

might bring on all sorts of woes. The remedy is easy. Let the government forbid Mr. Bryan to make a speech, or, still better, deport him at once after he lands in Manila.

MISCELLANY

CAMPING SONG.

Has your dinner lost its savor?
Has your greeting lost its cheer?
Is your dally stunt a burden?
Is your laughter half a sneer?
There's a medicine to cure you,
There's a way to lift your load,
With a horse and saddle and a mlie of open road.

Is your eyeball growing bilious?
Is your temper getting short?
Is this life a blind delusion,
Or a grim, unlovely sport?
There's a world of health and beauty,
There's a help that cannot fail,
In a day behind the burros on a dusty mountain trail.

Come out, old man; we're going
To a land that's free and large,
Where the rainless skies are resting
On a snowy mountain marge.
When we camp in God's own country,
You will find yourself again,
With a fire and a blanket and the stars upon the plain!
—Bliss Carman, in The Reader Magazine.

FOR WHAT WOULD ROCKEFELLER TAKE?

Marshall P. Wilder, the story teller, says that he had a dream the other night, in which he entered into business with Mr. Rockefeller, selling potted plants. The business did not thrive, and after it became apparent that the venture would not prosper, Mr. Rockefeller suggested a dissolution of partnership and a division of the assets, Wilder taking the pots and plants. At this juncture, the innocent bystander interrupted to inquire what Rockefeller took. Surely he must have gotten something as his share. And he did. "He took the earth."—Milwaukee Daily News.

TOLSTOY IS WRITING A BOOK ON GEORGE'S TEACHINGS.

An extract from a recent interview with Leo Tolstoy at his estate of Yasnaya Polyana, by Joseph Mandelkern, as published in the New York Times of August 20.

Hardly had the greetings been exchanged when Tolstoy plunged into talk about Henry George and his theories.

"That's the greatest man your country ever produced," he said. "I am writing a book now about his teachings. It is just what Russia wants. It is the only thing that can save us. What use have we for a constitution? The people are not ripe for

it. We must have a Czar, but one who knows his business—a man who knows not only what to do, but in what order to do everything."

Five times he repeated the same phrase, accentuating his words by swinging the heavy stick on which he was leaning while walking:

"A man who knows what to do first and what to do next!"

Then he began to ask questions, first about the children of George, if they were following in the footsteps of their father; then about the City Government of New York, the details of which he seemed to be quite familiar with.

"You had a good Mayor in Low," he said. "Why didn't you keep him in office? Why did you let in Tammany?" (He called it "the Society Tammanee.")

POST-OFFICE PATERNALISM.

A letter from Erving Winslow, Secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League, to the Washington Post.

Those who are deeply interested in democratic institutions must regard with particular apprehension the enthusiasm for "doing things" which are good in themselves, irrespective of the principle involved and the precedents established in doing them.

The imaginative and philosophical judge, Mr. Chief Justice Holmes, struck an admirable note in pointing out the fact that absolute obedience to law is of supreme importance, since, for the very reason that the law is a technical and conventional establishment founded on the consent of the community, the law-abiding element is the only security for a democracy. Hence an evil method for the pursuance of good, that is, lawbreaking to accomplish some apparently desirable end with speed and thoroughness, is a grave crime against the republic.

It is not denied that the action of the post-office authorities in interfering with the mail of shysters and rogues accomplishes much good, but is this kind of paternalism consistent with the common law and with the constitutional rights of the people of the United States?

The post-office is not a judicial department; it is not an authorized censor of morals. Is there any defense for the course which is apparently practiced by Mr. Cortelyou and his subordinates in investigating men's affairs, in formulating decisions without any hearing and authorized process of inquiry, in condemning their

business, and refusing the mail service to those who are thus tried, judged, condemned and executed with practically no recourse?

What justification is there for these methods which might not be pleaded to support, in a similar course, the postmaster, who, being a good Protestant, might regard Roman Catholic propaganda as dangerous and immoral; or, being a devout Catholic, might hold the same views regarding Protestant literature? Were he a strict temperance advocate, after the school of Mrs. Hunt, maintaining that alcohol is the root of all evil, he would, of course, proceed to suppress all mailing matter which recommended intoxicating drinks; or, on the other hand, being a believer in genuine temperance and one to whom the total abstinence propaganda seemed vicious and dangerous, he would feel authorized to exclude it from the mails!

Scores of illustrations might be cited of cases in which what seems meat to one man seems poison to another, where a conscientious Postmaster General might feel himself called upon to discriminate in this autocratic fashion, not to speak of the possible abuse of this power by a not wholly impossible functionary who was not conscientious, but who might use this extraordinary authority for personal or political ends, such as some of us held to be the case in the interference with Mr. Edward Atkinson's mail three years ago.

Is not this subject one of those to which that vigilance, which is the safeguard of liberty, should arouse the press and the public?

TOLSTOY AND HENRY GEORGE.

An editorial by W. M. Reedy, in the St. Louis Mirror of August 24.

Count Leo Tolstoy's letter to the London Times, published August 1st, in which he sets forth the Henry George land theory as the one thing which, put into practice, will do most to remedy the wrongs of the Russian people, has stirred the world of thinkers. Whatever other queer views Tolstoy may have, his views on the land question are sound and clear; as clear and sound as the same principles were when Herbert Spencer embodied them in his original edition of "Social Statics," Chapter IX., only to eliminate them from all future editions without ever giving an adequate explanation for his action.

The land belongs to all the people. There can be no private owner-