

water for drinking purposes. They have also added her name to an official committee, whom they have appointed to discuss tenders for the supply of necessary clothing. We think it necessary to state that we are well aware that some of the camps are well cared for, but the need of each camp must be considered on its own merits, as the conditions vary so widely, and even where the military may be doing everything in their power to alleviate suffering, very much remains to be done. We believe that we shall not appeal in vain to the common humanity of those who (whatever their opinion may be upon the war) are anxious to prevent as far as possible the infliction of unnecessary suffering upon women and children.

A TRAITOR TO WALL STREET.

An interview published in the Cleveland Plaindealer of June 2.

"Tom Johnson is a traitor to Wall street. That is what Wall street says, and if money can defeat Mr. Johnson's hopes and ambition, they will be defeated."

The speaker was August Lewis, of New York, one of Mayor Johnson's warmest friends. The two were perhaps closer to Henry George during the life of the great single tax apostle than any other two men in the world. Mr. Lewis came to Cleveland the other day from Buffalo, where he had been attending the exposition, to see the mayor. He will remain until the mayor returns from New York. He called at the mayor's tax bureau in the city hall to see the maps and other paraphernalia which the mayor expects to use in his tax reform fight.

"More eyes are on Mr. Johnson today," continued Mr. Lewis, "than on any senator or congressman in the United States. I might say with absolute truth that the people are watching him with greater interest than they are President McKinley. The masses are with him; they like him. They admire his frankness and his daring. Wall street hates him.

"All the money powers in the country are against him. They cannot understand how a man who was one of them in the grand struggle for wealth—how any man having amassed a fortune dare come out and fight the battles of the people, turning against the class to which, by right of his wealth, he belonged. So Wall street says he is a traitor. They don't know the man. They don't know that with Mr. Johnson principle is the one and great thing. He is not a seeker after

glory and he cares nothing for any position except as it may help him to carry out the purposes to which he has devoted his life. To do that he will take advantage of every opportunity.

"I don't like to hear this talk about Mr. Johnson being a candidate for president because I fear the people will not understand him. His enemies will say that everything he does is for a political purpose. I know him so well that I know that it is not true. Everything he does is for a principle.

"I remember when he was considering the matter of accepting the nomination for mayor of Cleveland. His wife was opposed to it. He was talking with me when he said: 'I don't know. What would Henry George do if he were alive and in my position?' He knew that Henry George would have accepted and that was the one thing that determined him. And thus it is that the man who, after being twice a congressman, became the mayor of Cleveland, is the most prominent man in the country.

"Down in New York state the people are watching his tax fight with perhaps greater interest than it is being watched right here in his own home. They believe that he is a great man and destined to become greater. Even old line conservative democrats are becoming enthusiastic over Mr. Johnson. 'He's the coming man,' they say. 'Whether he becomes president or not he is bound to take a leading part in American politics.'

"This talk about the next democratic ticket being Hill and Johnson is nonsense. Anyone who knows Mr. Johnson knows how ridiculous is the proposition. Mr. Johnson will not play second to any man.

"Whatever great position in the gift of the American people Mr. Johnson may accept it will be only for a principle. He has wealth and he cares nothing for honors.

"This tax fight he is waging is the making of a splendid foundation for single tax on land values. It is the only just and logical system of taxation and the people will see it. It is the light which guides Mr. Johnson in his every public act. Did you read the report of the Philippine commission? It was a most interesting document. The commission said that the Filipinos did not seem to be able to understand the wisdom of taxing only land values; that was what the commission had decided to do in the Phil-

ippines. There were great tracts of unimproved land there and the commission concluded that the only way to stimulate industry and progress was to tax it the same as improved land and levy no taxes on any other kind of property.

"The men who composed this commission could readily see how single tax was a good thing in the Philippines, but I doubt if any of them could see it in that light as applied to the United States."

Henry George's last book, "The Science of Political Economy," was dedicated to Mayor Johnson and Mr. Lewis.

THE ETHICS OF SUFFRAGE.

A condensation of an address delivered by Louis F. Post, June 1, 1901, at the National American Woman Suffrage association, in the First Baptist church at Minneapolis.

It is not the surface questions of the issue of woman suffrage that I intend to discuss, but the radical question of whether the suffrage is a privilege or a right. Is it something which those in power may grant or withhold according to their own notions of what may be wise? Or is it something which every adult and sane member of the community is entitled to as a right?

If the suffrage is a mere privilege, if it can rightfully be granted to men and withheld from women, be granted to those who are white and withheld from those who are colored, be granted to people with red hair and withheld from those with black; if it may be rightfully given to the millionaire and withheld from the day laborer, rightfully extended to those who can read and withheld from those who cannot, or to those with a college education and from those with only the education of the common school—if this is the basis of suffrage, if this is the only foundation on which women claim a share in the processes of government, then the fundamental argument for woman suffrage disappears. In that case, the best that women who want the suffrage can do, is to kneel before those who already have the power of assigning privileges of suffrage, and beg for it. All they can say is: "Please, mister, won't you let me vote?"

I do not forget that plausible arguments can be made in support of woman suffrage upon the mere basis of expediency. But neither can I ignore the fact that upon that basis arguments just as plausible can be made against it. They are made against it every day in the year, and by women

with even greater persistency than by men.

For my part, I do not believe that the suffrage is a privilege. I believe that it is a right, which belongs to every sane adult of whatever color, of whatever fortune, of whatever education, and of either sex; that it belongs to them in virtue simply of the fact that all such persons are members of the community to be governed. In other words, I place the determination of the question of woman suffrage upon the broad ground set forth in the declaration of independence, that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Let us for a moment consider that proposition. There are such things as individual concerns, concerns regarding which each of us has the absolute right to control our own action, free from all restraints of government, except when we infringe upon the equal individual rights of others. As to these individual concerns, it is the business of government to keep hands off. To illustrate what I mean, the government has no right to prescribe for me, or for you, or for any other person, the hour at which we shall eat our meals or the food of which they shall consist. Such things are individual affairs, and even a popular government, managed by a majority vote, has no right to interfere.

But individual concerns are not all the concerns of social life. There are also what we may call communal concerns; that is, concerns in which we are all mutually interested, concerns in which the interest of one is of necessity the interest of all, and the interests of all are interests of each. As an example of these concerns let me mention the highways. There can be no normal social life without highways. Therefore highways are of common concern. They are partnership affairs, and every partner is entitled to an equal voice in their management. It makes no difference whether he is rich or poor, black or white, educated or ignorant, man or woman. So with the land upon which we live. It has been provided by the Creator for the common good of all. It is the right, therefore, of every person in the community to have a voice in determining the tenures upon which it shall be held. Land is a partnership asset. So again with those values that attach to the land in every community simply because there is a community there, those values that are created by the whole community and not by individuals as such, those values that are due

to social and not to individual enterprise, those values that are commonly known as ground rent or ground price. These values constitute a common income, and in the expenditure of that common income everybody in the community has the right to an equal voice. It is not a privilege; it is a right.

There is nothing to the point that voting is a privilege and not a right because we cannot grant it to infants, because we cannot give it to idiots, or because we take it from the insane or from convicted criminals. If that objection were sound as to common property, it would also be sound as to private property; and so we could argue that inasmuch as we do not allow infants, nor idiots, nor the insane, nor convicts, to manage their own private property, therefore we should allow no one to manage his own private property, except certain privileged persons. Such a conclusion would be absurd, such a conclusion would be unjust. It is also absurd and unjust with reference to the management of common affairs. The right to participate in the management of common affairs, like the right to manage one's own private affairs, is in its very nature not a privilege to be granted or withheld in the discretion of superior power, but a right to be asserted and maintained. And being a right, it is also a duty. Duties and rights are like man and woman. It takes both to make a perfect whole. They were married before time began, and even the Outlook cannot divorce them.

This is the firm rock upon which woman suffrage must rest. It must be demanded because women are members of the community, because they have common interests in the common property and affairs of the community, because they have common interests in the common purposes of the community as a community, because, in a word, they have rights in the community and duties toward it, which are the same as the rights and duties of every other sane person of mature age who keeps out of the penitentiary. If you have local problems of suffrage which you cannot adjust, make exceptions if you will. While I should not go with you, I should not blame you. I blame nobody for not living up to the very letter of a principle. But don't fool yourselves. Don't trifle with your reason and your conscience. Don't try to make yourselves believe that your exception is right. Adopt it for

what it is. Let it be a confession of your inability to adapt the right to your political environment, but don't try to justify it on ethical grounds. Stand firmly by the principle, in theory at any rate, that the suffrage is a universal right.

FOR THE YOUNG MEN WHO ARE GRADUATING.

A portion of an address delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa society at Hobart college, by John Jay Chapman, of New York, as published in the International Journal of Ethics for January, 1901.

When I was asked to make this address I wondered what I had to say to you boys who are graduating. And I think I have one thing to say. If you wish to be useful, never take a course that will silence you. Refuse to learn anything that you cannot proclaim. Refuse to accept anything that implies collusion, whether it be a clerkship or a curacy, a legal fee or a post in a university. Retain the power of speech, no matter what other power you lose. If you can, take this course, and in so far as you take it, you will bless this country. In so far as you depart from this course you become dampers, mutes and hooded executioners. As for your own private character it will be preserved by such a course. Crime you cannot commit, for crime gags you. Collusion gags you. As a practical matter a mere failure to speak out upon occasions where no opinion is asked or expected of you, and when the utterance of an un-called-for suspicion is odious, will often hold you to a concurrence in palpable inquiry. It will bind and gag you and lay you dumb and in shackles like the veriest serf in Russia. I give you this one rule of conduct. Do what you will, but speak out always. Be shunned, be hated, be ridiculed, be scared, be in doubt, but don't be gaged.

The choice of Hercules was made when Hercules was a lad. It cannot be made late in life. It will perhaps come for each one of you within the next eighteen months. I have seen ten years of young men who rush out into the world with their messages, and when they find how deaf the world is, they think they must save their strength and get quietly up on some little eminence from which they can make themselves heard. "In a few years," reasons one of them, "I shall have gained a standing, and then I shall use my power for good." Next year comes, and with it a strange discovery. The man has lost his hori-