suggest that this was a business proposition, which required to be dealt with after business methods, and that the question at issue was one of commercial profit and loss, as well as imperial policy.

"Well," rejoined Mr. Ancketill, "the argument is a rather interminable one, isn't it? But I return to my starting point, and there I stay. The anomalous, unrighteous system of land tenure in England, combined with the existence of an equally unrighteous regime of class privilege and class oppression, is at the root of the whole matter, and the evil will not be removed until the cause has been first attacked and then eradicated."

In the same issue of the Advertiser with the above, appeared the following editorial on the interview:

FISCAL REFORM AND LAND TAXATION.

The interview with Mr. Henry Ancketill, M. L. A., on the subject of the fiscal controversy, which appears in another column, while many of Mr. Ancketill's remarks do not bear directly upon the points at issue, contains a good deal which is interesting and suggestive. Mr. Ancketill finds the solution of all commercial disabilities, whether they spring from causes associated with fiscal policy or are to be ascribed to any other reason, in the reform of land taxation. Mr. Ancketill is a land reformer of the most ardent type, and it does not surprise us to find him applying his universal panacea to the commercial ills for which Mr. Chamberlain is endeavoring to prescribe; but we are afraid he speaks too confidently, and takes altogether too optimistic a view of the immediate possibility of carrying out a reform such as he suggests. Mr. Ancketill says the chancellor of the exchequer could tax land values in his next budget. We fear not. The all-powerful vested land interests which control the legislature at home would place too formidable an obstacle in the way. Land Taxation is one of those social problems which will have to be dealt with in the near or far future, but its solution will be of a progressive nature, and one that is not to be attained in the interval between one budget and another. If the solution of the fiscal problem is to be made dependent upon this remedy, no reform need be expected for the next decade, or perhaps two. And, in our view, though not in that of Mr. Ancketill, by that time the evil would probably be past remedy. We are not surprised to find Mr. Ancketill opposed to the Chamberlain policy, and he is, of course, absolutely entitled to his opinions and to express them. But it is worthy of note that three out of the four Durban members are entirely in sympathy with that policy, and in that they represent the views of the constituency generally.

THE SHOOTING STAR, OR THE ORIGIN OF THE SUICIDE.

Now she was a little cloud-lady—
  He was a little star-man;
And they lived on love in the heavens above
  As only real sweethearts can.

But the lady was fickle, you see—
  As cloud-ladies are in June—
And it happened like this: she granted a kiss
  One day to the man in the moon.

And the little star-man understood—
  The little star-man withdrew;
And right then and there, away up in the air,
  He shot himself far from view!

—Charles Lowell Howard, in Life.

Duty is not transferable. We cannot worship God by telephone or fight the battles of righteousness by substitutes. Religion reaches into every detail of life and includes our duty as citizens. We may serve God at the ballot box as certainly as in the church. The man who evades his duty as a citizen by leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of the professionals is guilty before God. Suffrage is not only a privilege, but an obligation, and the man who holds himself too good to vote is too bad for the kingdom of Heaven.—Rev. L. A. Crandall, of Chicago.

The author of the "Strenuous Life" was moved with a feeling of mingled exaltation and vexation when he learned that his book was having a suddenly largely increased sale.

"Of course," he murmured, "I don't object to the royalties and the popularity that are coming my way, but it would be annoying if the increasing sales are caused by a Colombian demand."

G. T. E.

"Many a man would give a great deal for your opportunities," said the earnestly ambitious man.

"Of course," answered Senator Sorghum. "I had to give a great deal for 'em myself."—Washington Star.

Gen. Wood's place in history may not be high, but it will be roomy.

G. T. E.

"Aim high," said the successful business man.

"That's jest like a feller that don't know nothin' 'bout shootin'," commented the backwoodsman. "'Most every boy with his first gun aims so derned high he don't git nothin', an' it looks to me like it's that way in business sometimes."—Chicago Evening Post.

Wearing an emblem of loyalty may be laudable, but the adherents of the administration in the next Republican convention should be warned that they will not be able to get their heads together if they wear Panamas.

G. T. E.

"Are you aware that you are being criticised for using money in politics?"

"Yes," answered Senator Sorghum. "If you use money they criticise you, and if you don't they forget all about you."—Washington Star.

BOOKS

SOCIAL EVOLUTION.

In "An Examination of Society from the Standpoint of Evolution" (Columbus, O.: The Argus Press. Price, $1.75 net), Louis Wallis elaborates into a book the theory he outlined in a magazine article, "The Capitalization of Social Development," which was reviewed editorially in these columns (vol. v., p. 212) a year or more ago, by John Z. White. The book neither removes nor modifies any of the causes for Mr. White's just criticism. It rather accentuates them.

Mr. Wallis undertakes to rest what is commonly known as the "single tax" reform upon the materialistic hypothesis, and to harmonize it with the theory of "scientific socialism." He accordingly accounts for civilization, by an upward process of evolution from animality through slavery and land monopoly by means of "cleavage."

By "cleavage" Mr. Wallis refers to what he claims to be the governing principle of sociological development. Although the material universe was always abundantly supplied with all that man requires, this was only a potential condition. Man must have "capital" in order to produce what is needed for civilization. But he would never accumulate "capital" if his primitive freedom were perpetuated. Hence the necessity for and the beneficence of "cleavage"—the development of an exploiting or upper, and an exploited or lower, class.

The first manifestation of the principle of "cleavage" is in slavery. The upper class enslaves the lower, and thereby forces it to produce "capital," which contributes to the advance of civilization. In course of time slavery loses its potency, and becomes obstructive to progress instead of accelerating it; and in harmony with the general principle of evolutionary science, it then goes the way of the unfit for survival. Meanwhile, however, "cleavage" mani-

fests itself in more subtle fashion. Land monopoly differentiates the exploiting from the exploited class, and much more economically and effectively forces the latter to supply the "capital" which the former accumulates and utilizes.

It is at this point that Mr. Wallis parts company with "scientific socialism." Socialism, insisting that land monopoly is losing its potency and that "capitalism" has taken its place, predicts an uprising of the lower class to appropriate the accumulated "capital." But Mr. Wallis finds in land monopoly, not in "capital," the "cleavage-" producing power; and, concluding that its evolutionary uses have come to an end with the sufficient accumulation of "capital," the need for which alone has vitalized it in the past, he would henceforth have society give conscious direction to the hitherto consciousless and conscienceless evolutionary process. This, he would do by abolishing land monopoly. His method is the same as that of Henry George—the "single tax."

It is significant that the same "scientific" method should yield results so radically different as Karl Marx socialism and Henry George single taxism. We are not prepared to say which has "slipped a cog" in his reasoning, Marx or Wallis. But one thing is clear. Both have brought confusion into the most important sphere of their inquiry by their unanalytical concept of "capital." To the socialist, "capital" includes every productive agency except labor, and it includes part of that. For accumulated knowledge of productive principles and methods, and skill in their application, together with natural resources, are all comprised, along with such artificial products as machinery, in the socialistic concept. Consequently, the socialist thinks of "capital" as something which has been transmitted from generation to generation, time out of mind, in expanding volume. It is the inheritance of the ages. Mr. Wallis differs from socialists in this respect only in one particular. He excludes natural opportunities from the category of capital. In agreement with Henry George, he classifies them as land. But he includes, along with machines, "a vast amount of technical knowledge and training in the minds of experts"! He also includes the network of social organization. Thanks to that definition, Mr. Wallis is able to convince himself that "capital is almost entirely a social product of past and present generations."

Let us not be understood as criticising mere terms. Our objection to Mr. Wallis's definition of "capital" refers not to any infelicity in choosing a term nor to the liberties he takes in defining it, but to the incongruity of his classification of things. His concept of "capital" includes three things as different from one another for the purposes of truly scientific reasoning in the economics of sociology, as are the concepts four, five and six for the purposes of scientific reasoning in mathematics. One of these is artificial implements; another is accumulated knowledge; the third is social organization. How can really scientific reasoning in economics possibly proceed from premises which identify as one and the same thing, economically, such manifestly different things? Here we have an absolute identification of a characteristic of society as a whole (social organization), an acquirement of the individual man (knowledge and skill), and a concrete product of human effort (artificial implements). All these things may be necessary to the development of civilization, and the development of any one may promote the development of the others. But they are different things none the less.

In an army, for illustration, the military knowledge and skill of its rank and file, their organization into a cooperative body, and their munitions of war, are all necessary to military efficiency; but military knowledge and skill are one thing, military organization is another, and military equipment is another still. Though we may include them all in the one term "army," when comparing military science as a whole with some other science, we must be more analytical when studying the nature of military science itself. So we may include accumulated knowledge, social organization, artificial implements, and natural opportunities in the term "capital," when comparing sociology as a whole with something else. But any study of sociology itself must adopt a finer analysis.

The fact that one of these different things may be traded for another—as a machine for opportunity to acquire an education—makes no difference. The education does not therefore fall into the same economic category with the machine. If it did, we should have no trouble in proving that in slavery countries or eras men also are in the same economic category with machines. Where slavery exists you can trade a machine for a man. In like manner (as, indeed, socialists contend), a building site is in the same economic category with machines; for you can trade a machine for a building site. Thus we might include in the one term "capital" all productive land (a natural implement), all productive machines (artificial implements), all personal knowledge and skill (individual acquirements), and all social organization (cooperative phenomena). We should thereby abolish every economic distinction, and by confusing every economic difference make intelligible economic study quite impossible. Men are men, whether skilled or unskilled, educated or uneducated, bond or free. The globe on which we live is something different from men. Machines, which are produced by men from the natural storehouses of the globe, are different from either.

Of Mr. Wallis's theory of society (whether his by original invention or legitimate adoption), that it is "a collectivism under individual forms," we need say but a word. It is a painfully "scientific" formula for the simple and obvious truth that society results from division of labor through individual trading. With his materialistic hypothesis for sociology we need not deal at all. Since it is the hypothesis of the dominant schools, his error in that respect is theirs as well as his. If he rejects intuitional deductions, and therefore finds no place in sociology for morality and spirituality, except as a development from what is non-moral and non-spiritual, so do they. If the tradition that God made an intellectual and moral being out of clay, seems foolish to him in comparison with the "scientific" assumption that the clay itself did it, so do the schools. And if by adopting the hypothesis of the schools as to the origin of things sociological, he either leads them, with reference to the present and the future, into rational avenues of thought, or closes up the irrational for them, let us rejoice.

This book by Mr. Wallis is evidently a product of wide reading, hard study, a conscientious purpose, and a spirit of devotion to truth which lifts him high above his scholastic idea of the origin of things. Its subject matter is interesting, and the style scholarly and attractive. Students of sociology and political economy will find it suggestive, and teachers of these subjects will need to familiarize themselves with its argument. Of special interest as an historical study is the long chapter (which ought to be broken up into shorter ones) on "Oriental Civilization," especially the part that traces the development of Jewish civilization. It would have been more useful as an historical study for sociological purposes, if the author had grasped the symbolic values of the Jewish story and laid less stress upon the mere external narrative.

"POOR?"

There is a novel in every man's thoughts as well as in the incidents of his career. The most humdrum of human lives is vital with interest to the man who lives it; then why not to the rest of the world, if he tells the story so that others may know him as he knows himself. But there's the rub. Anybody may live an interesting story, but only an artist can tell it.

Some such thought must have influenced the anonymous author of "Poor? A New Political Standard for a True Democracy for a Millionaire Age. By A. N. Unknown" (New York: Continental Publishing Co., 24-26 Murray street).