

how the values could be determined. If they will watch the persons into whose hands the lands will pass they will see that there is not much difficulty in that respect. The fact that they stubbornly refused to bear in mind the ease with which private owners determine such values indicates that they preferred not to see. The names of the 126 who voted to permit monopolization of Alaska were not made a matter of record, but the following spoke against Bailey's preventive amendment: Wingo of Arkansas, Houston of Tennessee, Sherley of Kentucky and Callaway of Texas. These are all Democratic partisans. Perhaps some genuine democrats in their districts may be interested in this information.

S. D.



Senators in Need of Light.

Somewhat remarkable is an exchange of views between Senators Cummins of Iowa and Chamberlain of Oregon which occurred on January 12, and is recorded on page 1914 of the Congressional Record. The subject of discussion was Alaska. Senator Cummins said he had been waiting ever since he became a senator to hear discussed the question of what kind of law to devise that will permit honest settlers "to have their rights, and at the same time will prevent the monopoly which was feared in 1906 with regard to Alaska." For answer Mr. Chamberlain made this strange confession: "I am not sure that there is any power in Congress or anywhere to prevent the monopolization and control of resources such as Alaska has." Mr. Chamberlain need but consult with any of the Singletax Congressmen to learn that there is such power. He need but look over the amendment proposed by Representative Bailey of Pennsylvania to the Alaskan railroad bill to learn how the power should be applied. Senator Cummins will find in Congressman Bailey's proposition an answer to the question for which he has needlessly waited five years. He could have got it on the first day of his term had he looked elsewhere than among his colleagues.

S. D.



Legal Disfranchisement.

Of all the methods devised to deprive the voter of his just share in government, yet giving him the semblance of power, it may be doubted if there is another trick known to the machine politician quite so despicable as the "party declaration" of the Illinois primary law. We have long been accustomed to the disfranchisement of the district, or geographical, system of choosing representa-

tives, and the general election by plurality vote. And it has been recognized that to elect Congressmen from the state at large, or aldermen from the city at large, was grossly unjust. But the districts and wards that were introduced for the purpose of correcting this evil effected little good, for the reason that the party that had a majority in the state or city tended toward a majority in each district or ward; and it invariably resulted in a Congress, or a city council, whose members bore little relation to the votes cast at the election. Proportional representation is urged as a corrective for this evil; but proportional representation is still new to the mass of the people, and they need time to familiarize themselves with a new idea.



The evils of the Illinois primary law, however, are without a solitary excuse. One of the reasons given for the fact that only thirty per cent of the Chicago women who had registered, voted at the last primary—and this percentage was as high as that of the men—lay in the fact that they had been advised to keep away from the primaries unless they had made up their minds as to which party they belonged. The explanation of that strange advice lies in the fact that the Illinois primary law requires that the voter shall not only declare which party he or she "belongs to," but that when such declaration has been made the voter is prohibited from voting any other party ticket for two years.



The reason given by the framers of the bill for such a high-handed proceeding is that it is necessary to prevent the change of voters from election to election, in order to keep the bad men in one party from foisting bad candidates on their opponents. But the practical effect is to keep conscientious voters from the polls, and to compel the less scrupulous to commit perjury, if they would exercise their natural right to change their minds from one election to another. Voting at the election cannot be controlled, because it is secret, and all the candidates are on the same ballot; but the candidates at the primaries being on separate ballots, the voter can exercise the right of suffrage only by taking the ticket of his party, and having his name recorded in the poll books as a member of that party. Such a condition, it must be submitted in all candor, transcends the rights even of our political bosses.



This primary disfranchisement of conscientious and independent voters is merely another reason

for pushing the campaign for the complete enfranchisement of all citizens. The political slave pens—and districts and wards are nothing less—which give us government by a majority of a plurality, must be replaced by general tickets with proportional representation. The primary should be done away with entirely, and nominations made by petition. And the ballot should be short. By electing fewer officials, using preferential voting, the voter will be able to exercise better judgment in choosing his representatives, the sense of responsibility will be greater, and his power more effective. This will not bring the millenium. It will not make stupid voters wise, nor bigoted citizens board-minded, but it will give the people what a majority of the people desire.

S. C.



THE MODERN GOSPEL.

Agès ago a Jewish carpenter preached the Fatherhood of God, the equal Brotherhood of Men, to laborers and fishermen; said if we would but do Justice and practice right living we need no more worry about food and raiment than do bird or beast or flower, and taught His disciples to pray for the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. "The common people heard Him gladly," but Privilege shook with fear, and priests and rulers crucified Him between thieves. Yet His Gospel of Deliverance, spread by fugitives and slaves, roused and revolutionized the world. Then Privilege rallied, prostituted His preaching of Justice into a shield for injustice, and in His name consecrated inequality.

But yesterday another Jew, Joseph Fels, with heart of fire and tongue of flame, sought to teach Christianity to Christians, strove to rouse a sluggish world to realize that the wrongs which enslave women and rob even children, are rooted in land monopoly, and that the sole remedy is that which was indicated by Henry George. His dynamic energy was first felt here and in England; then stirred all Europe, and now Asia, Africa, and the isles have been roused. Now all the world mourns his death and in every city are those who realize they have lost a friend and brother in this Lion of the tribe of Judah who let light into dark places, shook vested wrongs on their thrones, and brought nearer the day Whittier foretold when will

"Earth own at last, untrod
By sect or class or clan,
The Fatherhood of God,
The Brotherhood of Man."

WILL ATKINSON.

WHY IS TAMMANY?

The lesson of the Sulzer incident is neither the wickedness of Tammany Hall nor the weakness of even illustrious men. It is, rather, the unrighteousness, the sociologic crime, of the unholy alliance between Big Business—as with more or less consistent significance we use the term—and the trade of office-getting.

The vice and the power of Tammany Hall have been so widely known and so long established that nothing can add to its disrepute or increase our appreciation of its vicious potency. The rising waves of civic morals and intelligence have lapped the ground of respectability from beneath it until nothing could further shrink the base upon which its apologists must stand. Nothing is needed, nor has there been these fifty years, to lessen the esteem in which it is held by right thinking men and women or to spread the knowledge of its infamy.

Many men of undoubted eminence, undoubted recitude and undoubted abilities, have endeavored to rectify and purify Tammany Hall from within, but the leaven is never sufficient for the loaf. It is beyond leavening. It is beyond curing for the reason that Tammany Hall itself is not the disease; it is only the manifestation of the disease. It is merely the obvious, festering sore.

Upon the other hand, history is replete with the instances of really great and good men who have gone wrong when in positions of public trust.

It is not the great and good men as individuals, as personalities, who will save society. To establish "Thy will on Earth as it is in Heaven," we must ever go back to the God in man. We must revert to the "Heaven" that "is within you." We must recognize, utilize and obey—not as individuals, but as men comprising society—the fundamental, natural laws laid down for social guidance, social order and social justice.

Just as the ordinary, or even less than ordinary, average man, mayhap overburdened with personal shortcomings, may see this great truth, so the personally great, illustrious and virtuous man in power may utterly fail to see it. But it is there, none the less.

Suppose that society's laws were fewer and simpler and the powers of legislators infinitely curtailed. Suppose that the simpler laws rested upon those basic, economic principles of justice which deny to any man the privilege of receiving more than he renders some acceptable form of service for. Suppose that men could not secure by legislative enactment or executive decree any of the special privileges, under special laws, by which