

primeval heavens, as a woodman into the primeval forest, and made his own slashings, and the marks are there yet. Now look here, for samples:

The moon like a rick on fire was rising over the dale,  
And whit, whit, whit, in the copse beside me,  
Chirruped the nightingale.

\* \* \* \* \*

Many a night from yonder ivied casement, ere I went to rest,  
Did I look on great Orion sloping slowly to the West.  
Many a night I saw the Pleiads, rising through the mellow shade,  
Glitter like a swarm of fireflies tangled in a silver braid.

The Englishman has pushed monopoly into the skies. You can't go out at night, without infringing, without seeing "the moon like a rick on fire," "Orion sloping to the west," or the glittering firefly tangle of the Pleiades; and instead of thinkin' of your Creator, as you ought, you think of Tennyson, as you must. There is no fair denyin' that he was in possession. The heavens were Alfred Tennyson's private park, and he walked there at night.

But what I am tryin' to reach is not that he was a great man, great in knowledge, up-to-date in science; "in the foremost ranks of time"; the unparalleled writer of musical verse, with a scope from the sweetest of lullabies and bugle calls to the trumpet notes of the "Welcome to Alexandra" and the Miltonic swing of "Boadicea"; not even that he was a seer and a prophet—but that he was a democrat.

Oh, yes, John, I can hear the "Tut, tut, nonsense" of your ridicule; and I admit he was a contradiction. Tory he was, dyed in the wool; laureate, paid by his pipe of wine, if by nothing else, for a loyalty to the throne; chronicler and beautifier of the annals of the horrid old feudal system. Yet not often, but whenever it was necessary, true to the light that was in him, he pushed his democratic conception even to the throne.

So in dedicatin' his book to Victoria in 1851, a good place to leave democracy out, he sturdily shoves it into notice; and, after complimentin' the ministers and palaverin' the Queen, he speaks of her throne unshaken still,

Broad based upon her people's will.

There you have it—the sovereign people; which was pretty nifty for a poet laureate addressin' the Queen, seems to me.

And again, in that wonderful poem, "Locksley Hall," where he prophesies the flyin' ship and navies fightin' in the air, he cuts royalty clear loose from the scheme of creation, and lets it go by the board.

Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;  
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,

Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;  
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew  
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;  
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furled  
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world.  
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,  
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

You see it now, don't you? Not much room for royalty where the "common sense of most" shall govern. That was Alfred Tennyson's conception of the highest political state of man, a republic—the same thing I'm strivin' for. He was all right, Alfred was—a great man and a great democrat.

UNCLE SAM.

+ + +

## THE RELATION OF UNIVERSITIES TO UNPOPULAR REFORMS.

Portions of an Address Delivered before the Students' Lecture Association of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, November 20, 1908,  
by William Lloyd Garrison.

The reformer may not inaptly be compared to the sea. Emerson makes that restless and aggressive element declare:

I, with my hammer pounding evermore  
The rocky coast, smite Andes into dust  
Strewing my bed, and in another age  
Rebuild a continent of better men.

Impelled by the same divine impulse, the reformer is not less insistent in pounding the rocky coast of prejudice and smiting the Andes of established wrong. Like the ocean he must await the long process required to rebuild a continent of better men. This he early learns from the unyielding nature of the objects he attacks.

Whoever first discerns a great evil or discovers a great truth, fondly imagines that he has only to denounce the one or proclaim the other, to enlist the world in his support. Full of faith and buoyancy, he makes his universal appeal. The rocks he mistook for sand prove adamant; the gentle hill becomes a frowning mountain. How slow is the attrition of ideas! Human lives wear themselves out in seemingly vain attempts to overcome impediments to social progress, and, so long as injustice prevails, the hammering can never cease.

Naturally, the reformer seeks first the aid of powerful institutions, of which, often, he is a part. What more instinctive than to appeal to the church, if the evil to be conquered conflicts with morality and religion? Or to the university if

ignorance is to blame for the wrong? Meeting the shock of unexpected resistance, surprise disheartens weak natures, but fortunately stimulates men of sterner fiber. Gradually the fact is forced upon the consciousness of the reformer that the most impenetrable barriers to his advance are the very organizations he counted upon as allies. . . .

It becomes, therefore, an interesting subject of inquiry, why the university, which ought ideally to lead progressive thought, should act rather as a clog? It does, indeed, produce specialists in matters whose importance it would be folly to under-rate; but in the fundamental changes of society, the work is largely left to those deprived of academic advantages. The list of unschooled leaders in the advanced movements of the Nineteenth Century, testify to the conservative opposition of scholarship. In nearly all the great political changes of that period, the educated classes in England took side with the party afterwards admitted to be in the wrong. The motive force behind the successful reforms came almost exclusively from the middle and lower classes, not from intellectual motives, but from humanitarian feelings.

It is strange that lives spent in exploring the history of past times, should be so atrophied regarding present issues. The student has leisure and opportunity to view the mistakes and failures of former peoples and governments. Unless morally obtuse, it seems impossible for him to fail in tracing the foundation principles underlying the momentous events of which he reads. From his watch tower what scope for warning and advice! For we have the authority of Polybius, that "it is history, and history alone, which, without involving us in actual danger, will mature our judgment, and prepare us to take right views, whatever may be the crisis or the posture of affairs."

In the field of general knowledge little reproach attaches to the schools. In the unending search of science and physics, a devoted army of investigators follow the path where

Gleams that untravell'd world, whose margin fades  
Forever and forever

when they move. A lifetime's devotion to the segment of a science is everywhere in evidence, so specialized has the pursuit of knowledge become. The trained observer finds his tools and opportunities in generously endowed universities, and, although outside sporadic discoveries come from independent minds untrammelled by authority, the total gains are garnered and preserved in educational archives.

How different is the attitude of scholarship toward social and political questions! No matter how plainly it can be shown that ethical principles are as exacting and unchangeable as those of physics, their treatment is the reverse of scientific. Alma Mater frowns upon her children whose

conscience forces them to enlist in unpopular agitations. The academic rule is uniformly one of reverence for accomplished reforms and sturdy resistance to new ones.

Primarily, we bestow precept and admonition upon our children, carefully supervising their reading, with reference to their ideals. Then we send them for four years to college, thinking our abstract instruction a sufficient safeguard. Among their comrades a different code of ethics prevails; among the reputations honored by the college, they find exalted men faithless to the duties of their time. Everywhere conformity is the predominant idea. Here the pressure begins that is to continue in the outside world. To be popular with the fellows, to accept the body of opinion held, to look upon a violation of good form as more heinous than a lapse of morals,—what better method to stifle independent thought and action?

In such an atmosphere the plastic student imbibes conservatism. The reverence of past worthies does little to assure the recognition of contemporary makers of history. When standards become conventional and materialized, though one may win the honors at Commencement, of what use are the tools of learning if wrong ideals are to command their service? College has done little for its sons who enter upon the world's work possessed with utilitarian aims.

The habit of putting authority above truth encourages respect for bad laws and customs because they are established. Against this pernicious influence how refreshing the protest of George Eliot: "I hold it blasphemy to say that a man should not fight against authority. There is no great religion and no great freedom that has not done it in the beginning." But in the atmosphere of universities where the surroundings are increasingly symbolical of wealth and ease, and the art of enjoyment is an alluring study, the science of pleasure takes an undue lead. This soil may be fertile for the growth of astute lawyers, subservient pro-consuls, spectacular officials and men of business, but for the growth of social reformers it is distinctly barren.

The democratic distrust of university influence is not unnatural. Carlyle, in his contempt for democracy, declared that "the wealthy and enlightened classes should lead the ignorant and those who live from hand to mouth,"—a common belief today. Since our national creed has changed, our colleges are in danger of becoming nurseries for a governing class rather than for a liberty-loving people. We are imitating England, whose immense colonial domains draw liberally upon the universities for officials to rule alien subjects, and where the professional classes belong by instinct and interest to the aristocracy.

Oxford is the consummate type of a university which breeds men for this undemocratic occupa-

tion. This "home of dead languages and undying prejudice," as John Bright called it, has furnished many brilliant and able rulers for British possessions beyond the seas. It was recently said by an Oxford graduate that, when meeting fellow-graduates by chance, the ordinary question is, "Were you in Milner's year, or did you overlap Curzon?" Soon it will be asked here, "Were you at Yale with Taft, or at Harvard with Cameron Forbes?"

Lord Acton took a different view from Carlyle. He held that no class was fit to govern; perhaps the most unfit of all, the "wealthy and intellectual classes," whose follies are stamped upon the pages of history. And Tolstoy charges that the wholesale executions in Russia are carefully planned and arranged by the learned and enlightened people of the upper classes. Class supremacy is the rock ever fatal to democracy, and there is no room for class distinctions in a republic worthy of the name.

If students in this country cannot confidently look forward to government service and a K. C. B., rather than to the Woolsack or the Exchequer, as is common in England, we are making rapid strides in that direction. Mr. Cameron Forbes, a grandson of Emerson, vice-governor of the Philippines, recently addressing the Harvard undergraduates at Cambridge, dwelt on the advantages opening for university men as administrators in the subject islands. Such incentives appeal to the so-called practical mind, but are lamentable in view of the professed aims of education.

Every generation has its pressing questions to answer. Gladly would reformers follow leaders of religion and learning were not such leaders usually defenders of the wrongs attacked. In vain is appeal made to the piety of the church, the wisdom of the schools, the virtue of the state. Every avenue of influence is sought for the reform's advance. The church offers for an excuse its preoccupation with individual souls and the fear of popular disapproval. The university, secure in the support of rich and cultured classes, cannot afford to peril its revenues. The state, which means the administration in power, deprecates all new issues likely to divide opinion and disturb party balance. This is comprehensible from a material point of view, but perplexing on the basis of ethics, to which all of these institutions lay claim.

It is the sad truth that no important social change for the better was ever achieved except in the face of university opposition. The Reform Bill, the Repeal of the Corn Laws, the extension of the franchise in England, and the anti-slavery movement in the United States, all triumphed in spite of these conservative influences. Having triumphed they were duly accepted. The long delay in every instance was not because the demand lacked reason, sense or justice. Their success came

through those very qualities; but imagine the progress society would make were organized religion and learning willing courts of appeal. In default of such tribunals the final resort is to the common people. They may be untrained and uneducated, but "the toad beneath the harrow knows precisely where each sharp tooth goes," and suffering breeds wisdom. If reforms are crudely led, it is not for the critics who declined the duty to complain.

Reformers are idealists, distrustful of temporary expedients and full of faith in principles and human progress. They know that compromises simply postpone the settlement which must finally be met with added cost and usurious interest. He who demands an immediate rectification of wrongs is the fanatic of today, but the conservative of tomorrow. So rapidly do estimates of character change, that in a single lifetime, men behold heroes in bronze or marble whom they remember as the sport of mobs and inmates of prison cells. The process is continuous, as new and vital questions confront each generation. . . .

For a concrete illustration of my subject let me take the great land question, predominant in all countries and constituting the most fundamental of all reforms. It has been foreshadowed for centuries and is traceable in all literature from the time of Moses. It found admirable statement in Emerson's lecture on "The Conservative," in 1842; Richard Cobden announced it as the necessary agitation to follow the abolition of the Corn Laws; John Stuart Mill gave it an impulse in his statement regarding the unearned increment of land, and Herbert Spencer, in the 9th chapter of *Social Statics*, vindicated the right to the use of the earth with unequalled completeness and moral force. But it remained for a young journeyman printer of San Francisco, without academic learning, to evolve and record in the monumental work of "Progress and Poverty," a remedy for an immemorial injustice which is the greatest barrier to human progress. Nothing since Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" has so disarranged orthodox political economy and compelled new thought. It has not only destroyed old dogmas, but, transcending speculative discussion, summons political parties to consider the remedy proposed by Henry George. Tolstoy hails and proclaims the gospel from a throne loftier than the Czar's. The Liberal party of Great Britain has been forced to incorporate the idea in its programme. Twice has the House of Commons passed that entering wedge, the Scottish Land Bill, to be shorn of its value in the House of Lords. In Australasia, in the United States, and even in conservative Germany, the principle is in varied experiment. Vested privilege has more to fear from the application of the single tax than from any other device proposed for its destruction.

This preface is necessary for my illustration.

One would think that an able and sincere contribution to science from any source would receive generous consideration from universities, where special chairs are maintained for investigation. What matter if it conflict with adopted theories? If it does not enlist sympathy it should at least challenge serious attention. Learning has no confines to its province and should have none for its hospitality. "Welcome!" is the fitting motto for its banners. Unlike chartered universities, knowledge has no special door of entrance and no walls.

How was the message of Henry George received? At first with surprise and with superlative praise. His power of statement, clear illustration, masterly style and moral uplift captivated the reviewers. The creation of a chair of political economy at Berkeley was suggested for the author. Then slowly it dawned upon the consciousness of privilege that a revolution in the existing order was inevitable if the principles asserted were put in practice. Had the discussion been confined to speculative limitations, with the proviso that the scheme was utopian, Henry George would have secured popularity with the schools and been a society pet, as toying with social theories of an imaginative nature promising results in the far future, suits the dilettante taste. When it was plain that the writer was no theorist and the plan intended for immediate application, privilege took alarm and anathema quickly followed praise. At once economists of authority were summoned to refute the new heresy. What effrontery for an unknown person without degree to cope with masters of the science on their own ground! Then began the unceasing battle.

At Saratoga, in 1890, at the annual meeting of the American Social Science Association, a day was devoted to the single tax discussion, with both sides ably represented. Near the conclusion, noting the mutual disagreements of his opponents, whose varying objections cancelled themselves, and weary of the casuistries used to embarrass him, Henry George addressed himself directly to the professors.

Let me say a word to you, professors of political economy, you men of light and leading. . . . We single tax men propose something we believe will make the life of the masses easier, that will end the strife between capital and labor and solve the darkening social problems of our time. If our remedy will not do, what is your remedy? . . . You must choose between the single tax, with its recognition of the rights of the individual, with its recognition of the rights of property, with its recognition of the province of government, on the one hand, and socialism on the other. . . . The matter is too solemn, too important. It involves the health, the lives, the very souls, of human beings. It involves the progress of society, the fate of civilization. If you have had superior education, if you have had what so many of us have been denied, the leisure for study, the oppor-

tunity to cultivate what is highest and best in your powers, the more is it incumbent on you to meet the question frankly and fairly. If you will not accept our remedy, what is your remedy? There must be some deep wrong underlying our organization today. If it is not the wrong we point to, the wrong that disinherits men of their birthright, what is it? There must be some way of securing the laborer the proper reward for his toll, of opening to every man willing to work opportunity to work. If you will not take our plan, what is your plan?

If universities cannot accept the reasons or approve the methods of present unpopular agitations, they have no excuse for persistent misunderstanding of the principles avowed. Yet students bring away from college no clear perceptions of prominent issues nor are able to draw intelligent distinctions between the opposite principles of socialism and of the single tax. Even trained economists confuse the two.

We mistake instruction for education. True education is fitting men to deal with living problems, so swiftly multiplying in our uncivilization. Wealth, gained through privilege, must seek the goal of self-indulgence. Opulence and vulgar display on the one hand, poverty and drunkenness on the other, are the natural social extremes when money and sport are the prevailing passions. Any nation is on its downward course whose avarice seeks new fields of exploitation and gigantic empire,—“hiding the conqueror's sword under the mantle of philanthropy.” While under the glamor of world ambitions we lose the power of intelligent dealing with destructive forces from within. And the great middle classes look on with complaisant optimism.

This is not the fulfillment of the destiny conceived by the framers of the constitution. Our lower standards are felt in the dearth of noble voices, such as in the mid-Victorian age rang out, distinct and inspiring, from great personalities. We miss these conscious prophets of a worthier era, interpreters of the new transforming ideas which spring from fresh discoveries in science and opening fields of thought.

What inspiration and enthusiasm were imparted to youth by the messages of Carlyle, Ruskin, Mazzini, Tennyson, the Brownings, Emerson and Lowell! Such oracles are dumb, and in their places are platitudes barren of intellectual stimulation or sincerity. Not that we lack intellects of high order in material pursuits, or abundant concrete benevolence, but, in the realm of inflexible conscience, when we name Tolstoy and Anatole France, we are at loss to think of other universal voices.

Still, in school and university, the study of past greatness goes on and the worship of dead heroes is unabated. Still Plutarch's men are lauded, and, on the recurring birthdays of Lincoln and other martyrs who have achieved their Valhalla,

their praise is spoken from lips equally ready to defend principles which the heroes abhorred. As the anniversaries of the revolutionary fathers were improved to disparage the abolitionists, so those of anti-slavery heroes are now used to defame their true successors. This retrogression, after assured advance, weakens faith in human progress, while old beliefs lose vitality and the new ones, which are assuredly to bring back trust and hope, are yet below the horizon.

Though differing in name, there is no serious reform, whether pertaining to peace, tariffs, race, land monopoly, suffrage, or other pressing question, that is not an offshoot of privilege. The attempt of men to prosper at the expense of their fellows, through process of law, explains them all. The idle and cunning have learned the secret of living upon the ignorant and industrious, without fear of legal penalty. Dictating the laws, they quickly convert plunder into a vested right, forcing government to be more conservative of property than of human beings. So injustice becomes organic and its tools hold the power in all nations.

Attack against such a guarded fortress requires either unselfish devotion to truth or the desperation which creates revolutions. And revolutions will continue to be the costly end of wrongs until religion and learning cease to shirk the conflict.

I commend to you, in closing, the words of Mazzini:

Love and venerate the ideal. High above every country, high above humanity, is the country of the spirit, in which all are brethren who believe in the inviolability of thought and in the dignity of the immortal soul. Adore enthusiasm and the visions of early youth, for they are a perfume of paradise which the soul retains in issuing from the hands of the Creator.

\* \* \*

### YOU CAN'T FOOL GOD.

For The Public.

You can fool the taxman, and fool your wife,  
And fool your neighbor 'most out of his life;  
You can fool in business, and fool in church,  
And fool your very best friend in a lurch;  
But you can't—fool—God.

You can fool your partner, and fool your clerk,  
And fool everybody with whom you work;  
You can fool your brothers, and sisters too,  
And fool your parents so good and true;  
But you can't—fool—God.

You can fool your creditors down to a dime,  
And fool your tradesmen, time after time;  
You can fool by night, you can fool by day,  
Till you fool your whole foolish life away;  
But you can't—fool—God.

TOWNSEND ALLEN.

## BOOKS FOR GIFTS

NO CHARGE FOR POSTAGE

- 10 CENTS**—Rough grey paper cover, handsomely stamped with dark blue, pages uncut. **The Prophet of San Francisco.** By Louis F. Post. Life and Principles of Henry George.
- 25 CENTS**—Smooth grey stiff cover with cloth back. **Fellowship Songs,** with music. Compiled by Ralph Albertson. The great songs of brotherhood and democracy.
- 25 CENTS**—Stiff drab paper cover. With portrait of author. **Labor and Neighbor.** By Ernest Crosby. Economics from the human standpoint.
- 25 CENTS**—Stiff drab paper cover. Beautifully printed on heavy paper. **Garrison the Non-Resistant.** By Ernest Crosby. A life of William Lloyd Garrison from a little known point of view.
- 50 CENTS**—The same book bound in blue cloth stamped with gold, and with a portrait of Garrison.
- \$1.00**—Fine blue cloth stamped with gold. **Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce.** By Louis F. Post.
- \$1.25**—Rich blue cloth stamped with gold. With portrait of author. **The Ethics of Democracy.** By Louis F. Post.
- \$2.00**—Green canvas. Octavo size. Well printed by a London house. **The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth,** as revealed in the writings of Gerrard Winstanley, the Digger—Mystic and Rationalist, Communist and Social Reformer. By Lewis H. Berens. Foreshadowings of our time in the days of the English Revolution. This is not fiction. It is literal history that should not be forgotten.

{Address: **THE PUBLIC, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg., Chicago**