

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

particular situation which of all situations most conduces to such promiscuity—namely, the meeting of the girl who is poor and very pretty and the man who is rich and very careless, because he knows he may count on much forgiveness because he is rich.

Mr. Patterson's answer to Mr. Roosevelt's point that "extreme Socialists hold that all wealth is produced by manual workers, that the entire product of labor should be handed over every day to the laborer, that wealth is criminal in itself," is this:

They don't hold anything of the sort. What they do hold is that all wealth is produced by labor (manual and mental) and that no wealth is produced by merely owning a vacant lot and waiting for it to rise in value, or by cutting coupons from bonds. They do not believe that the entire product of labor should be handed over to labor every day. In fact, they are the very ones who advocate enormous masses of social capital, which is wealth withheld from distribution.

Mr. Roosevelt says that Socialists would "enthroned privilege in its crudest form" by allowing "each man to put into a common store what he can and take out what he needs." To this Mr. Patterson replies:

A still cruder form of privilege might exist—namely, to allow some men to put into a common store nothing at all and to take out a thousand-fold. This still cruder form of privilege than any of which Mr. Roosevelt can conceive is the one which now exists in America and other civilized countries. To take a most conspicuous example of its working, it is the privilege which we allow to the present generation of Vanderbilts and Astors and Thaws—the privilege we are preparing to accord to future generations of Rockefellers and Carnegies and Coreys—unless something happens first.

+

Now everyone who is at all intelligent about Socialism, be he advocate or opponent, knows that those statements by Mr. Patterson represent it truly, as to every one of the points he quotes from Mr. Roosevelt. What injustice, then, did our brief characterization do to Mr. Roosevelt's tirade?

+ +

Murder for Murder.

Details of the electrocution of a woman in the New York prison at Auburn are somewhat more horrible, if possible, than the newspaper reports of her own dreadful crime. If lethal orgies like this tended to check murder, they would be justified by utilitarian standards of morality (vol. x, p. 102; vol. xi, p. 881). But in essential principle they could not be expected to do so, for the deliberate taking of life cannot in the nature of things foster respect for life; and in actual practice they are not a deterrent, as comparative sta-

tistics show. Revolting to wholesome minds, degrading to the minds they do not disgust, these legalized experiments in homicide tend only to gratify murder lusts and to augment the crimes they are vainly supposed to check.

+ +

An Advertisement Suitable for Use Anywhere.

Mr. Taft's prosperity boom, turned loose several months ago, has gone astray. A suitable reward awaits the finder who will take the trouble to head it in this direction.

+ + +

A SECOND-HAND TARIFF VOTE.

The hosiery hysteria is developing several new ideas of citizenship and stimulating a more thoughtful concern for its responsibilities. As some great reforms have grown out of insignificant incidents and trivial causes, so now a face to face recognition of the economic and political facts illustrated by the "stocking situation" promises to persuade woman of her own power—her own natural prerogative—to be expressed by and through an equal ballot.

The artful, insinuating invitation to "influence" the man-vote is to woman an actual revelation of her age-long stultification.

+

Woman, the original economist of short cuts and sensible savings, is being undeceived as to the necessity for proxies in the performance of her wish or will.

The vicarious vote is a vexation to her faith in herself.

The bland impudence of the dominant sex in promptly bringing to her good-natured genius for repair the battered and bungling policies of the commercial piracy of which she is the victim, exhibits a species of hardihood and a style of effrontery that not even submissive woman can by any stretch of self-respect approve or encourage.

The devoted habit of her sex has ever been to rise up and defend or applaud the authority by which her pride has been clubbed senseless. Stripped of her stockings she is suddenly "coming to." Every living organism has its vulnerable spot.

The progress of ideas is excusable, and woman need not be censured if her common sense is reached via her vanity instead of through some nobler quality. The peacock was born vain. His masculine human copyists have magnificently acquired and exemplified vanity, but, for the greater part, woman has had vanity thrust, buttoned,