

of Right." He even declares that government by the collective or general will is the doctrine of the future.

The Outlook's implied claim that the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" is now without support in reason, science or the authority of thoughtful men to-day, is as false as its other assertions on this question. Prof. Graham is a thoughtful man, and so is Prof. W. E. H. Lecky, and both are Englishmen with no sentiment for Thomas Jefferson. Prof. Graham, in his chapter on Locke, expresses his own opinion as follows:

But though there is no proof that governments began in this way, most of them having had their origin in conquest, it is true that unless they finally rest on the unforced and willing consent or agreement of the people or the majority, they are not free governments.

Presumably the Outlook believes in free governments. Prof. Lecky, in his "Democracy and Liberty" (volume 1, page 479), says:

The best, the truest, the most solid basis on which the peace of the civilized world can rest is the free consent of the great masses of its population to the form of government under which they live.

And Prof. Lecky is no particular friend of republics or democracy.

From the standpoint of scientific sociology, furthermore, the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" has a profound significance. As Prof. Lewis G. Janes has well said:

It is a sound political philosophy, justified by scientific sociological principles, which is enunciated in the affirmation of the Declaration of Independence, that "all just government rests on the consent of the governed." This is as true . . . of the older monarchical and aristocratic systems as it is of a democratic-republican form of government. While the evolutionary sociologist recognizes that different forms of government are adapted to varying degrees of culture and social development, he also knows that an autocracy which does not rest upon the actual consent of the governed, which finds no response in the hearts of the people, but is maintained solely by military compulsion, is a tyranny, unstable in its foundations, unadapted to its social environment, and destined to early destruction by peaceful or violent means.

The present British monarchy truly rests on the consent of the governed; if it did not, the monarchy would be destroyed. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, which embraces the doctrine of consent, permits the people to set up such governments as they may think are suited to their needs. But whatever the government, popular sovereignty requires that the people shall have ultimate power over it, to modify or change it, or set up another in its place. Without the consent, or, to use Hooker's word, the "approbation" of

the people, no government can endure for any length of time. The most unstable of governments is that to which the people are opposed. Jefferson's immortal declaration is essentially correct as a matter of right and as a matter of fact, and no imperialistic movement of an American political party can throw it into oblivion.—Editorial in Springfield Republican of Oct. 11.

AFTERGLOW.

I pray that Time full many years may bring  
And round about us heap his flowers and snow,  
That we adown the western slope may go  
Clasped hand in hand, as in that joyous spring  
When first together we did learn to sing  
The songs of youth beside the river's flow;  
The songs our hearts unto the end shall know,  
If now no more the woodlands with them ring.

And we shall sit on many a golden eve  
Beside the fire and dream of other days  
When we were young, and laugh a wrinkled laugh.  
Nor mourn nor sigh that loud the winds do grieve,  
For thou shalt more than multiply the Mays,  
And I the long Decembers count by half.  
—"A Valley Muse," by Chas. G. Blandin.

"But you will admit that Mr. McKinley has good intentions?" pleaded the apologizer of the administration.

"Oh, certainly; I'll concede that much," said the reformed gold democrat, "but we need more than a 'New Year's man' for our president."

G. T. E.

"A sail!" shouted the lookout.  
The admiral knit his brows.  
"I hope it's the enemy!" he muttered.  
"I have enough powder to fight a battle, but not enough to fire a salute!"

With this he folded his arms and gloomily contemplated the horizon.—Indianapolis Journal.

Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?  
For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.  
—Sir John Harrington.

Teacher—Who is it that sits idly by, doing nothing, while everybody else is working?

Bobby—The teacher. — Chicago Chronicle.

Pepsey—But, surely, colonel, you did not retreat when you saw the Boers approach?"

Col. Backway—Retreat? Never! I merely retired from business.

G. T. E.

"The world is mine!" asserted the count of Monte Christo. Thus is proved

the fact that not always has this earth been in the grasp of the Standard Oil trust.  
G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"The Eagle's Heart" (New York: D. Appleton and Company) is the latest of Hamlin Garland's characteristically rugged stories of western life. With its main setting in the cowboy country, its motive is to lay bare the heart of a Rocky Mountain outlaw whose badness is mostly external and not altogether of his own making. Garland has done some of his best work in this story. The wild country and rough-and-ready civilization through which it moves from the time the hero leaves his father's quiet parsonage and becomes a tenderfoot, passes like a picture before the reader's eyes; and the characters, of which there are several besides the hero that stand out in full relief, are instinct with life.

In "The Emancipation of the Workers" (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Price, 50 cents), Raphael Buck essays the solution of both the land question and the interest question, and thereby of the labor question. His proposition is to put all economic rent into the public treasury and lend it out to the people as capital without interest. From his general discussion it would appear that Mr. Buck imagines that private land monopoly injures labor only to the extent of the amount of the rents diverted to landlords. The consequent stimulation of land speculation, the most effective cause of labor exploitation, receives no adequate treatment. In the same connection he falls into the error of regarding economic rent as a tax upon consumers, whereas it is a premium which producers bear for advantage of place. We say that he "falls" into this error, because the error has been so often shown in economic literature to be an error, that the intelligent author who bases any reasoning upon it as if it were true, without showing with great care and clearness that after all it is no error, must be presumed to have fallen into it. And in his principal point, the abolition of interest, Mr. Buck evidently thinks of interest only as a phenomenon of borrowing and lending. If interest flows from the use of capital, and not merely from loans, his plan of abolishing it could not effect its purpose. Mr. Buck disclaims being a socialist; he is certainly not a single taxer; and his individualism is of a peculiar type, though in common with extreme individualists he recognizes society only as a loose aggregation of units in which all phenomena pertain to individuals and none of them to society as an indivisible whole.

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS

for

TEN CENTS

Send subscriptions with addresses to THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.