

the conclusions of a paper on particular subjects than for the principles to which it yields allegiance—people to whom even just conclusions mistakenly made from vicious principles are not attractive, while mistaken conclusions from sound principles are not offensive.

Such are the men and women all over this country and from other English speaking lands, who gladden the heart and strengthen the elbow of *The Public* with their assurances that they read it from title page to cartoon, and, though not agreeing with all it says, recognize its loyalty to principle and swear by its sincerity.

These five years of *The Public's* life have been momentous years in the history of the world. To look over its indexes is to pass in review a succession of events that are big with possibilities. It is a period upon which the philosophical historian of the future will be forced to dwell. To some the evil portent of this period is overshadowing. To others it is ablaze with gold and glory. But to us all it is what we as a whole decide to make it. Its evils have no power over us unless we adopt them. They may even be turned to good use as bad examples to be rejected.

The fight between public right and wrong is still on, and *The Public* will be in the fight so long as its service is in demand. Neither an optimist of the happy-go-lucky variety, nor a pessimist of the hopeless type, but a thorough believer in tearing down the bad in order to build up the good, yet with no malice toward persons, it will continue to fight wicked institutions and tendencies and to stimulate righteous possibilities with all the vigor it can command.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New Orleans, March 30.—Lincoln's greatest strength in his famous debates with Douglas lay in his insistence that the real issue was whether slavery was right or wrong. "That is the issue," he said, "that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles which have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of

humanity, and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle, in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, 'You work and toil and earn bread, and I'll eat it.' No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle." It was this boiling down of the question to the eternal struggle between right and wrong which gave his speeches strength to withstand all the fiery darts of his keen adversary.

Underlying the best speeches in the recent woman suffrage meeting in New Orleans—and there were many very able speeches during that meeting—there was the same insistence that the reform proposed is at bottom a question of right and wrong. This appeal to ultimate principles gave to these speeches, as it always does in any cause, an earnestness, an elevation of tone, a spirit of unselfishness and of devotion to humanity such as are rarely found in similar gatherings. Even opponents of the doctrine of woman suffrage could not fail to feel the fine enthusiasm that pervaded the meetings. No one could leave without having received new impulses to stand up and do something in this or in some other good cause, "in honor of the helpers of mankind."

We do not mean to say that there were lacking speeches which met definite arguments with definite arguments. There were old, familiar arguments in old familiar words and old arguments in new words and some new thoughts infused into old words; but, as I have said, back of all special arguments and back of all the details of facts there was the assurance of faith that the cause was right and just. I do not believe I should be wrong in saying that the keynote of the convention was the right of each human soul to self-government and self-development, and that this right depends upon equal rights.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

An extraordinary vote in favor of land values taxation was cast on the 27th in the British House of Commons, upon the second reading of a bill empowering municipalities to

adopt the single tax method of raising local revenues.

The bill in question had been introduced by Dr. Macnamara, the Liberal member for North Camberwell. It was backed also by the influence of such members as John Dillon, Mr. Burns, Dr. Douglas, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Robson, J. H. Whitley and Mr. Trevelyan, who, more than a month ago, assisted Dr. Macnamara in having his bill made a special order for March 27th. In an explanatory interview, published at that time in the *New Age of London*, Dr. Macnamara said:

Nothing is more urgent than the taxation of land values. At present the burden of communal expenditure is grievously heavy upon the occupying tenant; and it is bound to grow heavier and heavier. Meantime the ground landlord is the residuary legatee of the value of our rate-expenditure [local, as distinguished from imperial, expenditures]. We must tax him to find new revenues for our housing and other schemes. . . . Every municipal council, whether it be Tory or Liberal, is keen on the problem. It daily sees the glaring injustices of the present system. If social reformers on every municipal Council would put down a resolution for their next Council meeting in favor of the principle of my bill, the result would surprise many people. Then there are two or three associations for the reform of the land system. They too ought to lend a strong hand. We have a month. Wonders can be worked in that time.

Wonders were worked. When Dr. Macnamara's bill came forward on the 27th, pursuant to the order made by the House a month before, the leader of the Liberal party, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and all his lieutenants in parliament, supported it; the solicitor general for Scotland in the last Liberal ministry, making a radical speech in its favor, while many Tories and Liberal-Unionists abandoned their party to vote for it. In the Liberal party, not only did the leaders support the bill, but it was treated rather pointedly as a party measure. It came within only 13 votes of passage.

Regarding the importance of this vote the London correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News* cables the following which appeared in that paper on the 28th:

Political specialists regard the vote in the House of Commons last night by