

the morale of a people it has served a real purpose. In India this beneficent influence has been partly counteracted by the spiritual limitations of both Buddhism and Brahminism and the dead pessimism of the concepts.

IT may mean little to the average man to say that a real philosophy of life has yet to be born. This philosophy will concern itself, not alone with individual conduct and morals, but with social conduct and morals. The word "vision," as used in the Bible, connotes a philosophy that is far more inclusive than what we comprehend in the ordinary religious tenets. A real vision would reveal the essential character of natural law and the necessity of conforming our institutions to its requirements. And this will be clear to those who have caught a glimpse of the Georgeist philosophy. No wonder in view of this vision that he has set before us that we grow impatient with those who would reduce this philosophy to purely fiscal terms. It cannot be done and should not be attempted.

WHAT is the teaching embodied in this philosophy? How explain the frustrated ideals that bestrew the modern world? The War to End War, the League of Nations, the Russian Experiment, the Land Fight of Lloyd George, and the lesser dreams that have come to naught—even the mistaken policies of the New Deal and its early disastrous ending? It is clear that something has been left out, something forgotten. That something is Freedom. In all the futile planning, this experimentation with political forms, these makeshifts which promise so much, there is no hope.

THE hope is in Freedom—economic freedom, the destruction of those barriers which fence men out from the natural resources of the earth, which seek to penalize human effort, which erect barriers between nations, which punish production with fines we call taxes, which teach the false doctrine to which we have referred, that the well-to-do owe anything to the less fortunate and should be mulcted in accordance with their "ability to pay."

THERE is nothing in the world worth while but freedom. This is the solution of all questions, the settlement of all difficulties. It is the only truth the natural law recognizes. It is indeed the law of God. All perplexities vanish before it—all the mists are cleared away. Such progress as we have attained, political, social, cultural, are its offspring. Its children are the children of light, its fruit are the fruits of plenty. No matter with what persuasiveness, nor with what sonorous utterances, the contrary may be uttered, the law of Free-

dom will not be denied. It is proof even against the dulcet tones of those temporarily elevated as strange misfits to positions of power.

"Let George Do It"

A SLOGAN IN A NOTABLE CAMPAIGN

OF TENTIMES little things occur which will recall big moments in history. It may be a casual conversation or an inconspicuous news item; and the depth to which it will delve into our memories depends on the extent to which we may have participated in their occurrence. There can be but very little doubt among Georgeists that the election of Henry George, Jr., to membership in the United States House of Representatives (the 62 Congress) was a memorable moment in the history of the Single Tax movement.

In the *New York Sun* of April 27, 1938, nearly two columns were devoted in the news of the proceedings of a session of the New York State Constitutional Convention assembled at the State Capitol in Albany to write the State Constitution. Squeezed in, most inconspicuously, near the very end, was the following:

"William S. Bennet, Republican of New York, would exempt intangible personal property from taxation."

This was the news-reporter's way of saying in a few words that Mr. Bennet had offered and was therefore sponsoring an amendment to the Constitution to that effect, which for Mr. Bennet is quite laudable and in fact should be applauded, though very softly perhaps, by Single Taxers. It is impossible to conceive of a Georgeist who would not work for the adoption of such an amendment. An ever increasing number of people who have in recent years become tax-conscious would equally subscribe to its approval. It would not require a preponderance of evidence to prove that of all the silly, unjust, unscientific, impractical and uncollectable forms of taxation now cluttering up our statutes, the intangible personal property tax could easily win a first prize. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to hope for the adoption of this amendment.

Now, why the pianissimo applause of Single Taxers? It is curious how vigorously our opponents, especially the paid ones, will oppose most any forward step, whether it be ballot reform, tax reform, or any other reform, it happens to have our sponsorship or even our tacit approval. To them just one simple point stands out—"Single Taxers are behind it—it is another of their entering wedges." Yet another reason for the soft applause? If Mr. Bennet knew how acceptable his proposal is to Single Taxers, he might not be "so happy about the whole thing"; for it is a belated admission of conversion. Mr. Bennet's amendment cannot fail to remind the old time

of Mr. George's election, twenty-eight years ago. It was none other than this selfsame Mr. Bennet who lost his seat in the Congress to "our own Harry" as he was affectionately called by his family and intimate friends.

The high-lights of that campaign should interest those who, by reason of their tender age, were not privileged to participate in such an outstanding accomplishment. Truly, an event in history.

The present method of nomination by direct primary (so-called) was not then in vogue. Nominees were designated by the District and County leaders of political parties. It was, therefore, obligatory to approach these leaders to advance the qualifications and prospects of election in behalf of Henry George, Jr. Without intending to minimize the credit due to those who were instrumental in obtaining the nomination, it is only fair to say that it was not difficult to obtain. The district, in which the candidate was a bonafide resident, was regarded as "safely and hopelessly Republican." To elect a Democratic candidate there meant the over-turn of a normal 3,500 Republican party majority.

In 1910, the year of the Campaign, the 17th New York Congressional district was located in Manhattan Borough and extended roughly on the west side from 125th Street to the north tip of the Island. The district embraced the West Harlem, Washington Heights and Dyckman sections of the city. The conglomerate population included middle-class and poor. Race, creed and color were amply represented. At that time it was the largest Congressional district in the city for area and population. There were 56,513 votes cast by the two major parties alone, an electorate equivalent to that of many good sized cities; roughly, 200,000 inhabitants.

The committee was duly organized with the usual quota of officers. Headquarters were selected, and six weeks before election the campaign got under way with full team ahead. Someone had to be in constant attendance at the lone desk in the Headquarters to answer the telephone, greet visitors, and act as general buffer when required; to coordinate dates and places for meetings and designate the requisite number of speakers. For this job the narrator was selected. It will have to be noted right here that henceforth only a very few names will be mentioned and those only for human interest in the narration; and for the further reason that it would be necessary to include the entire roster of active Single Taxers, in and about the City of New York and distant places.

Perhaps the first important (?) telephone message was from the Secretary of the Speakers' Bureau of the County Committee. The latter portion of this high-sounding name was the official cognomen for Tammany Hall. The message was to inquire how many speakers the Bureau should designate to the services of the Congressman-to-be, to which the answer was, "we will let you know." Our Campaign Committee actually func-

tioned daily—either in the downtown offices of one of the Committee men, or at uptown Headquarters, and often at both places. These meetings were conscientiously attended, and all matters were discussed in detail; among other things, the Speakers' Bureau question came up. The mere mention of it signalized the customary vituperation of Tammany's arch foes. Naturally, we could have no possible need for the usual variety of "spell-binders" and "wind-jammers" who could in no wise be depended on to intelligently discourse on taxation and the tariff. Furthermore, the kind of speakers they would assign were campaign-fund participants at the rate of \$5.00 per night. This would have been out of the question since there was no such provision in our budget. Besides, it proved most unnecessary to employ that caliber of speaker, for without the slightest exaggeration, we were blessed with a veritable plethora of Single Taxers who came to Headquarters every evening, anxious to accept any assignment. Practically all of our speakers, after the conclusion of the evening "cart-tail" meetings would return to Headquarters to report the reception accorded them, and also the nature of questions asked by the proverbial hecklers. As is well known to us all, Single Taxers in general welcome questions while speaking, not only because they know the answers, but appreciate the tremendous assistance they prove to be in enabling them to go on and on and on, to the point of almost loss of voice.

The mention of "cart-tail" meetings, in such general use at that time, may require some explanation. Horse-drawn open-bodied trucks, during the afternoon, were driven through the streets of the district with appropriate banners and legends extolling the merits of the candidate, with cow-bells hung between the racks of the truck to attract attention. After school hours boys would ride on the trucks and with tin pans and most any other available hardware accessories add to the din of the cow-bells. At nightfall these trucks would be assigned to prominent street intersections to serve as platforms for our orators.

Speaking of appropriate banners brings to mind one that was used. It read: "Bennet Can't Reduce the High Cost of Living; Let George Do It." The last portion of the sentence at that time had the commonly accepted meaning of passing a responsibility or duty to another. To add to their interest, these banners were frequently changed with other trite and succinct legends.

Then one day a suggestion came forward to challenge Mr. Bennet to a debate on the "High Cost of Living and the Tariff." The Committee forthwith forwarded a written challenge, the debate to take place not later than a given date, agreeable to both sides. We had every confidence in Mr. George's ability to masterfully debate the question; nonetheless we were somewhat apprehensive. Mr. Bennet was an orator, impressive in personality and stature and it was difficult to foretell the sort

of impression Mr. George's style of speaking would make on a political audience against Mr. Bennet's adroit use of words.

Every day for two weeks Mr. Bennet's headquarters were contacted by telephone for an answer to the challenge, but he never seemed to be available and no one could say where he might be located. Day by day we became more convinced that Mr. Bennet was stalling and perhaps equally apprehensive, but for wholly different reasons. Mr. George's strength was in his inherited and generally respected knowledge of the subject. This seemed quite enough to make Mr. Bennet justifiably nervous to meet him in debate. So, we concluded, he was evading us. This brought forth new banners for our roving trucks: "Has Anybody Here Seen Bennet—Why Doesn't He Debate with George?" which will be recognized as paraphrasing the then popular song, "Has Anybody Here Seen Kelly, Kelly With the Green Necktie?" Even this did not bring Mr. Bennet out of hiding long enough to get his answer, but it did produce the Hon. Alexander Brough, then State Senator, and later a City Magistrate, who, in the capacity of Mr. Bennet's Campaign Manager, called on the telephone to say the reason they would not accept the challenge was because his side would not have a fair chance, since we would fill the hall with Tammany hoodlums and howl his side down. On our end of the phone this produced a smile and a prompt rejoinder; first it should not have taken all this time to conjure up such a poor excuse; second, we would be pleased to authorize him to print and distribute all admission tickets and by all means to fill the hall with only Republicans, since it was Republicans we were interested in converting—the others would vote for our candidate in any event. The only answer to this which Mr. Brough could think up was, "Well, anyway, we haven't got the money to pay our share of the cost." All this was strenuously employed by our "cart-tail" orators and audiences readily appreciated why the banners almost screeched out "Has Anybody Here Seen Bennet?" and it received an unprecedented amount of newspaper publicity for a mere local campaign. It was all quite novel, if not smart, coming as it did from amateurs, to compel the old line of practical politicians of both parties to "sit up and take notice." The debate did not take place. Mr. Bennet did not meet Mr. George.

The trucks kept making their daily rounds of the district, and one morning Mrs. Henry George, Jr., telephoned the Headquarters to say how pleased she was, but to warn us that Harry did not like the banners, but to pay no attention to his objections. Soon after this message the Candidate literally burst in through the door of Headquarters to first seek out the author of the signs, and then to demand their removal on the ground that they were "most undignified." Mrs. George's warning was heeded, and of course the Candidate's objections were wholly disregarded.

There were many other things to crop up during the course of the Campaign to make the Candidate difficult to manage. One such outstanding example was his inability to appear at all the indoor meetings for which he was scheduled to make a fifteen minute address. Taking traveling time from place to place into account, it was not unreasonable to expect him to make five or six such appearances nightly. But when the boys who accompanied him would report that only two or three were covered, it was necessary to learn the reason. It appeared that Mr. George would enter the hall to find one of the proverbial "spell-binders" holding forth and he would not budge from the rear until the speaker concluded. The Candidate did not appreciate the fact that the speaker was merely holding the audience for the arrival of candidates and other notables. His innate courtesy and supreme modesty did not permit him to interrupt the speaker on the platform. And wearing his customary black broad-brimmed slouch hat, he was not readily recognized by those in charge of the meeting. It did not take long to cure this situation. Others were assigned to accompany the Candidate to meetings, with definite instructions that upon entering the hall one of them was to gently but forcibly, if necessary, to remove that broad-brimmed hat, while another was to cup his hands and shout: "Three cheers for Henry George!" While the cheering was going on Mr. George was actually pushed forward to the platform and at once was introduced to the presiding officer. When the Candidate reached the street to proceed to the next meeting, he said, "Have you no regard for my feelings?" He was advised that under such circumstances candidates have no feelings. (To prove the extent of Mr. George's modesty, one need only to evaluate his consistent refusal to drop the name as an appendix to his name. He insisted that he was never to be confused with his father.) The following day he requested that others be assigned as escorts in the place of those who were so discourteous the night before. It was indeed sorry that he ever mentioned it, because the substitutes were even more vociferous.

One day a very dignified, stately appearing colored gentleman entered the Headquarters to enquire how the Campaign was progressing. He said he was a great admirer of the Candidate's father, and would consider it a privilege to make a money contribution to the Campaign. He made out a check for a liberal amount, and on reading the signature we recognized him to be the Internal Revenue Collector in one of the New York districts. It betrays no confidence to mention that he was Charles W. Anderson, a highly intellectual gentleman, a Tuskegee graduate, who received his first appointment to office from President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905, and continued in office with only minor interruptions until the advent of the present Roosevelt. Mr. Anderson was a Republican, but he claimed to be a firm believer in Free Trade and ascribed his conversion to the influence

Protection or Free Trade?" by Henry George. Although there was no law then to compel the publication of contributors to campaign funds, Mr. Anderson was told that because of his political affiliation his liberality and support would be treated in confidence. This, he said, would be quite unnecessary. Mr. Anderson was a resident of the district and at several important meetings held in colored sections, he made platform appearances, for he was well and favorably known to his people. There can be no doubt that his influence materially benefited the Candidate. At one of these meetings, Mr. Swan of Chicago, a thorough Single Taxer and able orator, affectionately referred to as the "Black Swan," came to New York especially to address a Saturday-night-before-election Rally in the colored section, at which both Mr. Swan and Mr. Anderson were enthusiastically received.

Another dignitary called at the Headquarters one afternoon, and without much ado said: "I suppose you could use some money in the Campaign Fund." He was advised that it would be most acceptable and was sorely needed. He was at once accorded the use of the lone desk and made out a check for a substantial amount. This man was Francis Lynde Stetson, a member of the famous law firm of Shearman and Sterling, of which Thomas G. Shearman was the head. Mr. Stetson at one time was a law partner of Grover Cleveland. Mr. Shearman was the author of "Natural Taxation," and while regarded as a Single Taxer of the "Limited" variety by orthodox adherents, he was nevertheless a man of forceful and outstanding ability and highly respected. Mr. Stetson later in the Campaign called at the office of Mr. Frederic Cyrus Leubuscher, Treasurer of the Campaign Committee, and very graciously added to his previous contribution.

About two weeks before election day, a voice on the telephone announced that he was "Mr. Halpern, secretary to Commissioner Murphy," none other than Charles J. Murphy, officially titled the Chairman of the New York County Committee of the Democratic Party, but known as the Leader of Tammany Hall. The voice continued: "The Commissioner would like to see your Treasurer at the Hall sometime soon, at his convenience." Mr. Murphy, many years before had been Commissioner of the Dock Department, and as with a Judge, once a Commissioner, always a Commissioner.

That afternoon, at a meeting of our Committee, the possible portent of the message was discussed. We were amateurs in practical organization politics, although several of us had gained some experience in campaigning for the Mayoralty election of the year before which culminated in the election of Justice William J. Gaynor. It is doubtful if the Judge was ever known to be a Single Taxer, though it is safe to assert that the theory had his cordial approval. There were more than a few Single Taxers whose counsel and advice he held in the highest

regard and whose friendship he esteemed. (Calvin Tompkins was his Dock Commissioner. John J. Murphy who was slated to be a Deputy, was astonished when the Mayor swore him in as his Commissioner of the Tenement House Department. Lawson Purdy was his President of the Tax Board; and there were others.) That Mayoralty Campaign gave us a wealth of experience in most everything except "inside" organization politics.

However,—the Treasurer said, "I don't care what he wants, I'll go see him tomorrow morning." One objector declared, "It would never do for you to be seen going into or out of Tammany Hall." Finally the suggestion was advanced that perhaps it would be better if some one other than the Treasurer make the call, someone who would not possess authority to make any commitments or even have official knowledge of our financial condition. So the narrator was delegated to call on Leader Murphy. About mid-morning of the next day he boldly entered the "Hall," then on 14th Street, in the historic old building. Many thoughts and emotions were straining the nerves of one soon to be in "his august presence." Suddenly, there stood the "Boss" promptly recognized from the press cartoons of the day. The tension was unexpectedly relieved by a cordial: "How do you do, how is Richard?" Of all things for this man to ask! It displayed an astounding fund of detailed information. Richard, the younger brother of Mr. George, was quite ill, and thereby was prevented from continuing his participation in the Campaign. Dick had made a number of splendid speeches in several of the Party clubhouses. His oratory was so direct from the heart, and delivered so convincingly, that he was soon in great demand; although he insisted that his only claim to fame, if any, would have to come via the spatula. Before the reference to Dick could be answered, Mr. Murphy continued, "I hope Mr. George doesn't take his brother's illness too hard to interfere in the great campaign he's making up there." By this time fully restored composure elicited the reply: "Well, Commissioner, they are very fond of each other." Mr. Murphy then went on to say that the excellent reports from his Captains showed promising indications of success. "But, Commissioner, do you realize what a tremendous over-turn of votes will be required?" To this he replied, "Don't worry about that; it can be done with the job you are doing. But, what I want to know is, why haven't you asked for some of our speakers to be assigned?" For a moment it seemed that this question was the reason for the meeting. Mr. Murphy was informed that we really had more speakers each and every night than it was possible for us to assign; that they came from all parts of the city, from Westchester, New Jersey and Connecticut; that their whole-hearted labor was one of love for the Candidate and the Cause, and entirely at their own expense. To which he replied, "That's the most remarkable thing I've ever heard," and, "Keep up the good work."

This narration must not be construed to hold any brief for "Boss" Murphy. Yet here is a man, whose early endeavors consisted of navigating a team of horses before a street car; then came a bartending period, to be succeeded by the ownership of a "gin-mill" in the "Gas House District." Numerous instances could be cited wherein the saloon has served as the ladder to fame and power in the "Hall," as witness, Tom Foley and "Big Tim" Sullivan, with not especially savory reputations. Their probable nefarious backgrounds are not their only qualifications for undisputed organization rule. They were not nearly as "hard-boiled" as the cartoonists would have us believe. Convincingly illustrative of this statement is a recital of the real reason for the requested meeting.

Mr. Murphy said that it was customary for all candidates for office, either directly or through their campaign committees, to make the "usual" contribution to the County Committee to defray the expenses of printing, addressing, and mailing of literature. Today, especially in the large cities, to receive in the mail around election time, more than three or four such communications is perhaps extraordinary; but back in 1910, letter boxes were cluttered up for weeks before election with sample ballots, map diagrams of the districts, photo-prints of the candidates with short biographical sketches, etc., etc. It was natural enough to inquire how much money that "usual" contribution would entail. When Mr. Murphy said: "\$10 per election district," his listener was about ready to collapse, but in some manner, probably buoyed by the apparent friendliness of the entire conversation thus far, managed to exclaim: "Commissioner, that means \$1,700. You know we have 170 election districts in the 17th Congressional District," and hurriedly added: "Why, we haven't anything like that in our treasury and not one chance in a million to raise it." After all, no serious consequences could result from such a defense, coming as it did from one without authority, but who could at any moment resort to the requirement of reporting to the Committee. Yet, what gave the defense its greatest strength was the fact that it was absolutely true. The reasonableness or unreasonableness of the assessment was not considered. The one controlling thought was the large amount involved. Upon later reflection, the requested sum could not be construed as exorbitant; there were an average 350 voters in each election district to whom a prodigious amount of literature was distributed. The Assembly and Aldermanic Candidates covering the same districts were similarly assessed. Perhaps impressed, Mr. Murphy said: "I want to help you all I can but I can't afford to be criticized too much by the boys down here, . . . I would like to see your Committee give something toward this expense, even if it's only \$1.00 a district," and, "Do the best you can." Then to indicate that the interview was at an end, said: "I wish you success and give my best wishes to Mr. George for Richard's speedy recovery." The narrator thanked

him and was escorted to the door with a final: "Come any time."

Dwelling to further extent on the "Boss of Tammany" is apt to be interpreted as extolling virtues where none can hardly exist. It will, however, be remiss if no mention is made of the fact that there can be no doubt that Mr. Murphy was justly proud of the success of the battle and thoroughly pleased in having sanctioned the selection of Mr. George for Congress, as a man utterly different type, caliber, and character, from that customarily sponsored by his organization. This will be conclusively shown by the action he took when an abortive attempt was made to interfere with the re-nomination of Mr. George for his second term.

Though it had been a strenuous campaign, not one felt really over-worked when Election Day, November 1910, finally came around. To the contrary, more work turned out that day than on any other; the entire Congressional District never saw nor had so many watchers to look after the interests of one candidate; not one election district, and there were 170 of them, was without a "George Watcher." When that day's work was done the Headquarters resembled a Single Tax Convention as one by one they streamed in with the district tallies which were being cumulatively tabulated. In addition to these faithful workers' reports, we had arranged for a special wire service.

Result: Henry George, Jr., 28,306; Wm. S. Bennett, 26,010. Mr. George's majority, 2,296.

The majority may not appear impressive, but it represented a tremendous reversal of voters in an exceptionally large district, heretofore acknowledged as "safely Republican."

Mr. George took his seat in the House of Representatives, nominally as a Democratic member of the 62nd Congress.

Quoting from the "Single Tax Year Book" (1911) Joseph Dana Miller, its editor, states: "His work in Congress included a notable address on the Single Tax and a report on Taxation in the District of Columbia, which attracted much attention."

His distinguished service on all the Committees of the House to which he was appointed was of such a conscientious nature as to be held in highest esteem by his associates.

In the meantime the district was reapportioned, with some justification, perhaps, because of its overly large population, and since the House was controlled for the first time in years by the Democratic party, it proceeded with a "gerry-mandering" programme to suit their desires. They cut up the 17th Congressional District to accommodate an added Representative, and arranged it so that at least the southerly portion would henceforth be considered safely Democratic, where a nomination would be tantamount to an election. Mr. George remained a resident of the southerly portion, and while not necessarily

quired for his eligibility for re-nomination from the new 1st District, it nevertheless was a factor of considerable weight. In the management of organization politics, claims for political preferment of resident members of the Party must be recognized or met with valid objections; it forms the strong and conversely the weak links in party control; it makes and breaks District Leaders.

A great and sudden desire manifested itself in the breast of one Percival E. Nagle to a coveted seat of respectability in the House of Representatives. Mr. Nagle was then a powerful individual in the Harlem section, not only through a menacing physique, and the employment of strong-arm tactics, but with his official designation as "Executive Member" (otherwise known as "District Leader"), did not expect to encounter any obstacles in his demand for the Congressional nomination for himself. Mr. Nagle felt he was entitled to the nomination simply because he wanted it, irrespective of personal disqualification. He knew full well that the "gerrymandered" district would not require any campaigning; that personal public appearances and speeches would be unnecessary, except to the dives and hangouts of his cohorts, where, along with himself, they were regular habits. There, his speech could be confined to promises of illicit protection, the principal words in his limited vocabulary. Such a speech was actually delivered by him in the presence of Mr. George, very, very much to the Candidate's consternation.

Much to his astonishment and eventual effacement, his demands were rejected by the "Boss" on substantial grounds. First, Mr. George was entitled to renomination for the remarkable feat of placing the district in the Democratic column, and was a resident of the district. Secondly, Mr. Nagle occupying a seat in the House of Representatives would put even Mr. Murphy to shame. In consequence of this eminently fair decision, Henry George, Jr., was re-nominated for his second term in Congress.

Despite the assurances for re-election it was nevertheless decreed by the management, that so long as the excellent opportunity for Single Tax propaganda existed, full advantage should be taken to spread the gospel. In both Campaigns, the "Democratic Party Handbook" was totally disregarded by our speakers. These Handbooks are intended to supply the party-hack variety of pell-binders with points and arguments to convert voters. They also contain sample speeches, which, in many instances, are memorized. It is, therefore, quite apparent that interruptions by hecklers seriously disarrange the thoughts of the "five-dollar-per-night-speaker." Invariably, by rule of thumb, the unison call of "Put him out" either quiets the heckler or results in his ejection.

Without exception, all of our speakers depended entirely upon their knowledge, gained from their only text-books, "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade?" Their coaching on what to talk about was wholly confined

to the stereotyped instructions, "Go out and give them straight Single Tax and the Tariff." And they did.

The results of the second campaign was as follows: Henry George, Jr., 13,189. Martin Anson, 5,265.

And for the second time they "Let George Do It."
(July 27, 1938)

JOS. HIRAM NEWMAN.

School Issues Report for First Half of Year

THE following figures tell the story of the growth of the School work. In an educational endeavor of this kind it is impossible to record its real value and import in statistics. No one recognizes more than do the instructors and class secretaries—who, after all, constitute the School—that the number of enrollments is an inadequate measure of the spread of the knowledge of fundamental economics. Somehow the truth has a way of circulating its way by the word-of-mouth method, and there is no known measure of this radiation. Nevertheless, it needs the constant stimulant of more classes, and the surer direction of thorough education.

The following figures are not complete, for the Extension Department reports that it has not received the records from eleven classes conducted this Spring in Cleveland, Ohio; four in Newark, N. J.; three in Cincinnati, Ohio, one in Omaha, Nebraska, and one in New Castle, Penn. The reports from these twenty classes should materially increase the totals.

Correspondence Course: Jan. 1 to June 30, 1938, 2,055. Total enrollments: 4,535. New York City Classes: Jan. 1 to June 30, 1938, 1,861. Total enrollments, 6,450. Number of Spring Classes, 32.

Extension Department: Jan. 1 to June 30, 1938, 2,862. Total enrollments, 10,080. Number of Spring Classes, 92. Grand total: Total Spring enrollments, 6,678. Total School enrollments, 21,065. Total number graduates, 8,835.

"COME with me," said Richard Cobden, as John Bright turned heart-stricken from a new-made grave. "There are in England women and children dying with hunger—with hunger made by the laws. Come with me, and we will not rest until we repeal those laws."

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

NOW, moreover, on the principle which you declare that "to the state the interests of all are equal, whether high or low," will you justify state aid to one man to buy a bit of land without also insisting on state aid to another man to buy a donkey, to another to buy a shop, to another to buy the tools and materials of a trade—state aid in short to everybody who may be able to make good use of it or thinks that he could?

THE CONDITION OF LABOR, BY HENRY GEORGE.