

cision is subject to local referendum. Wherever the affirmative on these referendums prevails, the law allows a special extra tax rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on assessed values— $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent on actual values,—toward the support of the high school of the township. In the pending controversies, there naturally is a great variety of opposition. But at bottom this is nothing but an objection on the part of a class of people who profit by township growth in population and wealth, to share their unearned profits with the community that produces them. If the townships had retained their 16th section of school lands—one mile square in each—those that have grown in population and wealth would have ample incomes of their own for school purposes. But they have given away this inheritance of the school children to the very class of people in the past who in the present sordidly oppose just such progressive movements as the present one for township high schools. Public-spirited citizenship should frown upon their niggardliness. Since they are enriched by the growth in value of their property in consequence of the growth and progress of their townships, a small tax for high schools is no burden at all for them to bear.

+ +

Death of James H. Canfield.

James H. Canfield, the librarian of Columbia University, died suddenly at New York on the 29th. He came into prominence first while professor of political economy at the University of Kansas. Being a free trader, he so declared himself; and in protection-crazed Kansas this was as if the professor of theology at an orthodox seminary had declared himself an atheist. Canfield was at that time in line for the presidency of the university, and would soon have had it, and knew he would; yet he minced no words when in a public speech it became morally necessary to declare and defend his economic faith. He might have been Senator from Kansas at the time of the Populist upheaval had he been willing, when lecturing on journalism after the election, to suppress the name of what he regarded as the best news paper in Kansas, which happened to have been extremely bitter toward the Populists in its campaign editorials. This transformed him from a probability into an impossibility. He went from Kansas to the Nebraska University as its president, and then to the presidency of the Ohio State University, whence he returned to his old home in New York as librarian of Columbia. A man of great ability, of superb equipment, of extraordinary political skill, who might have forged his way to the front

had he been willing to "pay the price" whenever "the door of opportunity" opened, he withdrew in middle life to the quiet of a college library. Not only was Dr. Canfield a free trader, but under the influence of Thomas G. Shearman's writings he became a single taxer as well. His monograph on "Taxation," published by the Putnams, may be recalled as one of the strongest presentations of the single tax as a fiscal reform to be found in the literature of the subject.

+ +

Socialism and Roosevelt.

We had supposed that our general characterization (p. 291) of Mr. Roosevelt's ignorant attack upon Socialism and his indecent aspersion of Socialists would need no elaboration. One need not be a Socialist to appreciate the justice of such a characterization without further statement or argument. All he needs is enough knowledge of the subject to warrant him in having an opinion upon it. We hold no brief for "scientific," or orthodox, or party Socialism; but we flatter ourselves that we can consider what it has to offer, and also look into the face of its advocates, without either going into angry hysterics ourselves or into raptures over persons who happen to be affected in that way. There is no objection, however, to giving reasons for our characterization of Mr. Roosevelt's diatribe, and in order that their soundness as representative of Socialism may be above reproach, we shall quote from a pointed reply to Mr. Roosevelt by Joseph Medill Patterson, who is a Socialist out and out.

+

Mr. Patterson's full reply will be found in the Chicago Record-Herald of March 24. He responds to Mr. Roosevelt categorically, point by point. On Mr. Roosevelt's point that Socialists preach free love, he replies:

They do—in this sense: That they believe woman should be economically independent, so that when the time comes for her to marry she may give herself to the man she loves, not sell herself, in married prostitution to the suitor with the most money.

To Mr. Roosevelt's point that Socialists advocate sexual promiscuity, his reply is that—

a very few Socialists have advocated such a thing. I do not know of a single one of the 40,000 members of the Socialist party in America who does advocate such a thing. There were two former members of the party who wrote a book in favor of sexual promiscuity, who were thereupon expelled from the party. Thus it will be seen that the percentage of Socialists who advocate sexual promiscuity is less than the percentage of plutocrats who practice it. Indeed, Socialists are intent upon the destruction of that