

proprieties, Mr. Barton left the grand jury room when the question of considering the labor cases came up, and announced his intention of taking no part therein. Yet the grand jury did not act. Why not? Is there any other reasonable inference than that the charges which Judge Brown outlined are probably false or frivolous, and that the persons and newspapers responsible for making them dare not come out into the open with their proof? This outcome of Judge Brown's attempt to have justice fairly done, casts further suspicion upon the good faith of the local contempt proceedings against strikers, which are based upon allegations of the very circumstances which the grand jury, though otherwise advised by the court, has refused to investigate.

Single taxers will be interested in the valuations of the real estate of Cook county, Ill., which are now completed for 1903. The total is \$337,819,707. As this is by law one-fifth of true value, the true value must be \$1,689,098,535. Of this amount 90 per cent. is estimated to be within the city of Chicago. Accepting that estimate, and the estimate of 55 per cent. for land and 45 for improvements in cities, and 45 for land and 55 for improvements in farming regions, a rough comparison of Chicago land values with country land values in Cook county can be made. As 90 per cent. of the total real estate value is in Chicago, we have \$1,520,188,681 for such values in Chicago, and \$168,909,854 for the same kind of values in the rest of Cook county. If, now, 55 per cent. of Chicago real estate values are the values of land, or sites, irrespective of improvements, the land values of Chicago would be about \$786,103,774; and if 45 per cent. of the real estate values outside of Chicago are values of the land alone, the Cook county land values outside of Chicago would be about \$76,009,434. It would appear, therefore, that the land values of Chicago are

over 91 per cent. of the total land values of the county, while those outside of Chicago are less than 9 per cent. of the whole. Yet the Chicago papers make unsophisticated out of town people believe that a tax exclusively upon land values would be borne by farmers!

ESSENTIAL UNITY OF THE THEORETICAL AND THE PRACTICAL.

It is an old strife, that between the self-styled "practical" man and the man whom he is pleased to call a "theorist."

To most of us, perhaps, practicality (in others) and the being practical (ourselves) are the "summum bonum" of life. But when we come to learn what is meant by these terms, as a large number of persons use them, it is found to be simply the contented acceptance and loyal advocacy of such institutions and practices as have become well established.

This is shown in the strenuous efforts that are made to keep "the ways of our fathers" saddled upon us, and in the almost abject fear of the unknown—the untried in the material sphere being always assumed to be the unknown.

Although "doing something" is what is explained as being practical, it is only the doing of something already in vogue that they will tolerate; it is doing something in the material sphere where it can be seen of others which they demand; and it is doing something regardless of the real relation between the doing and the professed purpose, which satisfies them.

It follows that any question of improvement in the form or methods of any existing practice or institution, involving as it must a period of cessation of physical activity in some degree, and a revival of mental activity through an inquiry into the relation of original purpose and real tendency, with some proposition for the trial of the untried, calls out from such "practicals" the criticism of "unpractical," "mere theory."

How shall these criticisms be answered? What is it to be a true practical? What is it to be a true theorist?

Although practical is roughly de-

finied as concerned only with action and theoretical as concerned only with thought, a more careful definition and usage gives to "practical" the meaning of "concerned with or related to use," "educated by practice." Its opposite, "unpractical," is defined as "not dictated by or in harmony with the lessons of experience in actual work." And "impracticable" as "unfit for the purpose intended or desired." Such are the definitions given by the Century Dictionary.

The same authority, although it defines theoretical as "concerned with knowledge only, not with accomplishing anything or with producing anything," yet makes the following quotations from other authorities: "The distinction between practical science and theoretical science which has descended to our times . . . diminishes in importance as science advances, all the sciences finding practical application." And "theory," which, like theorist, is "often used with the implication of lack of practical capacity," is "an intelligible account of how something has been brought about or should be done," and is to be carefully distinguished from conjecture, which "with good writers is hardly dignified by the name of theory." "The distinction of fact and theory is only relative;" "the merest artisan needs to theorize, i. e., to think—to think beforehand, to foresee; and that must be done by the aid of general principles, by the knowledge of laws."

It is clear from these definitions that the distinction between the theoretical and the practical—between theory and practice—is not such as involves a relation of antagonism, but rather of mutual dependence. It is clear that the theoretical is not more allied to the unpractical and the impracticable than is the practical; that it is, on the contrary, as opposed to the unpractical and the impracticable as is the practical.

If the question of superiority is to be considered at all, the cause or antecedent must take precedence over the effect or consequent. All practice, unless like "Topsy," it "never had a mother"—never had a beginning—was, in its first stage, theory, and should have respect for its origin.

The true theorist and the true practical are so inextricably mixed that no one will ever be able to separate them. Our critics, however, seek to identify the theorists with the impracticals, and to deny to the theorists practical intention or effort.

But if theorist is used in such a sense, the only man who really merits the title is the critic himself, though he styles himself (and because of the thoughtlessness of many of his fellows gets himself accepted as) "practical," or, sometimes, "conservative."

He reverses the natural order. Honoring action above thought, he gives to action the precedence over thought; and does, without knowing what he does.

He is the man wedded to a "guess" or a "conjecture."

He is the Non-Reasoner.

Between him and the true theorist there is, and must of necessity be, antagonism.

Though he may differ in other respects, in this he is not unlike the old woman who, when her knowledge of children was called in question, indignantly retorted: "I guess no woman knows more about children than I do; haven't I buried seven of 'em?"

He is also the one-ended man. He has got hold at some time, of something to busy himself with; and he keeps hold of the hard-working physical end, never stopping to consider the possible or probable outworkings of his efforts, knowing little or nothing of the relation of cause and effect, incapable of measuring the relation between effort put forth and results obtained or obtainable, wholly unobservant of tendencies or unheeding them. Though commonly given the title of practical, he is not "educated by experience." This is but another instance of the truth that "naming a thing so does not make it so."

The true theorist, however, is a man of sufficient insight and imagination to observe tendencies before they are realized in concrete results, and to think out a "better way" from the hints and suggestions that even the signs of failure offer.

He is the man observant and heedful of tendencies; for he knows that no matter how clear the purpose and aim may be, it can never be attained

by steps that tend in the opposite direction.

He is a believer in the orderly sequence of cause and effect.

He is the Reasoner.

Though he may at times be "concerned only with knowledge," and not immediately with physical action, yet nothing has ever been done, or ever will be done without him. Of all men he alone is the truly active man—too active for the unpractical practicals to whom repose is dearer than life, and who seek to rest upon the past as the pleasure-loving boatman "rests upon his oars." For to undo and to do over again, to retrace one's steps and to start afresh, is ever harder and requires a larger fund of the spirit of activity than to keep moving or doing as we began.

The true practical is also a man of insight and imagination.

He, too, foresees the future before he bumps his head against it; sees in the immediate workings before him the relation, or lack of relation, to original purpose or principle and to ultimate result; carefully notes tendencies, and so makes his effort the test of his theory and the quick and instant basis of a "better way"—of a new theory—if the test shows failure, if the tendency of his effort is to move toward another end. He is educated—i. e., led out and away from the old failure—by what he sees in practice, or by what he puts into practice. He, too, is the Reasoner. He is thus forever conceiving new ways and trying new ways—that bugaboo to the so-called practical man, to whom "what my father and my grandfather did is good enough for me," is only a hedge thrown up to protect his intellectual ennui.

The true theorist and the true practical are one in essential spirit and in essential service to the world. The true theorist believes in and mentally searches for the better way; and he works to get his theory into practice, either directly or by proxy, as soon as the world will have it. The true practical also believes in the better order; and he advances upon his own practice as soon as he can, and urges an advance upon general practices, from the basis of his own or others' clearer observation.

We are told that "experience is the great teacher;" that "we learn to do by doing." It is common, also, to confine our idea of experience and of doing to the material sphere, and to give to action and experience in that sphere precedence over thought and reason, in the evolutionary process; to maintain that we are pushed by our blind blunderings up into reason and intelligence. Hence the so-called "practicals," who are working in the material sphere only, suppose that they are in the sure and only way to obtain that great teacher's teaching.

Yet the fact is obvious that many do not learn to do by doing; that the majority are not educated by experience.

It has been only when and where reason has acted upon the phenomena of the material, or the spiritual, or the social, or the political environment, that the laws of those environments have been discovered. Knowledge of and obedience to those laws has been the foundation of all human progress.

Pure reason is the birthright of man as of no other part of the creation of which we are cognizant. It is that which distinguishes him from other animals. It is the parent of ideas, or theories; from its life they have their birth, and from them have come all those doings which have given to us the blessings of civilization. It is reason, therefore, and not experience, that is the great teacher. It is through reason, and not through doing—through reason acting upon other's doings as well as upon our own; acting upon all phenomena—that of the spiritual as well as of the material, that of the unconscious as well as that of the conscious realm—that we learn. The phenomena of the spiritual or of the material sphere, the phenomena caused by our conscious will, or by agencies outside our will, are but the material which reason uses to bring truth to our clearer consciousness or knowledge. The same phenomena may pass under our observation while reason sleeps, and leave us without knowledge of its nature.

So one may have seven children and learn nothing of the nature of the human soul, its needs and rights;

or a man may have the "ownership and operation" of coal mines, or gas wells, or of the oil supply or timber or metal supply of the world, and have no real knowledge of the origin of these things, or of their purpose, or of the right uses to which they should be put.

Yet the unpractical practicals, in whose minds the being physically busy and practicality are one—to whom physical contact with, or physical possession of, amounts to the experimental knowledge of—tell us very confidently: So and so "must know all about it, because they are right in it;" or, conversely, "it is not possible that you should know anything about children since you have never been a mother." "It is not possible that you, who have never managed a mine, should be able to tell a man who owns and operates a mine what he should do!"

But the layman has discovered the truth that was hidden from the priest. The non-slaveholding class discovered the truth that was hidden from the slaveholding class. The childless man discovered the principles of the kindergarten which countless mothers and fathers had missed. A youth, rocking a cradle and observing the rise and fall of the kettle's lid, discovered the nature and force of steam, and reasoned upon the uses which it might be made to serve. A landless man, observing the rise of land values and the fall of labor value in all civilized communities, discovered in the invariable connection of these two facts the force which operates to make a few very rich and the masses very poor, and reasoned that to take land values for public uses instead of to give them into private pockets, is the means by which the boundless resources of the earth, the natural heritage of all equally, may be shared by all equally, to the advantage of all and to the detriment of none.

As we have said, everything that we now know as practical was once theory—the canoe, the sailing vessel, the steamboat, the railroad, the trolley, the automobile, all bridges from the least to the greatest, all buildings from the tent or hut to the modern skyscraper, all forms of government from the patriarchal to the republican. The failure of the early forms of each of these to meet the requirements of the growing and rising desires of man has stimulated the conception of the new idea or theory

which has found birth in the succeeding forms.

To judge a theory as impractical before we have given it fair and honest consideration or trial, is to lay ourselves open, justly, to the charge of being opponents of progress; or to the charge of being recipients, or fancied recipients, of some special privilege under the present order; or to the charge of being incapable of reason; or it places upon us the burden of proof that there is nothing better needed, or possible, than what we already have in practice.

No period of time taken from working in a wrong direction, in order to "get our bearings" and to learn the true direction, can be wasted time. No period of time occupied in the reasonable examination of any theory that has got itself into practice, in order to see whether it is indeed doing what it was expected to do—in order to measure effort up against result and to ascertain tendencies—can be lost time. This is the work, the practical and joyful work, of the true theorist and the true practical alike.

But social institutions and social practices are not possible of alteration except by the aid of men who have made them or who support them or submit to them; and until that aid is given, the true theorists and the true practicals alike remain the butt of scorn of those who, through ignorance or selfishness, are interested in maintaining the present order undisturbed, and of those who, "of all men the most miserable," are "without hope in this world" that anything can be improved. And theorists and practicals alike are delayed in bringing in the better order by the obstructive tactics of these, who meanwhile teasingly press the question: "Why don't you do something?"

Such alterations of social practices or social institutions as a new theory suggests must be effected through the social bodies supporting those practices or institutions. They cannot be effected by individual action alone. If human laws are to be brought into harmony with natural law, if government is to be improved, if religious practices and teachings are to be elevated, if the discoveries in the mechanical arts are to be utilized for the common good, these changes must be effected through the will of the people. Though one man alone may see and announce the need-

ed change he cannot, unaided, make the change.

The world has been slow enough to adopt material improvements; slower still to change its ideas of God, and of the right relations of men towards each other. This has been due, however, neither to the true theorists nor to the true practicals, but to the timid and conservative impracticals.

McMaster tells us in his "History of the People of the United States," concerning the spinning jenny: "It was indeed with this at first as with every great invention, from the alphabet to the printing-press, from the printing-press to the railroad, from the railroad to the telegraph. It was bitterly opposed. . . . The life of the inventor was threatened. On more than one occasion the machines were broken to pieces by an angry mob." The jenny was denounced as "an impious thing, and the inventor as a man who richly deserved a halter and might possibly get his deserts."

And as with every great mechanical invention which has been adapted to add to the material comfort of mankind, so with every great new thought which has tended to fire the spirit of man with hope; which has sought to show the relation between man and man to be that between equals; which has tended to reveal to man a truer knowledge of his environment and to free him in his relation to that environment; which has tended to set the reason free through giving free play to the bodily powers—all have been bitterly opposed. The lives of the prophets of new ideas have been either threatened, or terminated, by violence, or they have been harassed and weakened by opposition.

Watching the fall of apples, Newton discovered that all-pervasive and fundamental law which governs all motion in the material universe—the law of gravitation. Observing the behavior of men in their relation to each other and to the material universe, Henry George discovered the all-pervasive and fundamental law of human nature which governs the actions of men in the pursuit of happiness: "Men seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion." Though very many know little of the real meaning of the law of gravitation, and know that they know little, yet those persons recognize that it is too late to make a display of such ignorance by deying that law. And it is already too late

to decry the profoundest truth which the discoveries of our own times have yet given to us—men seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion—or the means by which we may obey this fundamental law of our nature without restraint or restriction.

With regard to the operation of these and of all other natural laws, it is quite certain that neither ignorance of the law of gravitation, nor of those conditions through which it will act disastrously to our welfare, nor action in direct defiance of it, can prevent its action. Nor can ignorance of any fundamental law of human nature, nor of those conditions which, unrelieved, must bring out a violent expression of human nature's tremendous forces, nor deeds done in defiance of them, prevent the action of those forces when they have reached the point where repression is no longer possible. It is therefore not impracticable to inform ourselves of natural laws and to seek the means of working in harmony with them.

It was not that large majority on the island of Martinique who supposed that they were living under an unalterable condition of things because within the narrow limits of their own lives it had "always been so," who were the practical ones, as we all see well enough now. Yet without doubt the few who noted the warning signs of danger, and talked of them, were regarded as "calamity howlers," unsettlers of business and prosperity, "mere theorists." And without doubt those who wisely broke up the old, accustomed ways of life, and sought for safer conditions, were at least regarded by their "practical" neighbors (who, good conservatives, also no doubt supposed themselves to be evidencing justifiable regard for all the sacred accumulations of the past) as needlessly morbid and impractical. And that man would, indeed, have needed to be endowed with more than the power of an ordinary man who should have so supplemented nature's warnings with his own personal appeals, as to have disturbed the settled order of a great city, based upon confidence in and satisfaction with its prosperity, and upon the disbelief that anything less tangible than itself could have the power to overthrow it!

Doubting Thomas lives perpetually in all those unimaginative and unreasoning individuals who will not

believe until they can "see" and "touch" and "handle." Do they believe then?

We shrink from harshly judging a people who have lost their lives through their unreason or their inertia; and it is not our desire to do so. But if we let the sad event of Martinique occupy our thoughts at all, it is well that we should get at the real truth which it reveals. It is not well that we should settle down to the indolent, unreasoning notion that it was "according to the will of God," or due to his "inscrutable providence." It was not the providence or the will of God, nor yet the recklessness or carelessness of nature, any more than it would have been had each of the inhabitants of Martinique individually sat upon the safety valve of an engine, or upon a chimney while the warning signs of fire were coming up from its depths. It was the heedlessness, or the fear of change, or the inertia, of each citizen in himself, that was responsible for the disaster to each. In order to have escaped that disaster, each one must have thought or theorized for himself upon the phenomena that was making its appeal to his own eyes and ears and reason, and must have acted as the phenomena warned him to act. And if he would have saved others than himself, he must have sought to arouse the same thought and action in them.

"Men seek to satisfy their desires with the least exertion." The earth is the common heritage of all, and from which alone, those desires can be satisfied. To cut men off from, or to limit them in their freedom of access to, the earth, is to interfere with the free action of this law of their being. It is to make the satisfaction of desire difficult or impossible.

Interference with the freedom of men to follow the fundamental laws of their nature has brought on all those upheavals and disruptions of the social order which have darkened the pages of history. It has given us tyranny on the one hand, and revolt on the other; and it has kept those in whose minds the pure light of reason has shone, busy with the reiteration: "Set my people free!"

Such interference is operating today, though under somewhat different forms, to give us new phases of the old inequality of rights; new phases of ancient special privileges; new forms of the old claim of "divine right" and of the old superiority of

one class over another. It is those who seek to maintain this interference, and not those who protest and revolt against it, who are the impracticals. They only are the "theorists" in the bad sense in which they themselves use the word, who thus seek to defy a natural law. And they only are the true practicals who, reading the truth in all history and experiencing it within their own souls, that man was made for freedom, reasonably infer that this is what he will have by one means or another, and with loyalty of heart seek to effect the removal of all obstructions to freedom.

Protection—that indirect, subtle and unequal mode of taxation, and that impractical effort to make industry wholesome and vital through the denial of freedom to follow that social and industrial law of human nature to trade where and when it is easiest and most profitable to trade—has been tried and found wanting. All taxation of industry, both direct and indirect—the denial to men of the freedom to retain the full fruits of their own labor—has been tried and found wanting. Private ownership of land—which has given into the absolute control of a few that which by nature's evident purpose or law was intended for the equal use of all, and which has thus made the majority the virtual slaves of the few—has been tried and found wanting.

Through the maintenance of these practices, which deny justice to the masses and which give more than justice to the few, we have made and are making industrial slaves on the one hand, and "captains of industry" on the other; and the numbers of the former increase with far greater rapidity than the numbers of the latter. Is it reasonable to suppose that such tipping of the scales should go on without catastrophe?

With nineteen centuries of history behind us, and with that history repeating itself before us in the tendency everywhere apparent in every civilized community, toward inequality of rights, and of privileges, and of opportunities, they are not "educated by experience," they are not practical, they are not taught by reason, who fear or who refuse to stop and to question: "Why?" who fear or refuse to consider an honestly proposed remedy and to give it a fair trial.

No one needs to fear the taunt of "impractical." or "mere theorist." who is practical enough to note and to reason upon these tendencies, and

who is wise enough to understand and brave enough to advocate the theory which reveals the means by which we shall make real progress.

LIZZIE NYE NORTHROP.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

London, England, July 24.—We are beginning to reap the first fruits of the flood of reactionary thought which has steadily made headway during the past 25 years. Education, of a sort, and freedom to combine, to speak and to think, were wrested from the privileged classes at the beginning of the last century; and the people were getting out of hand, were commencing, to use Thorold Rogers's words, "to think of their natural rights." Henry George's immortal works quickened the pace; and the clever men of the privileged classes began to fear for the continuance of their privileges. As they know full well, his inspiring thoughts have gained headway in the minds and hearts of the thoughtful amongst the disinherited, and cannot be met and overthrown in a fair fight.

This sense of insecurity, to which Lord Salisbury so successfully appealed, has consciously or unconsciously impelled the privileged to unite in defense of their privileges. The passions and prejudices, as well as the ignorance, of the masses had to be appealed to; for they realized that anything they could do would have to be done in the guise or name of democracy, and, of course, in the interest of "the working man", without whose aid they were indeed helpless. Hence it is that the enthusiasm for democracy, for the brotherhood of man, for equal rights and equal opportunities to all, regardless of color or of race, has gradually been supplanted in the public mind by imperialism, by nationalism, by a studious disregard of principles, and an appeal to selfishness and materialism.

Imperialism! What crimes have been committed in its name both by you Americans and we Englishmen. But it cannot last, unless, indeed, the masses may be induced to forge fresh fetters for their own enslavement. And this is the immediate aim of the reactionaries on this side of the water.

Protectionism and conscription, of course under new names and new pretenses, these are the trump cards of the reactionaries. Chamberlain has led the first suit; and his lead cannot be countered by the old weapons, with which the ordinary official Liberals are meeting it, and will continue to meet it unless we can stop them. If we cannot, they must lose—some of them, I suspect, would be quite glad to lose—and the coming gen-

eration will find itself enslaved and helpless in the hands of its oppressors.

There is no doubt in my mind that much ground we once thought won forever, has already been lost; and I look around in vain for men in the orthodox Liberal party capable of leading the nation on to recover it. Land reform is the "joker" (you will, I think, understand the allusion) which could win the trick; but this card the Liberal party as at present constituted will not play—though, to suit their own ends, they may play *with* it, and flourish it in the eyes of their official enemies.

In view of the present situation, we are bringing out and selling through the trade, at half price, sixpence (12 cents), a special issue of the authorized edition of Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade." So far, we have ordered 17,000 copies, and if only we can secure the necessary financial support, we shall sell 50,000 and possibly 100,000 during the coming 12 months. We shall have large double crown placards, advertising the book, all over London; and we are in treaty to have similar placards at all railway bookstalls. There is, as you well know, no better antidote to the Chamberlain poison; and we shall do our best and strain our financial resources to the breaking point to get it as widely diffused as possible.

It will be heavy and most trying work, more especially as the financial resources at our disposal are most meager; but we must take advantage of the opportunity now presented. It may be that after all the Tories are playing into our hands; for every real struggle in the past has been fought out over fiscal questions—I mean in England; and it is into the field of fiscal politics that their move will force the taxation of land values. The opportunity for really effective propaganda work has come; and unless funds fail us we shall take the fullest advantage of it.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Aug. 6.

To the great Roman Catholic world, the event of the week has been the election of a successor to the late Pope Leo XIII. (p. 264) as head of their Church. The conclave of cardinals was assembled for the election in the Sistine chapel at Rome on the 31st, the number in attendance being 62, and on the 1st the voting began. The regulation two ballots were

taken, but without result. On the 2d the next two were also without result. Likewise with the two ballots of the 3d. But on the 4th a unanimous choice was made on the first ballot, the successful candidate being Giuseppe Sarto, patriarch of Venice, who has become Pope under the title of Pius X.

Pius X. is an Italian, born at Riese in 1835. He was of peasant birth, and his brother is postman and a small storekeeper in a village in Mantua. The pope was educated at Treviso and Padua. At 23 he was consecrated a priest at Castel Franco; and for 9 years following he acted as coadjutor to the parish priest of Tombolo in the province of Padua, going thence in 1867 as parish priest to the parish of Salzano. In 1875 he was elected chancellor of the bishopric of Treviso, and in 1884 Pope Leo appointed him bishop of Mantua, a place he held until 1893, when he was raised to the cardinalate and appointed patriarch of Venice.

Somewhat more definite news of the persecution of reformers in China than that which was briefly referred to editorially last week (p. 260) has since been received. It seems that the Chinese reform newspaper at Shanghai, the "Supao," is being prosecuted by the local Chinese authorities for sedition, warrants having been issued against the editor and his staff, seven persons in all, with a view to turning them over to the Chinese government for capital punishment. The editors have thus far been able to prevent the consummation of this purpose by appealing to the foreign ministers to assume jurisdiction of the matter. The ministers have not decided to comply. On the contrary, the Russian, French and American ministers favor surrendering the editors to the Chinese government. But the British minister is opposed to doing this, and upon his application to his government has received instructions in accordance with his wishes. The fact was announced in the House of Commons on the 5th, by Mr. Balfour, who said that the British minister at Peking had been telegraphically instructed that it was the opinion of the