

might bring on all sorts of woes. The remedy is easy. Let the government forbid Mr. Bryan to make a speech, or, still better, deport him at once after he lands in Manila.

MISCELLANY

CAMPING SONG.

Has your dinner lost its savor?
Has your greeting lost its cheer?
Is your dally stunt a burden?
Is your laughter half a sneer?
There's a medicine to cure you,
There's a way to lift your load,
With a horse and saddle and a mule of
open road.

Is your eyeball growing bilious?
Is your temper getting short?
Is this life a blind delusion,
Or a grim, unlovely sport?
There's a world of health and beauty,
There's a help that cannot fail,
In a day behind the burros on a dusty
mountain trail.

Come out, old man; we're going
To a land that's free and large,
Where the rainless skies are resting
On a snowy mountain marge.
When we camp in God's own country,
You will find yourself again,
With a fire and a blanket and the stars
upon the plain!
—Bliss Carman, in *The Reader Magazine*.

FOR WHAT WOULD ROCKEFELLER TAKE?

Marshall P. Wilder, the story teller, says that he had a dream the other night, in which he entered into business with Mr. Rockefeller, selling potted plants. The business did not thrive, and after it became apparent that the venture would not prosper, Mr. Rockefeller suggested a dissolution of partnership and a division of the assets, Wilder taking the pots and plants. At this juncture, the innocent bystander interrupted to inquire what Rockefeller took. Surely he must have gotten something as his share. And he did. "He took the earth."—*Milwaukee Daily News*.

TOLSTOY IS WRITING A BOOK ON GEORGE'S TEACHINGS.

An extract from a recent interview with Leo Tolstoy at his estate of Yasnaya Polyana, by Joseph Mandelkern, as published in the *New York Times* of August 20.

Hardly had the greetings been exchanged when Tolstoy plunged into talk about Henry George and his theories.

"That's the greatest man your country ever produced," he said. "I am writing a book now about his teachings. It is just what Russia wants. It is the only thing that can save us. What use have we for a constitution? The people are not ripe for

it. We must have a Czar, but one who knows his business—a man who knows not only what to do, but in what order to do everything."

Five times he repeated the same phrase, accentuating his words by swinging the heavy stick on which he was leaning while walking:

"A man who knows what to do first and what to do next!"

Then he began to ask questions, first about the children of George, if they were following in the footsteps of their father; then about the City Government of New York, the details of which he seemed to be quite familiar with.

"You had a good Mayor in Low," he said. "Why didn't you keep him in office? Why did you let in Tammany?" (He called it "the Society Tammanee.")

POST-OFFICE PATERNALISM.

A letter from Erving Winslow, Secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League, to the *Washington Post*.

Those who are deeply interested in democratic institutions must regard with particular apprehension the enthusiasm for "doing things" which are good in themselves, irrespective of the principle involved and the precedents established in doing them.

The imaginative and philosophical judge, Mr. Chief Justice Holmes, struck an admirable note in pointing out the fact that absolute obedience to law is of supreme importance, since, for the very reason that the law is a technical and conventional establishment founded on the consent of the community, the law-abiding element is the only security for a democracy. Hence an evil method for the pursuance of good, that is, lawbreaking to accomplish some apparently desirable end with speed and thoroughness, is a grave crime against the republic.

It is not denied that the action of the post-office authorities in interfering with the mail of shysters and rogues accomplishes much good, but is this kind of paternalism consistent with the common law and with the constitutional rights of the people of the United States?

The post-office is not a judicial department; it is not an authorized censor of morals. Is there any defense for the course which is apparently practiced by Mr. Cortelyou and his subordinates in investigating men's affairs, in formulating decisions without any hearing and authorized process of inquiry, in condemning their

business, and refusing the mail service to those who are thus tried, judged, condemned and executed with practically no recourse?

What justification is there for these methods which might not be pleaded to support, in a similar course, the postmaster, who, being a good Protestant, might regard Roman Catholic propaganda as dangerous and immoral; or, being a devout Catholic, might hold the same views regarding Protestant literature? Were he a strict temperance advocate, after the school of Mrs. Hunt, maintaining that alcohol is the root of all evil, he would, of course, proceed to suppress all mailing matter which recommended intoxicating drinks; or, on the other hand, being a believer in genuine temperance and one to whom the total abstinence propaganda seemed vicious and dangerous, he would feel authorized to exclude it from the mails!

Scores of illustrations might be cited of cases in which what seems meat to one man seems poison to another, where a conscientious Postmaster General might feel himself called upon to discriminate in this autocratic fashion, not to speak of the possible abuse of this power by a not wholly impossible functionary who was not conscientious, but who might use this extraordinary authority for personal or political ends, such as some of us held to be the case in the interference with Mr. Edward Atkinson's mail three years ago.

Is not this subject one of those to which that vigilance, which is the safeguard of liberty, should arouse the press and the public?

TOLSTOY AND HENRY GEORGE.

An editorial by W. M. Reedy, in the *St. Louis Mirror* of August 24.

Count Leo Tolstoy's letter to the *London Times*, published August 1st, in which he sets forth the Henry George land theory as the one thing which, put into practice, will do most to remedy the wrongs of the Russian people, has stirred the world of thinkers. Whatever other queer views Tolstoy may have, his views on the land question are sound and clear; as clear and sound as the same principles were when Herbert Spencer embodied them in his original edition of "Social Statics," Chapter IX., only to eliminate them from all future editions without ever giving an adequate explanation for his action.

The land belongs to all the people. There can be no private owner-

ship of land, in abstract justice. These are propositions Spencer "proved," although proved is the wrong word. The propositions don't need proving. All one has to do to see the truth is to think of land in a newly discovered country. Who owned it before it was discovered? No one. By what authority does anyone take it absolutely after discovery? By no authority. Land is valuable only because people's use of it makes it so, and the community makes it so, not the individual.

There is no escape from this doctrine—absolutely none.

Count Tolstoy goes into the argument of Henry George at some length, but his main contention is that only by giving the land to the uses of the people can salvation come to Russia, the point being enforced by the fact that Russia is chiefly an agricultural country. The people are impoverished because they are cut off from the land from which they should live. Tolstoy believes the people of the whole world are beginning to see the injustice of private appropriation of the land, and that when they do see it and believe it, the remedy will be applied. The influence of the George doctrine is plainly seen in the movement for a greater taxation of land values and of franchises in which the land is granted for quasi-public use. It has made the Irish tenant practically the arbiter of land values, and given him the advantage in dealing with the landlord in purchasing land. Plainly the George theory is forcing the land back into the common possession of the people by taxing it for the benefit of the people.

"The Great Iniquity," which is the title of Count Tolstoy's letter, has been published in full in the Chicago Public of August 19th, and it should be read carefully by every thinking man who knows and feels the injustice of the world as it is organized to-day. The one thought that comes to the philosophic student of the George theory, even after admitting its almost axiomatic nature, is that when the evil of private ownership shall be abolished, the ingenuity of man will probably contrive that the same advantage shall accrue to the shrewd and able and selfish and unscrupulous few that now accrues in what is known as "the unearned increment." Count Tolstoy seems to scent this, for the nubbin of his argument is that the people who refuse to see the truth have no religion. For the bringing about of the better day of

the land owned by the people, he argues, a change of heart is needed. Will such a change of heart come over us? It has come as to other injustices of organized life, and secured their abolition. It may come to make possible the destruction of the evil of a landed few and a landless many. At least we can hope so.

RUSSIA PROGRESSING TOWARDS ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

For The Public.

Count Tolstoy's ringing letter on the "Great Iniquity"* confirms me in the belief which I often expressed during the revolutionary crisis of last winter in Russia, namely, that the land question presents itself much more clearly in Russia than here, on account of the agricultural pursuits of the vast majority of the people; and that it is quite likely that their revolution, when it succeeds, will carry them, not to the point at which we have arrived of parliamentary representation, but far beyond us to actual economic freedom. The Russian sees all wealth coming out of the ground, and he craves land as the source of wealth. Hence any plan for securing the value of the land for the people would appeal to him. The American workman has lost mental hold of the connecting link between land and wealth, and instead of longing for land, he longs for an opening in the city for exercising in some shape or other the attractive profession of graft.

That Count Tolstoy's ideal civilization, a world of industrious and happy Russian peasants, may not be exactly ours, does not in the least diminish the force of his argument. It is true that the possibility of annexing other people's earnings is the great magnet which entices people into our cities to-day, and that when, under just conditions, that pastime becomes impossible, cities will fall back to the natural size of mere markets, entrepôts and ports, such as were the European cities of a century or two ago. The proportion of country-dwellers would vastly increase, and the production of wealth in rural districts would become the prevailing occupation. And so Tolstoy is not altogether wrong in placing so much emphasis upon rural land. But he fails to note how perfectly Henry George's system adapts itself to the urban problem too. In America the crying evil of land-monopoly—the absorption by

* Published in full in The Public of August 19.

private parties of the unearned increment—shows itself most conspicuously in the cities. There is our greatest leak, and the leakage can be stopped there by the simple scheme of the single tax, with the same mathematical perfection as on the fertile steppes of Russia.

And Tolstoy is right in urging the land question as the first question upon Russian reformers. Its settlement should precede a constitution if possible. It is easier to make great changes under the autocracy than under a representative government. The Russians freed their serfs by a stroke of the pen, while we spent four years of blood and anguish in accomplishing a similar task. It is easy to see that it will be more difficult to put a single tax bill through a national assembly made up largely of land-owners, than to obtain the assent of the Tsar. And even if the parliament were composed of peasants, which is impossible, is it likely that they will be more intelligent than our farmers, and see how perfectly the plan of Henry George meets their needs? It is very much to be hoped that those who guide the new movement in Russia will listen to Tolstoy's words. If they do, it will transform the losses of this war into the greatest of all blessings, and place Russia, in spite of her present weakness, in the van of the great nations of the earth—just as Japan's marvelous success may degrade her for centuries to the thralldom of low and material ideals.

ERNEST H. CROSBY.

Rhinebeck, N. Y., Aug. 26, 1905.

HOW THE RUSSIANS CONDUCT A CONGRESS.

The preparedness of the Russians for parliamentary government is a question upon which we have all been speculating. The following account of the late Zemstvo Congress at Moscow (pp. 276, 308), written at Moscow by Victor E. Marsden, appeared in the London Speaker of August 12.

Russia has held her first Parliament, a Parliament in every sense of the word. The members of this assembly, which met for a brief session of three days at Moscow, the heart of Russia, were the duly elected representatives of those who sent them from all quarters of the Empire of All the Russias, excepting only those parts which are not, and never will be, anywhere but on paper, Russian in more than name. And they have fulfilled admirably the first duty of a Parliament; they have talked and discussed, parleyed and played