

images that misrepresent the facts they are intended to illustrate. His parallels are on different planes which do not even remotely touch each other.

"If 100,000,000 pygmies were placed in a row would they become giants?"

"Here is one Shetland pony that can trot a mile in ten minutes. By putting 100 Shetland ponies side by side do you think they can compass the mile in two minutes?"

Does the reverend doctor suppose such trickster conundrums the Sphinx problem that is going to confound the intelligence of the ordinary individual thinker?

But when the "law of Christ" is totally ignored by skipping the first command of burden-bearing, basing the whole duty of life on the second clause of self-help and self-aggrandisement which acknowledges the help of neither God nor man, we have a social fabric rent and torn asunder by contrary interests, and reconcilable only by the love that shares and bears and equalizes all burdens.

ANNIE L. MUZZEY.

#### THE FOOTBALL DEBAUCH.

Would it not be well for the serious-minded American people who have ideals for higher education, to take a moment of meditation to ask themselves whether they propose, without protest and in despair, to permit the colleges and universities of the country to continue the annual football debauch? That it is a debauch we need only present as testimony the columns of the daily press for the past month, including the notes on betting. But there are inside facts which we may well doubt whether many good people who lend their approval to the game are aware of. The brutality of the game may easily be seen; but the secret dishonesty which the excited rivalry leads to is not perhaps known to many outside college walls. What this rivalry is, how presidents of the smaller colleges are coming to regard the football teams as advertising adjuncts in the competition of student-getting, only those who are on the inside can know. I have myself heard a college president appeal to a football team, in an assembly of all the students, in terms that would lead one to believe that the future of the college almost depended on winning a certain game.

Now what all this leads to is a disgraceful winking at anything to win. It is bad enough for thoughtless stu-

dents to fall into the temptation of playing men under false names without the knowledge of the college authorities—I have known this to be done—but the debauch has not stopped at this. By the connivance of college authorities men are played who have only a fictitious connection with the college; and the students of the college know that the college authorities aid and abet such action.

In another college than the one referred to above I know the following facts to be true: A student was matriculated at four p. m. one day to play the next morning, when there was no intention on the student's part of attending the college. He has other business. In this same game two other players had, by the college rules, absolutely forfeited their right to play. This was known to the students, and yet not a member of the faculty was brave enough to protest, so intense was the feeling about winning the game. I may add that the game was won, and mainly through the "great work" of the false student matriculated at four p. m. on the preceding day. The opposing team had consented to accept him because they themselves had been guilty of an irregularity.

I have before me a letter received by a friend from a correspondent living near another college. It is proper for me to say that the specific instances I cite refer to small colleges. I suppose the larger institutions have not the same temptation of playing false students. The college to which I now refer has hitherto prided itself on its high moral tone. Its new president has the reputation of being a hustler for athletics, and by personal appeal he secured the return of B— for the football season. B— had already made arrangements to attend a professional school. The letter says:

B. did matriculate and take a class or two, and will be paid enough for playing to get his outfit for winter, and to take him to —, and to give his mother a little; and she is satisfied, provided he does not get hurt. He will go to — as soon as the ball season is over, about the 25th, I believe.

Many are quite disgusted with Dr. —. Say he is doing so much about athletics, and letting down the dignity of the university in many ways, just to get a large number enrolled, and does not care whether they stay or not, if he can make it appear in the catalogue that the number of students has increased under his presidency.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, this private note, which had no thought of publication, will touch many responsive chords.

In this communication I have spoken

only of the moral side of the football debauch. I have said nothing of the neglect of work caused thereby. This is another story.—Medius, in New York Nation of Dec. 4.

#### THE LINE BETWEEN TRUE DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM.

Is government fundamentally intended as a paternalistic institution? If it is, socialism is correct. Should government provide employment for the people? If it should, socialism is right. Should the natural rights of individuals be subservient to the wishes of society? If they should be, socialism is the ideal system. Did society exist before the individual? If it did and the individual is but a branch of the tree of humanity, then socialism is the correct conception of human institutions. Do individuals grow great only as society grows great? If so, then let us have socialism, for under that, government will direct the footsteps of the citizen, just as a loving mother leads her sleepy child to bed and tucks him in, whether he will or no. Should society take the initiative in progress and civilization, should it direct the education, the thought, the culture, the love and the aspirations of the citizen? If so, let us have a paternalistic government based upon the doctrine of socialism. Should the citizen lean upon and base all his economic conditions upon society? If so, by all means adopt socialism. Do the powers of government descend from above down to men, or ascend from men up to government? Does history show that men have looked kindly upon the idea of government assuming the direction of the citizen? If it does, then wisdom would dictate the extension of that idea by adopting socialism.

In answer to all this let us remember that "before man made us citizens, great nature made us men."

The real socialistic party to-day is the Republican party. Socialists are consistent when they say that they prefer the success of that party, because it will soonest bring about what they aim at—the concentration under one head of all industrial enterprises. Socialism is but protectionism, is but the Fowler currency scheme, is but the ship subsidy idea, is but the colonial system, carried to their logical conclusions. The Republican policy has been that American genius could not stand alone, therefore government must put it into a hot house and wall it in with a protective tar-

iff; that our bankers could not maintain themselves alone, therefore government must help them with the gold standard and the Fowler bill; that the shipping trust was helpless, therefore government must put its hands into the pockets of the people and transfer some of their earnings to the trust; that weaker peoples cannot develop themselves in their own way, but need the guiding hand of a stronger government.

If the policies of the Republican party are correct, then socialism is true; with this additional virtue in favor of socialism—that while the Republican party bestows its privileges upon a select few, socialism would seek to extend them to all. I assert this upon the theory that any proposition if true at all is true altogether; that if the premise is true, the conclusion must follow; that any argument that is good a little way is still correct followed to its final analysis.

But I deny that either the premise or the conclusion is correct. I deny that the Republican party is right in the beginning. I deny that socialism is right in the end. I deny these because I have faith in man. I do not believe that by nature he is a hyena.

The legitimate purpose of government is not to direct the citizen. Its true scope is not paternalistic, but to act as an agency to effect an equitable distribution of the bounties of nature in order that man may most completely enjoy his natural rights. If it subserves this end, it is fulfilling its highest obligation. If it does more than this it is despotic, whether administered by a tyrant or by a majority of the people.

There is a wide difference between wealth produced by human toil, and the source of all wealth—the land—produced by the Creator. Men are entitled by natural right to the first; Social man is entitled by natural right to the second.

And what are men's natural rights? Their first economic right is a fair field in the bounties of nature. The land, which includes every natural source of wealth, is theirs. One man's title to this is as good in the sight of God as any other man's. Man's first political right is to enjoy the opportunity to apply his labor to these bounties of nature without let or hindrance, either from man or from government; to apply that labor in his own way and enjoy the full reward of his toil. His first religious right is to search after God

in his own way, by the light of his own conscience, and report his findings to the world untrammelled by human obstructions.

Now, in order to afford to each individual his just share in the bounties of nature, government, as the agent of all the people, has a right to equalize them. As it is not possible for all to enjoy the actual possession of these bounties, it follows that government has a right to collect a fee according to the value of the privilege from those in possession in order to compensate those out of possession. If government secured this revenue, instead of allowing private parties to collect it as they do to-day in rents for the occupancy of land without counting improvements, it would be ample to pay all public expenses and make all forms of taxation unnecessary. And with this revenue all public services could be furnished to the people without other cost.

By thus removing taxes from all forms of improvements and from the products of human toil, all forms of industry and enterprise would take on accelerated activity. Idle land, held out of use for speculative purposes, would be forced into use. An unlimited demand for a limited supply of labor would thereby follow. Wages would rise as a consequence, and where now we see starving men competing for work, all forms of enterprise would be competing for men. Economic emancipation would be realized. Liberty would be secure. Injustice could not exist, at least in an economic sense. The so-called "wage-slavery" problem would solve itself.

A franchise, though an artificial thing, in its economic sense bears much the same relation to society that nature's bounties do. When a government grants a franchise to a private party it thereby surrenders a part of its sovereignty; for all franchises carry with them the right of eminent domain—a distinctively sovereign attribute. It therefore follows that government, as the agent of the people, should never grant a franchise (at any rate, for a long time), but should operate for the commonwealth all industries that require a franchise. These industries, on account of their requiring franchises, are public utilities, and it is an absurdity to allude to any other industry as a public utility. It requires no franchise to operate a coal mine, a packing house or shoe fac-

tory, and therefore government can not properly engage in these industries. If private parties desire to cooperate in these lines under just economic conditions, well and good, but the government cannot cooperate in anything. Cooperation must be voluntary.

It requires a franchise to operate a railroad, telegraph, telephone, water works, lighting plants and the like, for the reason that such industries use the public highway, which necessitates condemning lands that might be occupied by private parties, and to condemn which requires the authority of eminent domain—a prerogative of government alone. Therefore private parties should not engage in these, save in exceptional cases as a matter of expediency, which the people have a right to consider.

I have attempted here briefly to draw a distinct line between true democracy and socialism—two terms absolutely antagonistic. Under such a system no one would think of "putting men into leading strings to that senseless abstraction called the state," for economic freedom and political liberty would be realized blessings as certainly as the rising sun dispels the gloom of night. No one could oppress. Every individual would have an opportunity to develop in his own way with his eye fixed upon the goal of universal brotherhood, peace and good will.—L. J. Quinby, in Omaha World-Herald.

#### IN PRAISE OF PROSPERITY.

They raised his salary two years ago last May,

The said increase amounting to thirty cents a day,

Since then they've raised the prices  
Of carrots and of beets,  
Of flour and of meats,  
Of corn and coal and fruits,  
Of babies' little boots,  
Of potatoes, milk and cheese,  
Of the product of the bees,  
Of hats and socks and coats,  
Of all that ginks or floats.

He's paying out the money that he saved  
before his raise,  
But prosperity's upon us, and his heart's  
full of praise.

—Chicago Post.

Now it came to pass that the reformers succeeded at last in having a portion of the earth set apart for them, where they could reorganize society on a basis that suited them.

They had been running their beautiful little Utopia two or three years, when a stranger in search of information happened along.

"I presume," said the stranger, "you are all perfectly happy here, with