

they shrank from condemning slavery. They, therefore, concluded that slavery was sinless provided the master were "good to his slaves," just as the Spectator concludes that monopoly is sinless except as it compels or enables its beneficiaries to "grind the face of the poor." But such exceptions are not contemplated by the eighth commandment.

It appears that the defeat of the federal constitution for the Australian colonies, was accomplished in the colony of New South Wales. Two-thirds of the popular vote in each colony was required for the adoption of the constitution, and though in the other principal colonies that vote was cast for it, the vote in New South Wales fell short. A majority there voted for adoption, but the requisite proportion of votes was lacking. The large minority of New South Wales voters who opposed federation doubtless understood what they were about. New South Wales is a free trade colony. It is almost absolutely so. Under this policy it has made rapid advances, and the people there have no notion of surrendering their freedom to the protectionists who rule the sister colony of Victoria. Though a majority did not suspect that federation would result in a general protection policy, as it has done in the United States, yet the large and effective minority evidently foresaw that under the federal constitution as proposed, the monopolists of Victoria, with a deluded people behind them, might in combination with the monopolists of New South Wales and the other colonies, close the ports of all Australia to the commerce of the world. Very sensibly, therefore, they preferred their freedom without nationality or expansion, to nationality and expansion with protection.

Most of Henry George's critics have been acute in discovering in his books much that is not there, and overlooking much that is there. The most charitable inference is that they have not read the books before reviewing

them. But the critic of the New York Independent is the first to confess that this was his case. He does confess it, however, almost in terms. Referring to George's last book—"The Science of Political Economy"—which he reviews at length without once touching upon any of its important points, this critic says: "We fail to find in it anything that is not to be found in Mr. George's earlier works, except some biographical details." No man could truthfully write that sentence if he had read the books. In the book under review, George discusses at length and with acuteness and profound judgment numerous subjects which are not to be found in any of his other works, except as the story of Robinson Crusoe is to be found in Webster's dictionary, or Webster's dictionary in the alphabet. Among these are the nature and causes of civilization, the distinction between political economy and "economics," the different schools of political economy, the history of political economy, the subject of value, the nature of money, the law of diminishing returns, the two modes of cooperation—by combination of effort and by separation of effort, and the subject of distribution. To imply that these subjects are to be found in George's earlier books is to confess ignorance of them; to assume that they are not to be found in his last book is to confess ignorance of that.

The truth is, that since George brought out so magnificently in "Progress and Poverty," one of those great elementary truths the proclamation of which makes an epoch in human history, his critics, like most inferior contemporaries of most great men, have been unable to measure him. If they see any allusion to that truth in earlier writers, they think George a plagiarist; if they see any allusion to it in his later works they think he repeats himself. And because George's last book makes still more solid the foundations of the truth he had proclaimed in all his other books, the chirping critics

"fail to find in it" anything that is not to be found in them.

OBLIGATIONS TO WORK.

The stereotypers' strike in Chicago brings up for consideration, with exceptional emphasis, a social question of vital and general concern. It is the question of the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by persons offering to serve the public to continue the service, if they can possibly do so, until after reasonable notice of their intention to withdraw.

For the better understanding of this question, as illustrated by the Chicago stereotypers' strike, a brief description of that strike is necessary. The stereotypers of the Chicago daily newspapers were under a contract with their employers as to wages and hours of labor, which they were at liberty to open up for revision at any time upon giving notice of their purpose. This notice was duly given and a new scale of wages demanded. No agreement was arrived at, however, and the publishers, believing that their stereotypers would strike unless increased wages and shorter hours were granted, anticipated that action by suddenly suspending publication. Every daily paper of importance in the city of Chicago joined in this suspension, so that for a period of four full days Chicago was without a local daily newspaper. And so perfect was the combination of publishers, that during the suspension every one of them refused in any way to make public the news in his possession. To aggravate the situation, this plan for exciting public hostility to the stereotypers was put in operation just at the close of the first day's battle before Santiago, and as the suspension continued throughout the four following days, the public of Chicago was deprived of extraordinarily important news, except as it percolated through chance channels. Was that conduct on the part of the publishers a breach of the obligation they had assumed, to serve the public with news?

It is always a good plan when dealing with a question like this, to get one's bearings by considering other cases, the same in principle, but simpler. Adopting that plan for present purposes, no better example could