

"taxes," and "imports," and "licenses," and "tariffs," and I don't know what besides, and think they do them all a lot of good."

"Well," said Zeus, "if they are so foolish as that, how are they to know how much to charge for each lot that people keep vacant?"

"Minerva turned away to hide a smile. She said, 'I am the goddess of wisdom, and I will tell them to charge for every piece just what it's worth.'

"Zeus said: 'Minn, you're always springing some new-fangled, far-off scheme on me, and I've no time to discuss panaceas for the woes of men. What I want to do is to really help those people out of their troubles, so just start them a Sunday-school to make them more resigned.'—P. 183.

J. D. M.

#### \*A WORK BY CLARENCE DARROW.

A few books have so clearly and exhaustively treated their subjects that anything more that is said is merely emphasis or amplification. Such are John Stuart Mill's "Subjection of Women," and Anna Kingsford's "Perfect Way in Diet on Vegetarianism." To these Clarence Darrow has added "Resist not Evil," on State punishment for breach of law.

Any one may refuse to accept the reasoning of these books: but no one can fail to recognize the lucidity and completeness of the argument. For this reason it is difficult to review such a book—the only complete review would be an abstract of the chapters.

Mr. Darrow, a lawyer experienced in criminal cases, has compiled a brief, plainly setting forth the principles of non-resistance, and tracing the effects of action by the state based on its denial. He shows that "punishment has absolutely no effect to lessen crime," that "the mental actions of man have been shown to be as much due to law and environment as his physical health,—certain sections of the world are indigenous to men who kill their fellows; and more than this, certain portions produce men who kill with guns, others who kill with a knife, others still who administer poison. In certain sections, the chief crime is horse stealing; in others, running illicit distilleries; again, burglary; in some places, poaching; sometimes, robbery; and again, smuggling. A study of conditions would reveal why each of those crimes is indigenous to the particular soil that gives it birth, and just as draining swamps prevents the miasma, so a rational treatment of the condition caused by the various crimes would cure them, too. If our physicians were no more intelligent than our lawyers,

when called to visit a miasmatic patient, instead of draining the swamp, they would chloroform the patient and expect thus to frighten all others from taking the disease."

"Men," he says, "would not steal sheep if they had land on which to raise mutton."

On the causes of crime, Darrow speaks as one who through God-like love has acquired God-like power so that "he seeth the heart."

It is to be wished, perhaps, that there were more emphasis and amplification of the chapter on the Remedial effects of Punishment, which might be more accurately called Preventative Effects of Punishment. Perhaps the author feared that to speak of its preventative effects might be taken for a ghastly joke.

It appears to me, however, that Mr. Darrow sometimes falls into the error of speaking to the animal and mental man from the standpoint of the spiritual man. He almost assumes that no one wishes to be revenged upon law breakers, whereas that is exactly what most persons do want, as is shown by the fact that the husband or the father of the alleged victim usually triumphantly lights the bonfire at which negroes accused of assaults on women are burnt. However, it is necessary first of all to lift up the standard and the world has need of the idealist, even though it believes that ideals are dangerous.

Those who wish to read further on this subject, or who find their interest in the subject languid, should read Oscar Wilde's "Ballad of Reading Gaol," and Ingersoll's "Crimes against Criminals." But if you believe that any one should ever punish anybody for anything, don't read this book, my brother. It will hurt your head with a new idea.

BOLTON HALL.

#### ESSAYS BY A. J. OGILVY.

We have received from the Land Nationalization Society of London a pamphlet by A. J. Ogilvy, consisting of short, pithy essays, on some of the mooted questions of political economy. Alfred Russell Wallace has spoken of Mr. Ogilvy as "an original thinker and acute reasoner." Certainly this is commendation from a high source, and a reading of these essays—clear, pointed, suggestive—do much to justify the commendation. On only a few points would we take issue with Mr. Ogilvy. Of such is his advocacy of the landlord's claim to compensation. Such claim possesses a certain reasonableness only where land nationalization proposes forcible expropriation.

"If compensation," says Mr. Ogilvy, "means that the victims of the wrong are to pay the doers of it for merely ceasing to do it then it is absurd indeed." Yet this is precisely what is involved in the claim

\*Resist Not Evil," by Clarence S. Darrow. Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. Cloth price, 75c.

of compensation. The wealth collected from the producers for the use of land is an annually recurring levy upon the labor and capital of the community; it is not something that is done and consummated, but something that will be done over and over again. Shall the owners of land be compensated for being denied the privilege of doing this next year, or the year after? And if the state shall decide next year that part of this economic rent, say twenty per cent, since a beginning must somewhere be made—shall be paid into the public treasury (which is the only real solution of the land question, and is, of course, the one favored by Mr. Ogilvy), how shall the land-owner be compensated? Shall it be by remitting half of the proposed tax? The absurdity of the suggestion is too self-evident, and it ought to be clear upon reflection that the whole question of compensation is not a practical one.

There are nearly a score of essays in this little pamphlet, and all will repay reading.

J. D. M.

### News—Domestic

CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.—(Special Correspondence—Ralph Hoyt.)—Though the result of the California State election in November last was not what Single Taxers hoped for, it was a very thin victory for the party of plutocracy and plunder. The head of the ticket was "counted in" by only about two thousand majority, and had it not been for certain complicated, ridiculous and pernicious provisions contained in the printed ballots (which, of course, militated against the Democratic ticket, and caused thousands of ballots to be thrown out), Franklin K. Lane, the candidate for Governor on the Democratic ticket, would have been declared elected, and California would have had a genuine Democratic Single Tax Chief Executive in the Gubernatorial chair for the next four years. As it is, however, the result shows a terrible falling off in the Republican vote since four years ago, when the majority for Gage, candidate for Governor on the so-called Republican ticket, was nearly twenty thousand. Added to this falling off as to the head of the ticket the P. O. P. (Party of Plunder) lost three Congressmen, instead of electing a solid delegation of eight, as was the case four years ago.

Another and still more significant feature of California politics this year is the city election in Los Angeles, which occurred one month later than the State contest. The outcome of that hotly contested struggle was very encouraging to citizens who want good government, and are determined to have it.

Mayor M. P. Snyder was the Democratic candidate for re-election, and the principal interest of the campaign was centered on

him. Next to him in importance was the question of the adoption or rejection of several charter amendments for city government which were of vital interest to every citizen. The amendments were in the direction of needed reform. Snyder was elected Mayor by nearly three thousand plurality, and some of the amendments to the city charter were adopted by a large majority.

The direct legislation amendment provides for both the initiative and the referendum. It gives fifteen per cent. of the legal voters the right to propose an ordinance and cause its submission to the people, in case the city council fails to pass it without alteration. Seven per cent. of the voters may invoke the referendum upon any ordinance passed by the Council, and thereby force its submission to the people for ratification or rejection. Any number of ordinances may be voted upon at any election, but not more than one election can be held in any period of six months. Furthermore, the people may retire any elected officer whose course is unsatisfactory. This can be done by a petition signed by twenty-five per cent. of the electors, asking the council to call a special election. The name of the objectionable officer must appear on the ballot as a candidate, unless he declines. The candidate receiving the highest number of votes is to be declared elected.

It is said that Los Angeles is the first city in the world to adopt this reform measure, though it will probably not long be the only one. The direct legislation amendment received the largest majority of any one of the fifteen amendments submitted, the figures showing 12,846 affirmative votes and only 1,042 negatives.

The result of the proposition to thus amend the city charter has since led to the formation of a "Direct Legislation League of California," with Dr. John R. Haynes, of Los Angeles, as president, for the adoption of an amendment to the state constitution providing for direct legislation for the state as a whole, as well as for each county.

Thus it appears that the world does move in the right direction, though very slowly, and only in spots—small spots, too. Meanwhile, the principles of the Single Tax are still alive in Southern California, and are slowly but surely taking hold of people who think independently regarding time-honored superstitions and musty prejudices. No public Single Tax meetings are being held, but people are disposed to read newspaper articles, and other literature with which I supply them, advocating the principles which we believe in. Every few days I hear things from the lips of persons who surprise me by either partially or wholly endorsing the theory of land taxation as the only correct, logical, practicable and just method of raising public revenue.

And the number of men hereabouts who