

difficulty in making the distinction upon their ballots. Local questions aside, however, and the national outlook alone considered—which is necessarily the attitude of Democrats outside of New York—Shepard's success is the desideratum.

One of the interesting incidents of this New York contest is the strenuous efforts that are being made to secure for Mr. Low the support of the friends of Henry George, as such, as if Mr. Low were a better friend of what Henry George stood for and what his memory now recalls and his name represents than Mr. Shepard. Those who know the history of the George movement know something of the aid, even if not advertised, which Mr. Shepard has given it. One of the men most familiar with these circumstances is Henry George, Jr., who refers to them in an open letter in reply to an open letter from the president of the Manhattan Single Tax club, which the Low papers have exploited, though they suppress the reply.

Mr. George begins his letter with a response to the strictures upon himself for supporting Mr. Shepard, which constitute the burden of the other letter. If your communication, he says,—

had been a purely private letter it would not have called for an answer, since it can scarcely interest you how I shall vote. But it is not a private letter. You have given it to the press and written it on the letter paper of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, on which paper your name is printed as president, thereby conveying an impression to the uninformed that you have written with the authority of the single tax organization, whereas you and I know that that organization has not so authorized you—that, indeed, its constitution forbids consideration of politics.

Mr. George then compares the two candidates with reference to the attitude of single tax men:

As to whether few or many single tax men beyond your own immediate circle, or whether men as wise and well known as yourself, are supporting Mr. Shepard, matters not. Nor

need we decide whether or not the Democratic candidate mentally and morally measures up to the mayoralty office, for most of his adversaries testify that he does. It is of no present moment whether Mr. Shepard has, as you say, sneered at the single tax, or whether he has, as I may inform you, contributed generously to help the discussion of that idea, for the single tax is not an issue any more than it was when we voted for the Democratic candidate for the presidency last year—Mr. Bryan. Nor yet need you and I disconcert ourselves over Mr. Shepard's course respecting the rapid transit tunnel contract, for Mr. Low refuses to make that an issue, he himself having been, while the rapid transit plans were forming, an active member of the Rapid Transit Commission, of which Mr. Shepard was counsel.

These preliminary matters Mr. George passes by with only the references we have quoted. But he follows with a consideration of the fact, of which much has been made, that his father, when a candidate for mayor four years ago, fought Tammany Hall bitterly, and recommended Low's candidacy as second to his own, Low then being opposed not only to Tammany, but also to the Republican machine.

Of that aspect of the present campaign Henry George, Jr., writes:

You "thank God" that the influence of Henry George "is still the inspiration of single tax men as a whole, and leads them to throw their weight upon the side of decency and an honest municipal government," by which you mean, of course, for Mr. Low. This observation is, doubtless, predicated upon my father's independent candidacy for the mayoralty in the campaign in which he lost his life four years ago. Now, let me remind you that he struggled against what he denounced as the rotten Democratic machine. He had previously announced through the newspapers that he was a Jeffersonian democrat, that he had no ill-will toward Tammany Hall which a good mayoralty nomination could not remove, and that he would vote for its candidate if the Democratic convention should name Hon. Charles W. Dayton, Justice William A. Gaynor or some other Democrat of equal moral and mental caliber. Instead of this kind of nominee, Robert A. Van Wyck, a mere tool Democrat, was named. Then it was that my father, in spite of the serious warning of the doctors, took the field to protest against such a representative of Democracy and against the

men who were responsible for his nomination. My father was in close enough touch with Mr. Shepard to know that in important respects they were laboring along the same lines—that to democratic educational work to which he was devoting much thought and effort, Mr. Shepard, also, was giving his voice and his purse; and from what I know of the circumstances, I have small doubt that had Shepard been spoken of for the mayoralty at that time my father would have ranked him with Dayton and Gaynor as the kind of men, citizens and Democrats, who were eligible for the office and to whom he could give hearty support. As to what my father, were he alive, would do in the present instance, you are as free to suppose as anyone else. For myself, I venture to say that he strove for the kind of democracy that Thomas Jefferson taught, as opposed to Republican paternalism; that he invariably worked with the Democratic party when it moved, however timidly, in that direction; that he tested that party, not by its past deeds, but by its present actions—in a campaign, by its candidate and its platform; that if he would have deemed Mr. Shepard eligible for the mayoralty four years ago he would have deemed him eligible now. You do not mention it, but it is none the less the fact, that my father four years ago had words of praise for Mr. Low. But why? Not because of Mr. Low's republicanism, but because, though a Republican, Low, as an independent candidate, was struggling against Plattism. Here are the words of my father, uttered in a public address on the last night of his life: "Let me say a word about Mr. Low. On election day, as between Mr. Low and myself, if you are yet undecided, you must vote for whom you please. I shall not attempt to dictate to you. I do entertain the hope, however, that you will rebuke the one man power by not voting for the candidates of the bosses. I am not with Low. He is a Republican. He is fighting the machine, which is all very good as far as it goes. But he is an aristocratic reformer. I am a democratic reformer. He would help the people; I would help the people to help themselves." Apply these words now. Is Mr. Low any less of an "aristocratic reformer" than he was four years ago? And has he not succumbed to Senator Platt, the very Republican boss he assailed before and said was past redemption? Has he not now become the Republican nominee, and is it not by his election that the Republican party leaders hope, in the words of Lieut. Gov. Woodruff, "to make New York state as Republican as Pennsylvania?" Can anyone imagine that "the influence" of Henry George is "an inspiration of single tax men as a whole" to "throw

their weight" on that side in this contest? I cannot think so.

A new word has been invented by Louis R. Ehrich, of Colorado Springs, to distinguish a new ceremony which he has suggested and Colorado Springs has adopted. The word is "posteritism." It is intended to distinguish the antithesis of the worship of ancestors. Mr. Ehrich's idea is that "the charge which the future has in store is, in conjunction with the deepest reverence for the past, a worship of the unborn, a consecration to posterity." To symbolize posteritism, the people of Colorado Springs have ceremoniously transmitted to posterity a "century chest," the purpose of which is to bring to the inhabitants of that city in the year 2001 a complete picture of the life of its inhabitants to-day. Sixty sealed letters, written by prominent citizens, each accompanied by a photograph of the writer, were deposited in the chest along with pictures, newspapers, etc., calculated to give an impression 100 years hence of the Colorado Springs of to-day. Private letters, also, were inclosed addressed by the writers to their personal relatives living when the chest is opened. After a solemn ceremony of dedication this chest was deposited in a public library for safekeeping. It is to be opened by the citizens of Colorado Springs of the twenty-first century, after midnight on December 31, 2000.

Senator Tillman is quoted by the press as expressing sentiments which we devoutly hope he never uttered. We hope so because Mr. Tillman is really a democrat; with limitations, it is true, but nevertheless much more a democrat than some men we might name whose democracy is not narrowed by his particular limitations. He does draw a line at Negroes. On one side of that line he is thoroughly democratic; on the other side he is an uncompromising advocate of the utterly undemocratic idea of status. To him the Negro seems to have no rights in civil society which the white

man is bound to respect. This we are prepared for, because he has developed in a social environment which fosters that false ideal. But we are not prepared to believe that Senator Tillman uttered the language attributed to him when he learned that Booker T. Washington had dined at the white house. This is the language as it is going through the press: "The action of President Roosevelt in entertaining that nigger will necessitate our killing a thousand niggers in the south before they will learn their place again." Such a sentiment would be grossly brutal. It would disclose at once a murderous and a cowardly disposition. It would tend to incite murderous actions, such as those that are already a horror in the South. It would furthermore tend to degrade the white man who seriously uttered it and the white community that indorsed it, below the level upon which the white race places the black. If white men have to maintain their claims of superiority by murder, then their claims, from any other point of view than that of the pirate or the savage, must be extremely frail.

PREACHING TRUTH.

One of the greatest obstacles that confront some advocates of a new and unpalatable truth, so it seems to us, is of their own making. No part of their truth is ever truth to them without the whole of it. They feel a call to preach the entire doctrine, unadulterated, in season and out of season; and then they wonder at the obstacles they meet, wonder at the non-receptivity of those who listen to them, wonder at the lack of interest, at the lack of comprehension, and at the distorted concepts of the truth they have tried so faithfully to make plain.

Yet who would wonder at similar difficulties in teaching children, if a similar notion of the supreme importance of teaching the whole truth at once prevailed in our schools. What would be thought of a teacher who should insist upon giving primary pupils a full dose of higher mathematics, because addition, subtraction,

multiplication and division are only partial mathematical truths? Suppose that the culminations of mathematical or other academical truth were driven into the child's mind before he had comprehended any of the steps leading up to it, would he not very likely be non-receptive, uninterested, indifferent, and afflicted with distorted concepts? The approved method of teaching truth to school children is not to teach "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," all at once. It is to give the pupil no more at a time than he can digest.

Now, children with reference to school learning are not so different from men with reference to new truths. If the truth develops easily out of their habits of thought, they cordially welcome it. But if it is in conflict with their habits of thought they are on the defensive at once. For illustration, to have put forth a radical evolutionary theory before evolution had become a fad, would have tended to close the mind of the average man to the whole subject. But now that evolution is a fad, the more extreme the evolutionary theory proposed the more greedily does the average man accept it. Without regard to whether evolutionary theories are true or not, here is a lesson for agitators of new moral and social or industrial truth.

Such truths are very apt to be unpalatable, almost certain to be if they are economic truths, because prevailing habits of thought with reference to the ethics of industrial adjustments have been away from and not in the direction of truth. When new truth in these relations confront men, therefore, they are apt to condemn it without a hearing. This argues nothing against either their intelligence or their moral integrity. It only shows, as a rule, that we have approached them with too much of the truth at once. We have offered them unaccustomed mental and moral food, and more at a time than they can digest.

Or, to draw an illustration from the physical law of inertia, we find them going at full headway in the wrong direction, and, instead of taking a lesson from railroading, and switch-