

### The Company He Keeps.

In criticizing Mr. Roosevelt for the New York Republican platform, it is but fair to recognize the plea of his friends. No Republican leader could be expected to take so pronounced a stand in New York for progressive measures as in a progressive State. But due allowance being made for those circumstances, what is to be said of Mr. Roosevelt's letter of September 30, written from The Outlook office, in which he congratulates Congressman William E. Humphrey of Seattle upon his renomination, and says: "For the sake of the people of Washington, as well as for the sake of the country as a whole, I hope you will be returned." Naturally Congressman Humphrey is using that letter now to promote his re-election. And who is Congressman Humphrey? He is a defender of the Aldrich-Payne-Taft tariff bill, which Mr. Roosevelt professes to despise. He is a defender of Cannon, the "Iron Duke of American politics," as he called Cannon in a glowing tribute at the Washington State convention recently. He opposed the nomination for Senator of Miles Poin-dexter, the Republican progressive. He won his own renomination, for which Mr. Roosevelt is glad, by barely defeating a progressive Republican; and he can be returned, as Mr. Roosevelt hopes he will be, only by defeating a progressive Democrat. If Mr. Roosevelt is truly what he makes his confiding friends think him—a progressive Republican who uses the soft pedal for progress in the State of New York because local conditions make it advisable—why does he use so loud a pedal for the other tune in the State of Washington?

\* \* \*

### Chicago Newspapers.

Assured of our error regarding the Chicago newspapers (p. 939), we should be glad to make complete amends were it not that these assurances, all from excellent sources, are almost as conflicting with one another as with our original hints. One thing seems certain, however, and that is that the Chicago Evening Post has not been bought by the Tribune, but is paddling its own canoe as the penny pioneer fighter, and satisfactorily, too. The fact appears also to be that the Tribune and the Record-Herald have adopted their penny price in order to force Hearst's Examiner to "go up"—to two cents or "the flue." So the penny fight is not a free-for-all between the Chicago papers, but a combination fight against Hearst. Rumor has it—but we mustn't be too tolerant of rumors—that The Tribune has cut deeply into the Hearst circulation, that the Hearst papers won't allow the newsdealers to cut down former orders, and that the

Record-Herald—really the best newspaper in Chicago—is playing in the role of the mouse that volunteered to help the cat fight the dog.

+ + +

### "BACK TO THE LAND."

Since Bishop Nulty of Meath uttered this slogan, and Henry George gave it currency some twenty years ago, it has taken on different meanings.

"Back to the land" may mean "back to the soil," away from the cities and towns and back to the farms. Had it been current in Horace Greeley's time, that might have been its meaning to him; for "back to the soil," the free soil at the American frontier of his day, was what he intended by his once famous but now obsolete advice: "Go West, young man, go West!" Such, too, is its meaning to most of the popular speakers and writers of the present time from whose lips the phrase falls or from whose pens it flows.

It is part of its meaning also with those to whom the venerable Irish bishop's words are pregnant with a broader significance, a significance more comprehensive and modern, one better suited to the fact that the land is vitally necessary to all industry,—not alone to the primitive in woodcraft or agriculture, but also to the highly specialized and organized in manufactures and commerce.

+

This comprehensive meaning of "back to the land" is clearly recognized in practice by your business man, by "capitalistic" classes of every grade. Though they know not the phrase itself in any other sense than popular speakers and writers do—as an allusion merely to agricultural soil—they understand and profit by what is involved in its broader meaning.

That Bishop Nulty meant more than soil when he urged men "back to the land," is plain enough from his memorable address; and it is certain that Henry George meant vastly more.

Henry George meant all that ordinary business men mean when they search for "good locations," that land speculators mean when they boast of their "confidence in the growth of localities," that great capitalists mean when they scheme with governments for grants of "undeveloped" natural resources. He meant all that they mean, and somewhat besides; for whereas their solicitude is for the augmentation of their own fortunes, his was for the individual rights of all the people, together with the conservation of their common wealth.

To Henry George, "back to the land" meant

back not only to the soil, not only to natural resources, not merely to land in even its widest physical significance, not alone from towns and cities to farms, nor by a moderately fortunate few; to him it meant as well, back from the custom of land monopolization, back from the grinding capitalism that land monopoly breeds and nurtures, back from the exploitation of labor, back from poverty in the midst of plenty—from all this, “back to the land” in order to open fair opportunities for the full enjoyment by all the people of all the benefits of advancing industrial processes. Not “back to the land” for a primitive life for any; but *forward*, through restoration of the land, to civilized and civilizing lives for all.

+

In associating this comprehensive meaning of “back to the land” with Henry George, there is no thought of chaining so great a gospel to any man’s altar.

Nor indeed is there ever such a thought when we pursue the subject in his name. No appeal is made to him as to one in authority, or to an original inventor or discoverer, or the founder of a cult. With few exceptions was he himself ever so impatient as with contentions for his priority of invention or originality of discovery of the substance of the civilizing message his name is identified with. He never claimed it as his own, and never so regarded it. He had no other solicitude about it than that the people should see it, understand it, and adopt it as theirs. Whether this were with credit to him or no, was not alone his least concern; it concerned him not at all. The relationship which Henry George regarded himself as holding to the message he proclaimed, was in no wise as of one having authority; it was simply that of an expositor, a teacher, an apostle.

Precisely so in spirit are his words always quoted in these columns, and his activities recalled. Whenever we recall his activities, it is because he was truly a great leader. Whenever we quote his words, it is because his is the best expression of that gospel of “back to the land” which constitutes the substance of the message his eloquence and devotion have made the civilized world listen to.

It is best for its reasoning; best for its completeness in form and its clarity of exposition; best for its wealth of suggestion, for the aptness and effectiveness of its practical proposals, and for their adaptability to institutional differences of time and place; best for its simple eloquence, its heart-felt appeal, for the common sense that characterizes every part, and for its consistency as a whole.

There is no idle or worshipful boast in this superlative estimate of the expression Henry George gave to the substance of that message.

Among the intelligent of every country and class, he can no longer be either over praised or depreciated with effect. For, scattered broadcast now, the message as he delivered it may be read by every one, and each may form a personal judgment.

To all intelligent persons who take the pains to do this, our estimate is submitted as an impersonal and moderate statement of fact.

+ + +

### HENRY GEORGE, JR.\*

It is nearly thirty years since Henry George, Jr., a candidate now for Congress from New York, first saw and first heard in public speech a man then hardly known who has since risen to high political power by renouncing the economic faith he at that time adhered to, and which is still Mr. George’s faith and the platform on which he is making his Congressional campaign.

+

It was at a dinner of the Free Trade Club of New York City, and in the early '80s. Parke Godwin, Captain Codman and other veteran free traders were among the speakers; and at the guest table where they assembled there was a single vacant chair. It remained vacant until the eating was over and the speaking had got well under way, when a bustling young man came pressing through the party to that table of honor at the far end of the room and took that empty chair.

He seemed the younger for the white heads about him. On his nose were eye glasses, and he showed his teeth. But what made this striking man most striking in that company of free traders whose doctrines committed them to peace, and where plain evening dress prevailed, was the fact that he wore soldier clothes.

That was really less out of place, however, than it seemed. A member of the “National Guard”—the official name for the organized citizen soldiery of New York—he had come over to the dinner from a drill at his regimental armory.

“I asked one of the club members,” Mr. George has explained, “who this confident-mannered young man might be; and I was informed that his name was Theodore Roosevelt, that he was one of the most active members of the Free Trade Club, that he belonged to an aggressive little band of wealthy young men of the region of Gramercy Park,

\*A portrait of Mr. George goes with this issue of The Public as a supplement.