

known as much of the nature and rights of man, as they knew about art, Greece might have soared from height to height until now. Had the Romans found out as much concerning man's natural rights as they learned of modes of enslaving men, the poorest people of Italy might now live in palaces, instead of running mad of hunger in caves.

Society being a natural thing, government is natural. Is there a natural form of government? Clearly, there must be. Otherwise we should have a complex organism with no natural provision for a head. The natural government must be one of three things: an autocracy, a democracy, or an oligarchy. An autocracy cannot be natural; for nature has provided no way of constituting the autocrat; and for one to impose obedience upon all violates the law of equal freedom. An oligarchy cannot be natural for the same reasons, and because no number larger than one can rightfully possess more rights over their fellows than can one.

The natural government of reasonable beings must be the democracy. The natural mode of its exercise must be that in which the individual reason acts directly upon its institutions by the exercise of the voting power. The natural and healthful state will be reached when a just balance shall be established between the respective areas of individual and collective action. Neither an autocracy nor an oligarchy can accomplish this, because the governing body will always act in the interests of the person or class composing it. A pure democracy is the only form of government in which the governing body is selfishly interested in knowing the right and doing right by all.

Man has natural rights. He has a natural right to labor, to move from place to place, to transport his property, and to highways provided by the society for his use. He has a natural right to think freely and speak freely. He has a natural right to so much of the earth as he needs on such terms as shall be just to the rest of society whom he excludes from it. He has a natural right to vote. These and other rights are as essentially present in his nature and in the nature of so-

ciety, as the peculiar attributes of bee-life and hive-life are inseparable from the nature of bees and hives. And among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." There never was a time or a condition of society when the denial of these rights was not a wrong and the cause of social disease and pain.

HERBERT QUICK.

LAND, LABOR AND CAPITAL.

Humanity has from time to time been subjected to various classifications. One of these, the dictum of a wag, was that mankind fell naturally under three heads, "Men, women and French." Indebted doubtless more or less to this suggestion, an American in lieu of it wrote that the human race was divided into "saints, sinners and the Beecher family." Our humorous sage, Josh Billings, declared that humanity was divided into two kinds of people, "the wise and the otherwise," and the writer of this article invites the reader's attention to a still further division of the "wise" as distinct from the "otherwise."

Among intelligent men are to be found two distinct orders of intellect which might fitly be called the mathematical and the logical, were it not for the popular conception that the mathematical mind is the logical mind. Does it not even seem heresy, then, to question it? Let us consider it a moment.

If we call mathematics the logic of quantity, we may as well call logic the mathematics of quality; and in both instances we shall hint at a distinction which, though usually overlooked, is most vital, viz.: the distinction between the quantitative and the qualitative perceptions.

Who does not remember those provoking school examples in the attempt to solve which he was ignominiously detected subtracting oranges from apples and dividing tables by chairs? Was not the "12" which formed the coefficient of the "tables" a most seductive invitation to you to divide it by the "3," serving the like purpose in the case of the chairs? And the result! It was neither tables to be sat upon, nor chairs to be eaten off of.

The quantitative order of intellect

is most plentiful, in comparison with the much higher qualitative order in which both poetry and humor have their rise—as much more plentiful as mathematicians are than poets.

For an historical illustration, take Francis Bacon. Although "Baconian logic" owes its name to the "wisest, brightest, and meanest of mankind," and notwithstanding the fact that his name in this field of learning is at least co-luminous with that of Aristotle, he had such a "plentiful lack" of the sense of qualitative proportion as to be absolutely destitute of humor—that subtle perception of qualitative incongruity. Indeed, to such a remarkable extent is this true that the theory of Baconian authorship of Shakespeare's plays is met by the insuperable fact that in all the brilliant, scintillant wit of Bacon's admitted writings is not to be found one solitary glimmer of genuine humor, if we may believe high authorities; while, as we all know, Shakespeare's plays abound no less in inimitable humor than in surpassing wit. Had Bacon had a sense of humor it would assuredly have saved him from being the "meanest of mankind."

Recall all the long line of historic villains who have scourged the race from Cain to—well, never mind the living example. What one was endowed with a sense of genuine humor? It is not contended that both these orders of intellect may not, upon rare occasions, be found in one and the same person. The immortal bard, whose cosmical mind enveloped the universe like another ethereal ocean, is a case in point. So too, nearer our own time and place, is Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. But such instances are notably conspicuous by their dearth.

The present ascendancy of the quantitative intellect is productive of dire results, since, among other things, it tends to consider facts merely as numerical units, and fails to duly recognize that qualitative value which inheres in their particular degree of generality. That a magnet attracts iron, nickel, etc., is just as true as that all bodies attract other bodies, but the two truths are not of the same size—not of the same generality.

Take a most common example

from economics. Land, labor and capital are the three factors of all production, we are told, and many of us think all of these of the same degree of generality; and many more, it is to be feared, mistaking capital for money, think the least the greatest in this respect. The apotheosis of the dollar is of daily occurrence. Justly did a great American say: "The ancients worshiped the golden calf; we worship the gold of the calf; even the calf is beginning to see the difference."

It has been truly said to be an impossibility to live down a falsehood when it is immortalized in a witty bon mot or a clever adage and we have not so far to look to find instances of "wise saws" which, misinterpreted by the masses, result in continual error. Two examples will suffice. In "feed a cold and starve a fever" we have what is usually taken for a command, though the author meant to say "Feed a cold and you will have a fever to starve." "The exception proves the rule," is the weak reply of many a disputant when the fallacy of his contention is pointed out in a single instance. One would think, from the common acceptance of this adage, that exceptions were corollaries or that they tended to increase the generality of the rule. Of course the meaning intended to be conveyed was: the exception proves that there is a rule to which it is an exception.

In like manner the intimate collocation of "land, labor and capital" seizes upon the public mind with an aphoristic power much to be deplored since these three factors are by no means equally basic.

To say "land, labor and capital" is to the qualitative or logical mind like saying: "Oxygen, hydrogen and water;" or, "Chlorin, sodium and salt."

Let us go back of society for a moment. The principal religious cosmogonies start the universe with chaos, to which is later added Divine labor, while the agnostic nebular hypothesis assumes an homogeneous nebular mist and motion-producing energy. In each theory, gnostic or agnostic, we have chaos, plus work, the only difference being that the gnostic assumes the work to be the result of Divine Personality, and

may, therefore, call it "labor;" while pure science postulates work and then stops. We see, therefore, that labor, or at least work as measured in foot-pounds, whether personal or impersonal, is even antecedent to the universe ("land") as we know it.

The minute organisms whose life temples make our coral reefs, the earth worm that fits the soil for tillage, and those multifarious erosions which feed continents into Neptune's insatiate maw to be elsewhere precipitated as some new-born Atlantis, are as truly exhibitions of that "labor" of forces which science calls "work" as is that personal work of the coal-heaver which we call "labor."

The scientific triad, "matter, ether and motion," seems likely in the light of the vortex theory to undergo a similar curtailment into ether and motion with matter as a result. Was it not that great economist who is said, upon the evidence of a bishop, to have translated Greek at the tender age of four, who justly contended that where two things are necessary to a result one cannot be said to be more necessary than the other? And may we not hold, conversely, that where a thing is not absolutely essential to a result it cannot be of a same degree of generality—of the same importance, or of the same qualitative size, as those factors which, as antecedents to a desired product, are primary indispensables?

We have seen that land itself breaks into two factors, one of which is work measurable in foot-pounds, or "labor," according as our beliefs may incline us to name it, and we now are able to premise two alternative triads as follows:

1. Chaos, Divine Labor, human labor.
2. Chaos, impersonal work, personal labor.

And from either of these the laboratory of grey matter can produce all the rest, as easily as the chemist can synthesize water from oxygen and hydrogen, or produce salt from chlorin and sodium.

What becomes then of "capital"? It is relegated to a lower degree of generalization, a far less status of importance, than either "land" or "labor." The factors "land," "labor" and "capital" are not therefore all of a qualitative size and do not all be-

long to the same category. The first two are immeasurably the more important and belong to an order of generalization different from the last. Of these first two but one is personal, but one is human, and that one, labor, the grand mundane paraphrase of ultramundane creation.

Is not, then, the toiler his own sublimest monument? And need Labor, steering the economic craft of the universe, seek to acquire dignity from the seductive drivel of monopolistic stowaways stealing free passage in the first cabins of life?

MELVIN L. SEVERY.

NEWS

The last session of the 57th Congress, which began in December (p. 551), came to an end at noon on the 4th.

In the lower House a fight against rushing appropriations through without debate under the previous question had been maintained for several days. It was caused by the decision of a contested election case from St. Louis—the case of Waggoner, Republican, against Butler, Democrat. On the 24th the committee on contested elections reported two resolutions, the first declaring that Butler had not been elected and was not entitled to the seat he occupied, and the second declaring that Waggoner had been elected and was entitled to the seat. A minority report was presented to the House on the 25th, which sustained Butler's claim, showing that he had fairly received 16,844 votes, while Waggoner's vote was only 10,551. The matter came before the House on the 25th, and after a brief debate the Republicans carried a demand for the previous question, 151 to 112. The Democratic resolution in favor of Butler was then defeated, 153 to 112. A motion to recommit being made, the previous question was ordered on that by 146 to 12; and upon a division the motion to recommit was lost—ayes 5 and noes 165. Thereupon the point of no quorum was made by the Democrats. The speaker overruled it as dilatory, and, putting the motion on the resolution to unseat Butler, declared it carried. He refused to entertain a demand for a division. This decision was followed by his putting the resolution to seat Waggoner, on which he allowed the demand for a division and