wing of the Socialist party. Should it be defeated on referendum there would seem to be little possibility thereafter of confidently regarding the Socialist party as representing a peaceable political movement. Defeat of the proposed amendment would be in the nature of a declaration of class war by methods which cannot and would not long be tolerated by the great body of the people of this country of whatever class.

Needless for us to say that our sympathies are with the political Socialists in this controversy.

That there is an unjust and growing division of our people into "capitalist" and wage-working" classes, tending to a centralization of wealth and power in the narrowing few and to economic dependence and poverty among the widening many, seems to us obvious. Not many are there any longer who deny it. That there is already a class war under way seems to us to be proved by an overwhelming mass of facts. That the warefare is becoming more bitter and is tending to greater lawlessness on both sides is also evident. That it can be won by the wage-working class as a class, either by political action or "direct action," we do not believe. That it can be won by non-class political action looking to the reversal of the unjust laws of property that cause the differentiation into those two classes, we do believe—but that is another story.

The special point we would make just now is that while the wage-working class can have no reasonable hope of winning this war as a class either by political action or by "direct action" (and that either in politics or out of it their effective fighting power for their own class will diminish as their numerical strength increases), yet that the Socialist party as a political movement has a rightful place in the forum of American citizenship, but that physical force "direct actionists" have not.

We do not mean that the protection of the law should be withdrawn from those who defy the law. On the contrary, for the common good the law ought to protect enemies of the law equally with everybody else. Though any were to scout all distinctions of right and wrong and all allegiance to law, nevertheless, in the interest of right and of the common good, their rights too ought to be scrupulously conserved. But we do mean that the law will wholly disappear and a reign of terror take its place, in which not the "capitalist" class but the wage-working class will be the pathetic victims, if violent forms of "direct action" are resorted to in this war of classes.

For "direct actionists" to proclaim, as they frequently do, that they are not advocates of violence doctrines is useless. They are in fact prompting and pursuing a policy of violence such as that which the proposed Socialist amendment indicates. This policy is not confined to Socialist organizations. There are reasons for believing that it connects with labor agitators who, some of them Socialists and some not, adopt destructive methods of waging the "working class war." Whether "direct actionists" advocate violence doctrinally or not, they are looking to violence and depending upon it as a policy of class warfare. Should they be brought to book lawfully for crime, the plea that they are not violence doctrinaires would be no defense. Should they be run down lawlessly by "vigilante" mobs, it won't make any practical difference whether they have argued for violence or only welcomed and promoted it.

It is not for lack of sympathy with the impulses of the "direct actionists" that we say this. The injustice that prevails, through which great masses of industrious human beings suffer, so that favored ones may luxuriate in idleness or worse, makes any one's blood boil if he has red blood in him. If a period of violence could, sooner or better than the ballot, remedy these conditions, then for those who advocate violence or would welcome it there might be much to say, even though it meant a reign of terror. Bloody international and civil wars are excused for less reason. But violence won't remedy those conditions. Violence can't remedy them. Violence can only make them worse and give them a longer lease.

The privileged classes could hardly adopt tactics for the class-war that would serve their own side better than the tactics of violent "direct action" which the Socialist party convention urges its party membership to exclude from the armory of its class-war weapons. "Direct action" of that kind, at this time and in this country, by or for the working class means reaction in favor of the privileged class.

JAMES E. MILLS.

In the earliest days of what is now known as the Singletax movement, about the time when Henry George first sprang into fame in Great Britain and was yet but barely known in his own country, "Progress and Poverty" caught the thought and the conscience of a busy man of science on the Pacific slope. Snowbound in the Grizzly Mountains, among the Sierras of Plumas county, northern California, he found his first

leisure for reading this book, of which some hard-headed business friend had spoken strongly. "The worst of it is," his friend had said, "that Henry George proves his theories and shows that they will work."

Our scientist thought so too, when he had finished reading the book; and being a conscientious man, he took advantage of his first visit to Boston to offer his resignation, if they cared to accept it, to one of the principal firms which employed him. Their interests in the monopoly of natural resources were great, and as it was his professional duty as their consulting geologist and engineer to pass upon mineral-land purchases for them, he thought they might object to his remaining in their service if they knew he held Henry George's views.

The firm was composed of Alexander Agassiz and Quincy A. Shaw, son and son-in-law respectively of Louis Agassiz, the world-renowned scientist—he who "could not *afford* to work for money."* "Why," laughed Mr. Shaw when their expert adviser made his confession, "my brother helped bring out the first editions of "Progress and Poverty." With seriousness then he said: "I am convinced that we are not treating fairly the people who are doing the work of the world. They are not getting their fair share of the product of their labor. But I do not know how to remedy the wrong. I am caught in the net. I am like a cog in the wheel and have to go around with it. If I tried to help them I should probably do more harm than good. But my brother helped Mr. George bring out the first editions of 'Progress and Poverty.'"

That engineer and consulting geologist never knew Mr. Shaw's exact convictions on the subject, although from this time on their personal correspondence dealt largely with economics and Mr. Shaw's interest was as keen as his correspondent's; but in the conversation the geologist inferred a sympathy by Mr. Shaw with Henry George, more from the tone it may be than from the words. He made the guess that Mr. Shaw in giving credit to his brother for financially aiding in the publication of Henry George's book, was concealing the fact that he himself had with good feeling furnished the money.

The correctness of that inference was confirmed as time went on. For Mr. Shaw's brother was Francis G. Shaw, father of the Colonel Shaw whose death in battle at the head of a Negro regiment before Charleston in the Civil War is memorialized with a St. Gaudens bronze on Boston Common; and of that same Francis G. Shaw this is said in the "Life of Henry George" by his son, Henry George, Jr.: "One thousand copies of the best edition of 'Progress and Poverty' had been ordered by Francis G. Shaw, a man of means and advanced years living quietly on Staten Island," who furthermore wrote to Henry George that "he had received a pledge of $3,000 for the circulation of 'Progress and Poverty' from a man richer than he was, who did not want to be known."*

Delighted with his employer's sympathetic spirit, as welcome as it was unexpected—delighted more with that, no doubt, than with the assurances as to his own continuous employment, for which, indeed, he as an expert of high rank and without financial ambitions felt no necessity—the working geologist whom "Progress and Poverty" had converted in those California mountains remained in his old relations with the firm until his death, some twenty years later. And in all that time he was one of the most disinterested and useful of the men anywhere in the world who responded to the clarion notes of Henry George's battle call.

●

It is a memory of this man, James E. Mills, that we wish to revive. He worked hard for his cause. He spent much for it from a professional income which, while large as earned incomes go, was laboriously acquired by daily work. And he spoke and wrote ably in its behalf on occasion. But, though assuming many responsibilities for this cause and shirking none, and though well known in California, he was hardly known at all in the Singletax movement at the East except to Henry George and his immediate coadjutors. Mr. Mills was modest as well as devoted and efficient.

Those who did know him, warmly appreciated his work, his liberal aid when and where money was needed (liberal out of all proportion to his means), his timely speech and his effective writing. Henry George's "Standard" had his sympathetic and substantial support; so had "The New Earth;" and if the history of The Public ever comes to be written, his name will be found in the long list of those who in its early days made its publication possible.

Another thing. Like Thomas G. Shearman, Tom L. Johnson and Joseph Fels, the money Mr.

*Louis Agassiz was once offered $600 for two lectures in New York and refused. "Mr. Agassiz," said this man, "six hundred dollars is a great deal of money!" Mr. Agassiz opened wide his big eyes and said: "But I can't afford to work for money."

*"The Life of Henry George," by Henry George, Jr., pages 353 and 381.

Mills happened to be able to give was the least of what he gave. He gave also himself.

James Ellison Mills.

James Ellison Mills was born in Bangor, Maine, February 13, 1834. His father was Dr. P. B. Mills, a noted physician whose rock-bound and rugged New England democracy, though by no means narrow, found broader expression in the son. A fearless thinker was Dr. Mills, reverent toward genuine ideals, but righteously and outspokenly indignant at mere conventional goodness. With this spirit strong in him, and with a manner of native refinement exquisitely sensitive, James E. Mills developed into the best type of Westerner. He was free without aggressiveness, strong without coarseness, tender without weakness. His balance in these respects enabled him to find manhood in others beneath unseemly externals, or lack of it within the mask of polished manners, as well as the genuine man under conventional culture. It made him sterling friends regardless of class or station.

In his boyhood, under his father's advice and in order to strengthen a somewhat naturally delicate physique, Mr. Mills worked at intervals in a logging camp of his father's. But at eighteen he was a vigorous youth, robust in mind as well as body. He was even then a thorough democrat withal, plus a democratic vanity or two in the way of sartorial peculiarities, which cling through life to some but which he with his good common sense soon discarded as un-democratic.

At this time he appeared at Harvard University and was admitted to the Lawrence scientific school, where he acquired a vocation in which he came to excel. Louis Agassiz was chief of his instructors from the first, and six years later he became an assistant in that great scientist's laboratory. The young geologist was then and during the rest of Agassiz's life one of his most intimate and cherished personal friends.

There was an interval, however, in his scientific career, which he devoted to theological study and pulpit service. A Swedenborgian in religous faith before going to Harvard, he came there into intimate relations with the leaders in that faith of half a century ago—the Worcesters and Reeds and Goddards; and from 1860 to 1865 he was pastor of the Swedenborgian Society of Brooklyn, N. Y. But his health in manhood demanded the outdoor life, as it had in youth, and upon leaving the pulpit he engaged actively in out door work as a consulting geologist. Among the mining capitalists for whom he did the largest amount of geological work were Louis Agassiz's son Alexander and his son-in-law, Quincy A. Shaw. For this firm and at the suggestion of the elder Agassiz, Mr. Mills made a geological survey of the Sierras in and about Plumas county, California, near the spot at which he afterwards became a convert to the doctrines of "Progress and Poverty." Louis Agassiz had described the region as likely to disclose the "most interesting geological formation in the world," and recommended Mr. Mills for the work.

Soon after reading the book that converted him, Mr. Mills met Henry George; and their friendship continued intimately until Henry George died at the climax of his campaign for Mayor of Greater New York. At the farewell banquet given to Mr. George by the Manhattan Singletax Club upon his departure for his trip around the world in 1890, Mr. Mills was among those who spoke, his toast being "The Prophet of San Francisco." Subsequently Mr. Mills wrote three pamphlets on Henry George's philosophy, which had come to represent to him the "new earth," or human form of that "new heaven" which had long been and always continued to be

his concept of spiritual substance. The basis of the articles was the spiritual and economic doctrine of service for service—that in normal conditions service, and service only, entitles any one to the service of others. One of them bore the title of "Privilege or Service?" It was published in the New Jerusalem Magazine (Boston), issue of February, 1893. One on "Sacrifice or Service" had appeared in that magazine for January, 1892. "Metanoia," the title of an earlier one, published in the same magazine for February, 1891, developed the thought that death is not a climax of life but that, with repentance in the true sense, we are eternally living but without it are eternally dying. Two other pamphlets by Mr. Mills were on the general subject of "Christian Economics," one being "The First Principles of Political Economy," from which we quote a substantial part in this issue of The Public in the department of Related Things. The other was "The Two Great Commandments in Economics." They were published originally in the San Francisco Star and The New Earth.

Mr. Mills died at San Fernando, State of Durango, Mexico, July 25, 1901.* His wife, Jane Dearborn Mills, having returned from Mexico to New England, still lives at Jamaica Plain, Mass.

❁

An old-time San Francisco friend of Mr. Mills, Joseph Leggett, also a follower of Henry George, and one of Mayor Taylor's police commissioners in the city by the Golden Gate, writes of Mr. Mills that "he possessed in a very marked degree that high spiritual insight which enabled him to perceive clearly the advance of thought in the world." "Being a close scientific observer," Mr. Leggett continues, "and a marvelously clear thinker, his conclusions were singularly accurate and definite. He was intensely democratic in the highest and truest sense, but had little use for either the Democratic or the Republican party. He regarded Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and Henry George as the four great American democrats, and it grieved him to note how the first of these men had been ignored by the people of his own State and of the country at large. 'Hasn't his part of the work of establishing real political freedom been strangely overlooked?' Mr. Mills asked me once in a letter, in which he went on to say: 'The real democrats have been strangely neglected or damned by faint praise. Lincoln stands above them all in real democracy of sympathy; but others will loom up still more democratic—indeed, George seems to me the best representative of democracy among living men. No man can have an adequate idea of God until he sees all other men equal before God.' This sense of democracy gave Mr. Mills a deep sympathetic interest in the Labor movement. In the same letter he wrote: 'The eight-hour movement seems to progress. The May-day labor movement in Europe was orderly, and all along the line the skirmishing goes on well. But the real battle will be fought on the line of the Singletax, and until that is won the fruits of the skirmishing will be a poor crop for the mowers.' I believe that Mr. Mills played a very important part in leavening the thought of our time with the fundamental truth of the Singletax philosophy, which is just beginning to bear fruit all over the world. Through his pamphlets on 'Privilege or Service?' on 'First Principles of Political Economy' and on 'The Two Great Commandments in Economics,' I am sure that he exerted a powerful influence upon the leading minds of the Singletax movement, and did much to keep it on the high moral and spiritual plane on which it has moved and which has contributed so largely to its marvelous progress."

*See The Public of August 10, 1901, page 276, and of August 31, 1901, page 333.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE LABOR WAR.

Kingussie, Scotland, May 29.

There are signs in England of the social cyclone which Mr. John Macmillan declares to be brewing in the Western States (see "Public" May 3rd). The portents are daily growing more ominous. The country has just begun to recover from the paralysing effects of the coal strike and now the transport workers are out 125,000 strong and the Port of London is tied up. So sensitive has the world of labor become that some apparently trivial maladjustment suddenly throws the vital machinery of industry out of gear. Strikes recur, involving enormous waste, and when they are settled, under pressure from all sides, wages remain low and the economic position of the laborers is not greatly bettered. The railway strikers came to terms last autumn and there remain today 100,000 of their number who receive less than $5 a week in wages. And the miners are already expressing dissatisfaction with the awards under the Minimum Wage Act.

No expedient can bring relief as long as the law of supply and demand is blocked by land monopoly. As Emerson perceived, "artifice or legislation punishes itself by reaction, gluts and bankruptcies." Three years ago the Liberal Party seemed to have learned this lesson and subsequent experience has proved that, like the giant of mythology, their strength is increased whenever they are thrown back upon the earth. Meanwhile the House of Have is in need of a new prophet. Malthus is played out and