoln stands above them all in real democracy of sympathy; but others will loom up

still more democratic—indeed, George seems to me the best representative of democracy among living men. No man can have an adequate idea of God until he sees all other men equal before God.' This sense of democracy gave Mr. Mills a deep sympathetic interest in the Labor movement. In the same letter he wrote: 'The eight-hour movement seems to progress. The May-day labor movement in Europe was orderly, and all along the line the skirmishing goes on well. But the real battle will be fought on the line of the Singletax, and until that is won the fruits of the skirmishing will be a poor crop for the mowers.' I believe that Mr. Mills played a very important part in leavening the thought of our time with the fundamental truth of the Singletax philosophy, which is just beginning to bear fruit all over the world. Through his pamphlets on 'Privilege or Service?' on 'First Principles of Political Economy' and on 'The Two Great Commandments in Economics,' I am sure that he exerted a powerful influence upon the leading minds of the Singletax movement, and did much to keep it on the high moral and spiritual plane on which it has moved and which has contributed so largely to its marvelous progress."

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE LABOR WAR.

Kingussle, Scotland, May 29.

There are signs in England of the social cyclone which Mr. John Macmillan declares to be brewing in the Western States (see "Public" May 3rd). The portents are daily growing more ominous. The country has just begun to recover from the paralysing effects of the coal strike and now the transport workers are out 125,000 strong and the Port of London is tied up. So sensitive has the world of labor become that some apparently trivial maladjustment suddenly throws the vital machinery of industry out of gear. Strikes recur, involving enormous waste, and when they are settled, under pressure from all sides, wages remain low and the economic position of the laborers is not greatly bettered. The railway strikers came to terms last autumn and there remain today 100,000 of their number who receive less than \$5 a week in wages. And the miners are already expressing dissatisfaction with the awards under the Minimum Wage Act.

No expedient can bring relief as long as the law of supply and demand is blocked by land monopoly. As Emerson perceived, "artifice or legislation punishes itself by reaction, gluts and bankruptcies." Three years ago the Liberal Party seemed to have learned this lesson and subsequent experience has proved that, like the giant of mythology, their strength is increased whenever they are thrown back upon the earth. Meanwhile the House of Have is in need of a new prophet. Malthus is played out and

*See *The Public* of August 10, 1901, page 276, and of August 31, 1901, page 333.

the defenders of the existing order catch at the Eugenists as at a straw.

Unfortunately the organized forces of discontent are fighting at cross purposes and playing into the hands of their enemies. In the words of Philip Snowden, M. P., "neither trade unionism, nor the Labor movement, nor the Socialist parties have any clear idea of the attitude they ought to take up in regard to the functions of the state in industrial affairs." His remedy is state interference to counteract the effects of the competitive system. The British Socialist Party, assembled at Manchester, hold a turbulent session at which mutually destructive theories are hotly discussed. The Fabian Society at Keswick celebrate the advent of the minimum wage. At the 20th annual conference of the Independent Labor Party at Merthyr, Mr. W. C. Anderson condemns profit-sharing and co-partnerships and demands the abolition of private property in land and in industrial capital.

But there are signs of promise. Socialists are not too pleased with recent socialistic legislation, and members of the Labor Party find themselves more and more in accord with the Singletax group in Parliament so brilliantly led by Josiah Wedgwood.



Most hopeful of all, the discussion of Welsh Disestablishment has brought the land question to the front again and Lloyd George seems prepared to make use of his great opportunity. Speaking at Swansea, on May 28, he declared that Liberals were too timid. "Let them look at the land question," he continued. "Up to the present time they had dealt with it as if they were handling a hedgehog." Religious foundations had been robbed to establish private fortunes, but this was not the only trust in land which had been betrayed. "In South Wales they had hundreds of thousands a year paid in rents and taxes, and the men of South Wales jeopardized their lives to pay these exactions, and when they came up into the sunshine again to seek rest and restoration they were met with disease and degradation. The men for whom they worked grudged them every inch of sunlight or space of breathing ground. That was a trust that would be looked into. They claimed a right to it. Who gave it them? It was not in the Law nor in the Prophets. . . . I will tell you what is the matter with this country. There is one limited monarchy here and there are ten thousand little Tsars. They hold an absolutely autocratic sway. Who gave it to them, this trust or property? We mean to examine the conditions of it. It is a fight full of hope for the democracy.

F. W. GARRISON.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

SENATOR LA FOLLETTE AND THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

Asbury Park, N. J., June 4.

I have read with great pleasure the editorial in your current issue relative to the interrogatory concerning his stand on the liquor question which was put to Senator La Follette at the conclusion of his

speech in Asbury Park.* Your conclusions are to the point and unanswerable. I desire, however, to correct one detail which may seem of small consequence, but which will gain in significance as the campaign proceeds if Mr. Roosevelt is nominated. I was standing with my hand on Senator La Follette's shoulder when he said to the minister: "If you are an honest man you will come tomorrow and ask the same question of Mr. Roosevelt." Mr. Taft's name was not mentioned. The minister was merely admonished to ask the question of Mr. Roosevelt. The significance of the Senator's remark will doubtless be appreciated by The Public even though recent primary votes go to show that as yet the public isn't "on."

G. A. MILLER.

*See The Public of May 31, page 506.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 11, 1912.

Presidential Politics.

Although ex-President Roosevelt has been carrying the party vote at the primaries for Republican candidate for President, President Taft appears to be getting the convention delegates. In Ohio, where the popular vote for Roosevelt was overwhelming, the Republican State Convention at Columbus on the 4th awarded the six delegates-at-large to Taft by 390½ to 362½, with the net result of giving Taft 14 and Roosevelt 34 of the national delegation as a whole. "Pure political brigandage," is what Mr. Roosevelt called this action in an interview about it. When the national committee met at Chicago, a vote regarded as a test disclosed only 13 anti-Taft members to 39 in favor of Taft. The vote was over two questions: (1) That 8 votes in the committee should be enough to require a roll call, and (2) that the newspapers be afforded representation on the Congressional press-gallery basis. By *viva voce* vote the first was defeated by the substitution of 20 for 8, and by a roll call vote the second was defeated by providing for accommodations only for 5 accredited press associations. On the 7th contests from Alabama and Arkansas were decided adversely to Roosevelt by the national committee. Most of these were decided unanimously; but in the one from the 9th Alabama district "steam roller" methods were used for Taft in the spirit of rule or ruin, as Roosevelt partisans assert. In a public address on the 8th, Mr. Roosevelt said that "a nomination obtained by the votes of delegates seated in utter defiance of justice as these two Alabama delegates [those from the 9th district] have just been seated, would be worthless to the