

boards in Federal affairs. They now have a majority in both Houses.

In South Australia they have been successful in getting 22 members in a house of 42, so we shall have a Labor ministry in power as soon as the State parliament assembles.

Unfortunately the greatest portion of the Federal Labor members are advocates of protection. They do not believe in the old protection, but favor what they call new protection; that is, protection for the manufacturer by means of the tariff; for the factory worker by means of wages boards. Evidently the consumer does not require any protection.

They favor a progressive land tax with a £5,000 exemption clause, but they do not advocate it for revenue purposes, but simply as a means of breaking up big estates. I should think with the experience of New Zealand before them, they would drop the progressive and adopt the all around tax.

E. J. CRAIGIE.

+ + +

## A DAY IN NEW YORK.

New York, May 31.

It is to be hoped that the two portrait tablets dedicated here yesterday may long remain to identify their respective sites as the death place, the one of William Lloyd Garrison and the other of Henry George. These men were abolitionists, if you think of their mission as destructive of social wrong; they were constructionists, if you think of it as promotive of social righteousness. In fact, every effective career necessitates both; and the old Hebrew formula is not out of the way in putting destruction of the wrong ahead of construction of the right. In the development of social character it is as true as of the development of individual character, that we must "cease to do evil" before we can "learn to do well."

Garrison was world-famed as an abolitionist of that kind of slavery which consists in making workers the literal property of masters. George was an abolitionist of the only other kind of slavery—that which consists in making workers dependent for working opportunities upon the caprice or the greed of monopolists of land. Both, therefore, were liberators, and there was consequently great propriety in the double ceremonial. All the more so since a son of Garrison had become a leading disciple of George, and a son of George had designed and modeled both the tablets—each of them a faithful portrait. And inasmuch as the two men had died in places near together, there was no inconvenience in unifying the dedications. The same audience that participated in dedicating one of the tablets participated also in dedicating the other.

The distinguished committee, of which Joseph H. Choate is chairman, was represented by Bolton Hall, its treasurer; and ex-Congressman Robert Baker served as chairman of the double meeting. Henry George III, son of Henry George, Jr., unveiled the tablet to his grandfather; the other was unveiled by Henry Serrano Villard, great grandson of Garrison. As one of the old-time friends of Henry George, it fell to me to say the few words of dedication that were spoken when the American flag was drawn away from the George tablet; and Thomas Mott Os-

borne, formerly Mayor of Auburn and now a formidable candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of New York, delivered an impressive oration at the Garrison unveiling. Mr. Osborne's theme was democracy in its widest and deepest sense. One of his epigrams flashed out the spirit of his whole oration: "You may have an imperial republic, but you cannot have an imperial democracy."

Among the participants in the Garrison-George dedication were Richard F. George, the sculptor who had made the tablets, with his elder brother, Henry George, Jr., and his surviving sister, Mrs. Wm. C. de Mille. There were Mrs. Villard (Garrison's daughter), and William Lloyd Garrison of Boston, third of the name and son of the late William Lloyd Garrison (vol. xii, pp. 902, 950, 970, 973, 997, 1006, 1021, 1026, 1215; vol. xiii, p. 186), whose father's faith is also his own. Many intimate friends of Henry George were at both dedications—Charles Frederick Adams, Jerome O'Neill, L. S. Dickey (of Chicago), Dr. Levenson, John S. Crosby, W. E. Barker (of Boston), August Lewis and Mrs. Lewis, and Frank Stephens of Philadelphia; and there was Joseph Dana Miller, editor of the *National Single Tax Review*, besides many attendants from distant places, among whom were James H. Dillard of New Orleans, formerly dean of Tulane University and now superintendent of the Jeanes fund for Negro education, and Professor Lewis J. Johnson of Harvard University, both of them ardent disciples of George. Full half the crowd were women, and in it besides was Edwin G. Cooley, formerly superintendent of schools in Chicago.

The Garrison tablet is affixed to the Fourth avenue wall of the Westmoreland apartments, about ten feet above the sidewalk, a little south of Seventeenth street and facing Union Square. Mr. Garrison died in this building in the apartments of his son-in-law and daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Henry S. Villard, in 1879.

Hardly two blocks farther south, and about ten feet high on the wall of the Union Square Hotel, somewhat south of Fifteenth street and also facing Union Square, is the George tablet. Henry George died in this building near the close of the first mayoralty campaign of Greater New York, in which he was one of the three leading candidates. It is at the center, too, of most of George's later activities. Nearby in one direction is the Union Square cottage from the covered porch of which he often addressed vast crowds assembled on the 17th street plaza. Within a stone's throw are Steinway Hall and the old Academy of Music, where George and McGlynn thrilled many a great audience. Another of his notable speaking places was Chickering Hall somewhat to the north, and Cooper Union about as far to the south. The "Standard" office, where most of his service as editor and publisher of that paper was spent, is only a building or two south of the tablet.

The walls bearing these tablets will doubtless soon come down to give place to modern business buildings, types of which have already made Union Square hardly recognizable by the nineteenth century New Yorker, except perhaps for the equestrian statue of Washington which still salutes the setting sun. But care will doubtless be taken by the committee while its members live, and by volunteers

thereafter, to have these tablets placed on new walls when the old ones are pulled down.

+

While meeting old friends and making new ones, I learned somewhat of the Single Tax convention (p. 515), which had been held a week before—the 21st of May—but of which I had until then failed to get reports.

About 70 persons attended. The meeting was called to order by Wm. F. Casey. Jerome O'Neill (one of the principal candidates with Henry George in the campaign in which the latter died) was made temporary chairman, and George Wallace (formerly a Republican member of the New York legislature) permanent chairman. The secretary was B. T. Sample; and among the important members was Joseph F. Darling, recently an assistant attorney general of New York. A platform (p. 515) with supplementary specific political statements was adopted, and the name of "Land Value Tax Party" was given to the organization. No nominations were made, as I was informed, and I have learned of no permanent committees. The headquarters is at 43 East 22d street.

Among those who are promoting this movement, I find perhaps a dozen whose names are familiar. All these—and I am satisfactorily assured that this is true also of the others—are persons who in my judgment are above all possible suspicion of bad faith. They are men and women who, beyond adventure, are devoted disciples of Henry George, and they believe sincerely in this method of promoting the cause he stood for. According to my notions they are entitled to make their experiment without obstruction from those of us who, though having the same goal in view, do not agree with them as to method. "The proof of the pudding is the eating thereof," and those who would make puddings their way instead of our way, must be left in freedom to prove that they are right. This does not mean that those of us who object to the side-party policy, or ill-timed independent movements in politics, must yield our own judgment to any coterie of our friends, however sincere they may be, who get together in the name of our common cause and say "Go to! Let's manufacture a political party for it." But it does mean that we should throw no obstacles in their way, unless frank expressions of opinion may be so regarded.

As a rule, the demand for a political party to represent each particular cause is bred by that impatience which springs from the very human "lust for finishing." As a rule, too, it ignores the essential difference between principle and policy, between ultimate purpose and intermediate tactics. A political party (big or little) is neither a principle nor a cause. For a principle or a cause one should "dare to be a Daniel" and "dare to stand alone;" but a political party with a perfect platform and a lonesome membership is as an army with a good cause and no soldiers. To stand for a cause though alone, is great; but to march forth alone as an army or a political party is not so great. It is as impossible politically for men, as it is gregariously for birds, to "flock alone." And gradual growth from little to big is not characteristic of political parties in the United States. New parties usually spring spon-

taneously into the political arena in effective numbers. They are not factory made nor garden grown.

No one can quite predict the time of birth of a new party, but the best test that my experience suggests is this: When a new party is so overrun with applicants for committee work that vigorous sifting processes are necessary to keep out crooks and self-serverers or the inefficient, the hour is probably at hand; but when its lonesome promoters have to beg vainly for effective workers, the hour is certainly still afar off.

+

A man who has probably done more than any other to promote the political growth of Henry George's ideas in the United States, is Tom L. Johnson. He has done this partly through third parties and partly through the Democratic party—through third parties only when political conditions made them formidable enough to be reckoned with as political factors.

In his Congressional campaigns in Cleveland, in his service in Congress, and in his long service as Mayor of Cleveland (inclusive of his campaigning), all done in the Democratic party and with the Democratic party, Tom L. Johnson has made sentiment in Cleveland in favor of George's ideas and created champions for them; and through his work there, this sentiment has been spread over the whole country. Neither he nor anybody else could have done as much, or approached it, had he fluttered about with a side party. The notion which some followers of Henry George have, that Mayor Johnson has accomplished nothing in politics for their cause, is an undeserved though self-imposed reflection upon their own understanding.

To him on Decoration Day a tribute was paid in New York before I came away. In the same room of the Hotel Astor where five and a half years ago the twenty-fifth anniversary of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" was celebrated, an impressive bronze medallion modelled by Richard F. George, was presented to Mr. Johnson in honor of his service in politics under the inspiration of George's teachings. In place of Hamlin Garland, who presided before, the toastmaster was Frederick C. Leubuscher; where Bryan was, there were Thomas Mott Osborne and John DeWitt Warner; in place of the late William Lloyd Garrison the younger, was Edmund Vance Cooke, with Newton D. Baker at his side, and on the floor was Mr. Garrison's son. Daniel Kiefer was there from Cincinnati; Professor Dillard from New Orleans; Professor Johnson from Harvard, Hon. George L. Record from New Jersey, Frank Stephens from Philadelphia, Charles Hardon from New Hampshire, Horace Carr, E. W. Doty, Frederic C. Howe and Charles W. Stage from Cleveland, L. S. Dickey from Chicago, ex-Mayor McGuire from Syracuse, Bolton Hall, Lawson Purdy (president of the New York tax department), and Mrs. Purdy, Charles Frederick Adams (p. 532) and Mrs. Adams, W. E. Barker and Mrs. Barker (of Boston), and over two hundred more men and women among whom my defective memory manages to recall John Filmer, L. E. Wilmarth, Benjamin Doblin, Grace Isabel Colbron, Jennie L. Munroe (of Washington), Mrs. Frederic C. Howe, August Lewis and E. J. Shriver, Lawrence Dunham, Fenton Lawson (of Cincinnati), John J. Murphy, Robert Baker,

John S. Crosby and Mrs. Crosby, Mrs. Goldzier, Charles O'Connor Hennessy and his wife and Lincoln Steffens. Some were from nearby, others from far away, many I have known these many years and am amazed to see growing grey, and all with one accord were doing honor and giving encouragement to the man who has been for years distinctively the political pioneer of the movement to which Henry George gave voice.

Some of us are so bewitched with the vision of brotherhood which George opened our eyes to, that we are apt to despise the commonplace method he proposed for realizing it. Others of us are so enthralled by his simple and common sense method, that we forget the vision it aims to realize. But Tom L. Johnson has kept a steady hand on the method without losing sight of the vision, and a steady eye on the vision without resolving it into a dream.

L. F. P.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### THE DIVORCE QUESTION.

South Portland, Me.

In Chicago recently Archbishop Falconio was quoted as saying: "I consider the prevalence of divorce the greatest of this country's evils, and I consider the misuse of wealth by the brainless rich, who promote divorce and other evils, the greatest menace to the United States."

I will not concede to any man that divorce is evil. Webster defines divorce as "A legal dissolution of the bonds of matrimony, or the separation of husband and wife by a judicial sentence." Before there can be any divorce, then, there must first be marriage, and what is marriage? A few might answer, "Heaven;" but some would surely answer "Hell," therefore, I think we had better take Webster's definition again: "Marriage is a contract, both civil and religious, by which the parties engage to live together in mutual affection and fidelity till death shall separate them. Marriage was instituted by God himself, for the purpose of preventing promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, for promoting domestic felicity and for securing the maintenance and education of children."

The religious contract contains this clause: "Whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder." It is God, then, who joins them, the man and woman together. And who and what is God? After years of study and thought I believe that God is love, nothing more and nothing less. Not the silly passion of the boy and girl, or the lustfulness of grosser natures, but the love that holds the world together; the love of the mother; the trusting love of the child; the love that will suffer even death, willingly, for the object of its affection; the love that sends men and women to the slums to help their lowly brothers and sisters; love for nature, beauty and worth. That is God, the power that moves us, that rules us, and makes us marry. Happiness is Heaven, and Love is God.

Then if Love is God and God is Love, and the people whom he has joined together renounce him, for when they cease to love each other they cease to

see God in the question, Love and God are no longer in the contract. It is no longer marriage as God planned; then why the horror of divorce? Rather should they have a horror of living together, people who no longer have a marriage contract. As to "domestic felicity," let us see what "domestic felicity" really means. We will try Webster again: "Felicity, happiness, or rather great happiness; blessedness; appropriately, the joys of heaven." With the contract broken, for when there is no longer "mutual affection," that part of the contract is void, where does "domestic felicity," "the joys of heaven," come in? That part of the contract looks cracked, to say the least.

When there is no love, no God, in the contract, it is shameful for people to live together; it is the lowest kind of life; nothing can excuse it. It is not divorce, but marriage with wrong intention, that is evil. Divorce is the golden key that opens the prison doors for many poor helpless creatures. Divorce should be as free as marriage. Those who are honorable, the men and women who really make marriage the holy institution that God intended it to be, will stay married. For the rest, give them the chance, honorably and legally, to try again; and don't make of them the low creatures that all good men and women despise.

Divorce should be had for the asking. Under present laws the party or parties desiring divorce must commit a crime to obtain it; and that is the only evil in divorce—the difficulty in obtaining it.

And now we come to the last part of the marriage contract, "the maintenance and education of children." Children are not necessary to complete happiness in married life, but when they do come, they are one of "the joys of heaven." Children born of marriage where love comes and stays through all the years of life, do not need our consideration. The love that gives them life will provide for them. It is the little creatures where the marriage contract is broken that claim our attention. Sometimes when the love for the husband or wife or even both has gone, the love for the child remains, and that child is often well provided for.

The court granting the divorce should see to the "maintenance and education of children." If the parents cannot provide for them in their divided state, then the government should. I have come to this conclusion since reading of Ex-President Roosevelt's talks on race suicide. If the government desires increased production of any sort, and those talks would lead us to believe it did, it ought to be willing to take care of it when the demand is supplied. It surely ought to be willing to take care of all helpless American Citizens, unable to care for themselves. There are National Soldiers' Homes, why not National Children's Homes?

ANNIE H. QUILL.

+ + +

Tell me, O Cow, with tranquil air,  
Feeding in pastures green,  
Why is it that you always wear  
An attitude serene?  
No indigestion mars thy dreams,  
No cramps provoke thy cries.  
"It is," the knowing Cow replied,  
"Because I Fletcherize." —Life.