

sional caucus is referred to as something which a democracy could not and did not long endure. Here, then are the two extremes. A close caucus which arbitrarily and absolutely controls nominations and thus controls elections, and a great mass meeting which represents nobody but the people who succeed in getting into the hall and which while democratic in form is not at all democratic in fact. The convention must, indeed, meet the fate of the close caucus. But what can be substituted? To make the convention a deliberative body would be a step back toward the caucus, and that would be followed by others until King Caucus would reign once more. The only remedy is to restore to the people fully a free power of choice. This can be done by any system of effective voting, whereby the voter declares his first, second, third, etc., choice. When voters can do that, they will lose all fear of helping a strong candidate whom they detest by voting for a weak one whom they prefer. They will vote for the weak candidate as first choice, confident that if he fails of election their second choice, or third, or fourth, will still count against the objectionable candidate. And if voters did lose this fear of throwing away their votes or indirectly helping an objectionable candidate, it wouldn't make much difference how nominations were made.

"The Land of Sunshine," Charles F. Lummis's dollar magazine, published at Los Angeles, contains a department called "The Lion's Den," in which Mr. Lummis himself comments with characteristic brevity, wit and force upon subjects of perennial interest. In the July number he pays his respects to those thoughtless people who seem to regard letters of introduction as certificates which anybody ought to give to anybody else upon demand. Mr. Lummis—aims to remark that he gives "letters" to people whose paper he would indorse in the bank—and they are fewer than a few. He thinks as much of his word of honor as of his innumerable dollars. Possibly one reason why he has some

respectable friends is that he does not lie to them for the sake of being "polite" to strangers. A letter of introduction ought to mean something. And it is just as well to begin to make it do so.

This is a word in season. The man who asks a letter of introduction which suggests an acquaintanceship that does not exist, and the man who gives it, conspire to defraud. There is no palliation for these introductory letters, unless it be that people to whom they are addressed seldom give them more than polite attention, when the writer does not vouch for them by emphatic direct communication.

SERVICE FOR SERVICE.

So accustomed have men become to the association of elegant leisure with civilization, that they realize only with considerable mental effort that civilization depends neither upon leisure nor the leisure class, but altogether upon interchange of work. Service for service is the condition of civilized life. It is this that gives us comfortable shelter and clothing, that keeps us supplied with food, that furnishes us with all our implements, and that enables us to accumulate knowledge.

Should we altogether cease serving one another, civilization would quickly collapse. Though men may live without serving, it is only through some degree of interchange of service that they can live civilized lives. The less intense and just this interchange, the lower the grade of civilization; the more perfect the interchange, both in its economic and its moral qualities, the higher the civilization it will generate and maintain. Service for service is the central law of social development.

In the civilized state with which we of this generation are acquainted, most exchanges of service take the form of exchanges of substantial objects which have been shaped by human art, by work. Some exchanges are indeed of work itself. For barbers, physicians, teachers, some classes of household servants, actors, lawyers, and so on, do not shape substantial objects and trade them; they render direct personal service. But most

exchanges of service take the form of exchanges of artificial objects.

The exchange of these objects, however, depends upon the principle of service for service. They are congealed or crystallized service. A familiar type is bread. By no immediate service could anyone furnish us with bread. The field must be plowed and seeded, the mill must be made and managed, and the flour must be baked in an oven that must be built, before anyone can be served with bread. When bread comes to the table, therefore, it is an embodiment of all the different kinds of service which have brought it there; from that of the farmer to that of the baker, from that of the miner and machinist to that of the transporter. And as with bread, so with all artificial things in the way of food, clothing, shelter, luxuries, and the artificial materials and machinery for producing them. They are products of labor, and in exchanging them we are essentially exchanging service for service.

Hardly less evanescent, however, are these things than direct personal service. Some kinds of artificial objects thus embodying service are quickly consumed, and even those that are lasting last but a little while—a month or two, a year or two, or possibly a generation or two. Though we often speak of saving, such things cannot be saved. The civilization of to-day rests not upon the saved-up products of earlier generations; but upon interchanges of service in this generation, and to a great degree in this year, or month, or week, or day.

It is often explained that the idle rich are living upon the accumulated savings of their ancestors. They live upon nothing of the kind. Imagine a rich young man as breakfasting luxuriously upon toast which his great-great-grandmother had made, and eggs that his great-great-grandfather had saved up! So far from his doing that, the toast and eggs he eats are those which some of his own fellow inhabitants of this planet have caused to come to him at this very time. Some of his brethren have rendered him a service by working for him, and if he has rendered in ex-

change no equivalent service for others with his own work, then some of his brethren have to that extent given service for which they have not received service.

Service cannot be saved. Even when congealed in consumable things, it can be saved for only a little while. Society as a whole lives almost literally from hand to mouth. The work that is done to-day serves the wants of to-day. We cannot save it for future generations.

But we can and do save obligations to work. And this is what is really meant by saving wealth.

Nor is such saving necessarily incompatible with the principle of service for service. If a farmer, for example, works a day for his neighbor in corn planting time with an understanding that the neighbor is to help him in harvest, he will in effect have saved a day's service from corn planting time till harvest time. Or if a farmer delivers 100 bushels of grain to the storekeeper upon an agreement that he shall have its equivalent in dry goods upon demand, and he does not demand them for a year, he will in effect have saved the dry goods. Suppose, however, that instead of giving the farmer credit for his wheat the storekeeper pays him money for it, and that the farmer does not spend that money until the next year, then the farmer will in effect have saved the things he ultimately buys. But the storekeeper, instead of giving either credit or money, may give the farmer his note payable in a year, and by mutual agreement this note may be renewed from year to year, until the farmer dies, leaving it to his son; and after successive renewals it may come to his grandson, to whom finally it is paid with money and the money used to hire a cook to toast bread and boil eggs. The principle will be the same. The service or goods so procured will in effect have been saved up through those three generations, though in fact the cook was not born until after the wheat for which the note was given had been consumed, nor the eggs laid until the day before they were served. In all these instances there is an exchange of service for service.

The fact that the service in one direction was rendered long before the

service in the other makes no difference. So long as all the processes of the transaction are voluntary on the part of all parties concerned, it is immaterial whether or not the exchange is concurrent. The essential thing is that when a service is rendered it shall be in exchange for an equivalent service, whether the equivalent service be rendered concurrently or in the past, or is to be rendered in the future. This is what constitutes service for service.

If all obligations to serve represented service rendered or to be rendered, there would be no volcanic rumblings in the development of civilization. No one could then complain of undeserved poverty, nor would any be unjustly rich. For if each rendered service only as he received an equivalent in service, suffering from poverty would imply voluntary idleness and the possession of great wealth would imply great industry and usefulness. It is an indisputable truth, however, that most of the obligations to serve which constitute the so-called wealth of the leisure classes represent neither service rendered nor to be rendered by the possessors, but only power acquired.

To illustrate this side of the matter, let us suppose a ten-dollar bill extorted by a highwayman from a workingman whose wages it is. The workingman had rendered service, and this bill was his certificate of title to receive service in return. But now he must lose the power to demand that service. The robber has acquired it. So the workingman will have rendered ten dollars' worth of service without getting any service, and the robber will have gained ten dollars' worth of service without rendering any.

In that case the workingman is plundered in defiance of law. But there would be no essential difference if the law justified the act. There are instances in which the law does justify precisely such acts. The institution of slavery is one. A master's title to his slave is an obligation upon the slave to serve. He must serve as his master orders. The law compels him to. Yet he never has received and never is to receive any adequate service in return. As with the robbed

workingman, the slave must render service without getting service, while his master gets service without rendering any. The principle of service for service is ignored. It is the same, though the process is more subtle, when private monopolies are given control of public business. When, for instance, the streets of a city are turned over to private corporations for street car purposes, and the corporations charge for fares more than could be exacted for the same service in competitive conditions, the excess is upon a footing precisely with the ten dollars extorted from the workingman in defiance of law, and with the labor extorted from the slave pursuant to law. To the extent of that excess the passengers are forced to render service without getting service, and the corporations get service without rendering any.

The most universal method, however, as it is the fundamental one, of getting service without giving service, through the enforcement of legal obligations to serve, is that of land monopoly. This method operates to effect the result in two ways: First, by extorting private compensation for the enjoyment of a common right; secondly, by abnormally lessening opportunities to use land, and thereby abnormally reducing the price of service.

All incomes from land—not from its use, but from the mere power of forbidding its use—are unearned. That is, they consist of services rendered by others for which no service is rendered in return. For no man can render his fellow man a service by "allowing" him to use land, any more than he can render him a service by "allowing" him to breathe. There is no service in either case unless it has been preceded by a commensurate injury. If an enemy grabs my throat and chokes me, he may indeed do me a service by "allowing" me to breathe. But if he had in the first place recognized my right to breathe, there would have been no need for his permission. It would be wrenching language to call such permission a service. The same remark is true of the "service" of allowing men to use land, to which all men's rights are equal if there is such a thing as morality in the universe. It is only by divesting

men of their natural right to land that they can ever be made to feel that permission to use land is a service. The principle of service for service demands that service by work shall be repaid with service by work. Nothing else satisfies it. Consequently rent exactions for private benefit as compensation for permission to use land, are hostile to this principle. They enable the beneficiaries to that extent to get service without giving any, and therefore compel others to the same extent to give service without getting any.

The system of land monopoly which thus enables land monopolists to get service without giving service, produces the secondary effect noted above. It is infinitely more subtle and vastly more oppressive than the first. Through occasional phenomenal rises of some land in rent-yielding qualities, whereby families have become very rich—acquiring thereby great power to exact service without rendering any—a craze for buying land and holding it for a rise has become chronic, in consequence of which the whole earth, though but slightly used, is almost completely monopolized. One result of this is to set the service-rendering elements of society into deadly competition with one another for opportunities to use the earth in rendering service. For use of the earth is necessary in all occupations. A city store-keeper, for example, requires more land for his business than a country farmer does for his,—measuring the land by value. The inevitable effect of that competition has been to reduce the value of service, as compared with the value of opportunities to render service, until those who render it must invariably give more service than they receive. So the principle of service for service in society is turned topsy-turvy.

The two kinds of obligations to serve which we have thus attempted to distinguish—those that represent service and those that extort it—are commonly confused by the habit of speaking of all interchange or rendering of service in terms of money. It is by money, that is, that we measure service, whether we measure it for purposes of exchange or for purposes of extortion. If we hire a man to

work for us, or buy a consignment of goods, we fix the value in terms of dollars or of pounds sterling. We do the same if we buy a lot of land to hold for a rise or buy a slave to do our work. Yet in the one case the expression in dollars or pounds means that we are arranging to exchange service for service; whereas in the other it means that we are arranging to exchange a power of extorting service without rendering service. The moral nature of the transactions is confused by the terms in which they are expressed.

There arises, therefore, a feeling that money itself is in some sense an unholy thing. In some churches, for instance, collections are not taken up, because the jingle of money in church is felt to be offensive. And in many churches where collections are taken, they are regarded as unavoidable evils; a sense of incongruity is felt and often expressed. Yet there should be no such feeling regarding money that has been earned by service. To drop such money into the contribution box of any society is to say: "I have done this much work for this cause and here is the certificate." But so much of the money that goes into contribution boxes represents not service for the cause, but extortion for the cause, that it is little wonder a sense of incongruity between money boxes and church worship is felt and expressed both within and without the churches.

Such is the kind of money that people would get were their wishes granted when they wish to be rich. To wish to be rich is to wish to be able to get service without giving service. It is therefore the most selfish possible wish. Yet it is often made in what purports to be a philanthropic spirit. We sometimes wish we might be rich so that we could lighten the burdens of the poor. But why not wish that they might be rich so that they could lighten their own burdens? Zangwill's Jew understood this thing to a nicety. After praying the Lord to give him \$100,000, upon his promise to distribute \$50,000 of it among the poor, he added: "But Lord, if you can't trust me, then give me \$50,000 and distribute the other \$50,000 among the poor yourself." It all comes back to our original proposition that obligations to serve are of

two kinds, those which certify to exchange of service and those which certify to a legal power of extorting service. This distinction must always be kept clear.

Of the justice of the former species of obligation there can be no question. When men freely contract for an exchange of service, whether in the form of direct personal service or of substantial products of labor, or partly in one and partly in the other, the obligation of him who gets service to return its equivalent is a moral obligation. But the obligation which represents power to extort service without certifying to the rendering of service must be condemned.

Simple ethics condemn it. If one gets without working, others must work without getting; and that is something which no school of ethics can frankly approve. It is essentially robbery.

The Bible also condemns it. That venerated volume admonishes us to do to others as we would have them do to us, and to love our neighbors as ourselves—neither more nor less, but the same; and in it we are distinctly told that he who will not work shall not eat, a text which is frequently enough quoted against parasitical tramps but seldom against parasitical millionaires. In fact the Bible is replete with condemnations of extortions of service. In this way only are its otherwise incomprehensible condemnations of the rich to be explained. For the rich, in the opprobrious sense, are not those who have much in the way of obligations requiring others to serve, but those who have anything in the way of such obligations which do not represent service rendered by themselves. Says Henry George (in chapter 19 book 2 of the "Science of Political Economy):

Is there not a natural or normal line of the possession or enjoyment of service? Clearly there is. It is that of equality between giving and receiving. . . . He who can command more service than he need render, is rich. He is poor who can command less service than he does render or is willing to render; for in our civilization of to-day we must take note of the monstrous fact that men willing to work cannot always find opportunity to work. The one has more than he ought to have; the other has less. Rich and poor are thus correlatives of each

other; the existence of a class of rich involving the existence of a class of poor, and the reverse; and abnormal luxury on the one side and abnormal want on the other have a relation of necessary sequence. To put this relation into terms of morals, the rich are the robbers, since they are at least sharers in the proceeds of robbery; and the poor are the robbed. This is the reason, I take it, why Christ, who was not really a man of such reckless speech as some Christians deem him to have been, always expressed sympathy with the poor and repugnance of the rich. In his philosophy it was better even to be robbed than to rob. In the kingdom of right doing which he preached, rich and poor would be impossible, because rich and poor in the true sense are the results of wrong-doing. . . . Injustice cannot live where justice rules, and even if the man himself might get through, his riches—his power of compelling service without rendering service—must of necessity be left behind. If there can be no poor in the kingdom of heaven, clearly there can be no rich! And so it is utterly impossible in this, or in any other conceivable world, to abolish unjust poverty, without at the same time abolishing unjust possessions. This is a hard word to the softly amiable philanthropists who, to speak metaphorically, would like to get on the good side of God without angering the devil. But it is a true word nevertheless.

Verily it is a true word. If the extortion of service is to be abolished and the world left free to exchange service for service, then those obligations to serve which represent naked legal power and not service rendered must be unconditionally abolished. To pay their beneficiaries for their loss of extorting power would be merely to substitute one form of extortion for another. Whoever is rich because he possesses legal power to compel the rendering of service without rendering or having rendered therefor an equivalent service, must in justice lose that power. So long as he retains it the natural law of service for service cannot operate. It is only by his losing his power to extort service that others can be restored to their right to exchange service.

NEWS

Though news of the Chinese situation has not much altered in any important respect since our last report, it is impossible to escape the conviction that a great world war has fairly begun. The foreign powers still

maintain the fiction that they are aiding the Chinese government to establish order, and no declarations of war have been made. But China has carried the fight into the enemy's country by firing on a Russian transport steamer on the Amur river, which is the boundary between Chinese and Russian territory, and attacking a city on the Russian side—the city of Blagoveshchensk, in Siberia. This attack, which was made on the 14th, is not in itself important, but it attracts attention because it makes an opportunity for Russia to declare war if she chooses. And as we write there comes a report from London that she has in effect done so by handing to the Chinese envoy at St. Petersburg his passports and requesting his withdrawal from the country. Significance is attached also to the fact that Li Hung Chang went from Canton on the 18th to Peking in response to an edict of the Chinese government.

The fate of the foreign colony in Peking is still involved in mystery. All the news consists of rumors of doubtful character. A dispatch from the Russian Admiral Alexieff, at Port Arthur, telling of the torture and murder by boxers of the Russian minister, M. De Giers, and his wife, was received at St. Petersburg on the 11th, but was discredited by the Russian government on the day following its publication. On the 14th a report from Shanghai, purporting to come from Sheng, the Chinese director of telegraphs at that point, told with much grewsome detail of the destruction of the legations and the massacre of all the foreigners on the night of July 7th, after repeated attacks had been made upon them by Chinese troops and boxers under the command of Prince Tuan. This report was disavowed by Sheng on the 17th, and was followed on the 18th by a dispatch from the American consul at Chefoo, reporting that the courier of the governor of Shantung, who left Peking on the 9th, reported the legations as still holding out at the time of his departure.

Our last week's report told of the retaking of the native city at Tientsin by the Chinese and closed with the news that on the 9th they were fiercely bombarding the allies in the foreign quarter, which is outside the walls of the native city. This bombardment, which was very destructive, was continued on the

10th, 11th and 12th, and was accompanied by repeated infantry attacks, all of which were repulsed. Though the allies made counter attacks, they were, nevertheless, gradually hemmed in; and on the 13th they decided upon a general assault on the native city and the forts commanding it. This assault, which lasted all day on the 13th, was most sanguinary, and at nightfall the issue was still undecided. But the attack was renewed on the 14th, when, the walls of the native city having been breached by a heavy artillery fire, the allies succeeded in capturing both the city and the forts. The Chinese were completely routed. For the two days' fighting the allied loss was nearly 800 killed and wounded. The American loss was especially heavy and included Col. Liscum, of the Ninth infantry. He was killed on the 13th. This decisive defeat of the Chinese puts Tientsin out of danger.

When news reached this country of the repulse of the allies in their first attack upon the native city at Tientsin, President McKinley was urged by members of the cabinet to call a cabinet meeting to consider the advisability of summoning congress in extra session and asking for supplies and additional troops. The president accordingly cut his vacation short and left Canton on the 16th, having called a cabinet meeting for the 17th. When the cabinet assembled Admiral Remey, of the Asiatic station, had been heard from in a report which explained that although the allies at Tientsin were at first repulsed with terrible loss, they had since secured complete control of the forts and the native city. The cabinet concluded, therefore, that the present situation does not require the expenditure of more money nor the use of more American troops than the president already controls, and for that reason it was decided not to call an extra session of congress. This decision was in harmony with the views of Senator Hanna, who, in an interview given out the day before the cabinet meeting, said:

The president has full power to meet all conditions as they may arise. He has a full treasury and is empowered to call on all the troops he may require. There seems now to be no reason why congress should be called together. Subsequent developments, however, may make such a step necessary.

Evidently, however, it will not be easy, in the absence of further au-