

sued which is still in progress in some parts of the archipelago. . . . There is not an objection against Philippine independence which cannot be applied to the United States. Caciqueism, or the rule of the more ignorant portions of the populace by keen and unscrupulous individuals is frequently alleged as a reason why the United States should retain control of the islands. . . . But the chief of Tammany Hall rules with a more iron hand than any Presidente in the jungles of Luzon, and the career of Abe Ruef as a cacique has never been rivaled in our Asiatic dependency. . . . Above and beyond all, is the moral question involved. President Wilson has smitten with a deadly blow the pernicious doctrine that "they shall take who have the power and they shall keep who can." America's withdrawal from the Philippines, in addition to establishing a new standard in natural ethics, will enshrine us forever in the affection of the 900,000,000 yellow peoples who inhabit the world's largest continent, and who, in days to come, will furnish a tremendous market for the products of Occidental Nations.



Catching Up With Europe.

Sacramento (California) Bee, December 13.—The telegraph and telephone are natural monopolies, and for that reason they should be owned and operated by the government. This is the rule throughout the world. In Europe generally they are branches of the general postal service, and there the charges are much less than in this country. More than that, the restrictions as to the number of words in an ordinary telegraph message are much less narrow than in the United States.



Crimes Against Criminals.

La Follette's Weekly (Madison, Wis.), December 13.—A recent headline in the New York Press announces: "End of torture for women in penitentiary promised." Isn't there volumes of commentary in that brief line upon our dark ages attitude toward the treatment of wrong-doers?



How Public Ownership Works.

Cleveland (Ohio) Press, December 13.—A little ticket, just a slip of pasteboard, . . . A. M. Todd of Kalamazoo bought it in Switzerland for \$27 . . . Todd was over studying the initiative and referendum. Todd wanted to travel throughout the cantons; to go by rail and also by boat. He wanted to be spared the bother of buying a new ticket every time he started for the next place. So Todd went to the government-owned railroad; to the costliest-per-mile roadbed in the world—costliest, because of two great tunnels driven through the granite heart of the Alps—and said: "I want a wholesale price." And they made him one—\$27 for 42 days, the ticket good on any Swiss conveyance and good as many times within that period as Todd wanted to use it—he might have traveled 42 days and 42 nights! The Swiss railroads are good roads. They give a good service. They also give a cheap service. And they serve the public first.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

A LOVING LIFE.

By Augustine Duganne.

Let Love inspire thee, and thy life shall be
 A daily prayer to Heaven for sinful earth:
 For by true Love hath all true virtue birth;
 And He Whose life was Love, shall strengthen thee.
 For Love, like perfume in the floweret's cup,
 Its balmy influence still rendereth up,
 To fill each breeze with sweetness like its own:
 Thus by our loving lives a sway is thrown
 (Even though that sway to us be all unknown)
 O'er many a wanderer in this world of guile;
 And thus a soul may cost us but a smile!
 Let then our Love in loving deeds be shown;
 For, as their fragrance lifts itself alone,
 Be sure that many a heart is lifted thus by Love.



THE SOCIAL UNIT.

From Responsibilities to Rights.

An Address Delivered by Alice Thacher Post Before
 the Women's Single Tax League of the Dis-
 trict of Columbia, December 8, 1913.

I have not come here tonight to make an argument to you; I have not come to try to teach you anything. I am going simply to ask you for a little while to leave behind you the busy matters of daily living, the complicated things, the troublesome things. Let us come to some of the very simple things, as if we were very little children once more.

Come for a little and let us walk in our gardens—yours and mine;—those gardens of our souls where we seem to remember having been when we were very little children—where the flowers grew out of the brown earth, and the little fruit-trees blossomed, and the little animals of the children scampered about; those gardens whither we go now when we want to feel after the simple, elemental laws of life, and obtain visions of their fruitions.

What do we find in these gardens of memories as to the factors which make up our common human life?

We find pleasant human things—little groups, mostly family groups, in which we received protection and comfort. And it seems to us good that family and group responsibilities should exist, covering the weaknesses and errors as well as the immaturities of the younger members, with the strength and wisdom and high purpose of the able and mature.

It is good; let us not deny it. The ideal of it comes from the love of the neighbor—the second great commandment laid upon men. It has come

down to us from immemorial time—the family grouping under a patriarch; the tribal grouping that developed out of it; the civic groupings of the “hundreds” among the Germanic peoples, with their responsibilities to prevent crime in their own “hundreds,” or to recompense for committed crime.

Group responsibility—it is an excellent thing. But where do the fine edges of it come? How do we differentiate out the individual? How protect him from being engulfed in his group?

We are variously sensitive to such engulfment. It has been regarded as a trait of the Germanic peoples that they are sensitive to the need of preserving the rights of the individual as against the state, while the Latin peoples regard the right of the individual as against the state as a matter of small importance. But the right of the individual as against the smaller group is not always clear, partly because the smaller group is usually so beneficent in its administration of the common welfare, and partly because we have advanced only a few steps in the development of a great human political life, and have hardly taken our first step in developing a great economic common life.

Group responsibility, as I said, is an excellent thing. Fundamentally it is a development of love of the neighbor. Gone wrong, it becomes love of dominion over others. The family is its chief minor expression in our modern life. And the family has been regarded, and is still very generally regarded, as the unit of the social life. Now this view of the family is really at the base of all the objections to woman suffrage. The family the social unit—how reasonable! how satisfactory! The family group furnishes a complete whole—the fighting force, the rearing force, the exterior social service, the interior domestic service, the protection of the generation to come. We need find no fault with a social development which took this as one step in its course. It is humane and constructive, and is one step in the long progressions of democracy.

But we are restive. We ask to take another step. How far and how deep may we go for our fundamentals for another step? That first step was good; the love of a man for a woman, and the love of a woman for a man, and the love of both for little children, made the group. And the group was a social unit, having one vote in the social organization of which it made a part—one vote, the man's vote, covering, protecting and expressing the others.

Certainly we found the elements for that group unit back in our memory gardens.

But let us wander back farther and farther, into our old and oldest garden of twilight beginnings. Back in the old Wonderbook we read of it in our childhood. And it is the same garden—the soul of the same garden—that your own memory calls up to you. For the race it lay “eastward in

Eden.” There were folks there—“male and female created he them.” The man and the woman, both were units in the sight of their Maker.

I have said that the group idea was born of the love of the neighbor. What is that love linked to? When it was enjoined upon that ancient democratic people that went up out of Egypt into a garden country, the love of the neighbor was declared to be “like unto” the love of God. And it is to the love of God that we are now getting back.

Now do not for a moment think that when I speak of God I am thinking of a formal autocrat, of a high potentate, of a far-off great person. I am not here to sermonize, but I beg of you that while wandering with me in the gardens of our souls you will each of you look there for whatever there is of God to you in the universe—whether that be the Force which impels all things, whether it be the Life which vivifies all things, whether it be a transcendent Wisdom and a glorifying Love, whether it be a personality which the essence of all that is Divine and all that is human. See this vision of God in your garden, and you will find—as the quaint old story tells—that the very Lord God Himself is walking in your own very garden, “in the cool of the day,” when it is still, and the birds cease calling, and the winds hush among the leaves.

And why do we care to come to the Lord God in our quest?

Because now we want to get even farther and deeper into the heart of things than the love of the neighbor by itself can carry us.

For one thing, we may remember that God knew us as individual units—individual human souls—at the creation, and He knows us so now. However we group ourselves in families in the sight of men, before God we are separate naked souls, each with its own responsibilities.

For another thing, God put the man and the woman who represent the infant life of the race, in the garden, to till it and keep it. Is this an old fairy tale? But it exactly tells the everlasting law of birth into this world. Every unit soul is born upon the earth upon which it must live. Each one of us—born upon this green rich earth, with no differentiation of titles from the Maker of us. With what impudence do we flaunt paper titles in the faces of brethren of common birth-right!

But there is no need of harsh words over this matter. Slowly we have to make progression. Remember that just as all the men now on the earth are your brethren, so also all the men from the beginning down through the sequences of the years have been your brethren. They have been no more evil than you. Land ownership has grown up with civilization, and it was not all born of evil. Greed, love of dominion, love of getting the results of labor without laboring, have not been the only causes of the monopolization of the earth

by a part of its inhabitants, as against an increasing army of the exploited landless. There has also been the recognition that enterprise, pioneer work and faithful industry upon the land should give some permanence of title. And so came confusion as to where justice lay. Now, however, vision is clearing. Now we know how to preserve permanence of tenure and private ownership of the results of enterprise and labor, while preventing monopolization of land—all through a simple use of the taxing power as if it were a rent-collecting agency—taking bare land values for public use, and leaving all else to the labor which produced it. Thanks to Henry George we now know how to do this. And thanks to Henry George and to the remembered words of many of the greatest humanitarians, from Tiberius Gracchus, through church fathers, and the French Physiocrats, and Thomas Carlyle, and our own Emerson, the wrongs involved in the monopolization of land, whether as to its fertile soils and its mineral wealth, or as to its social advantages for business, manufacturing, transportation and habitation, are being generally recognized. With the tools for abolition at hand the end of monopoly of the common inheritance of us all must necessarily follow the recognition of its unrighteousness, as day follows night. The dawn of the day is here; the laborers are already in the fields. The songs of achievement already echo from afar to listening ears.

Now, while men believed that individuals held the right to own the earth as against all *other* individuals, there was nothing in the field of economics to suggest the individual soul as the unit of society. But how different is the case when we recognize equal rights in the earth as our common birthright. Think of it. Every man, every woman, every child, born anywhere on this globe of green earth and blue waters—every child—white, or red, or yellow, or black—equal co-heirs with all others in the earth which was given to the children of men! A foolish little child—girl child, if you will—whose mind has never waked up, has the same rights here as you have and as I have. And we must look to it about that mind that does not wake up. Was its brain starved before it was born? Does not its birthright in the social values of the world, that rest upon the land values, entitle it to the best of surgical and medical inquiry and attention, and pedagogical care, for whatever development science and devotion can induce? What fields for glorious human service in the cause of justice, rather than charity, lie spread out before us!

So far for the vision of economics we find in the gardens of memory, personal and racial, as we get back to those cool, dim alleys where we find our God.

How is it in the fields of political and civil life?

Why, once we see clearly the individual soul as the economic human unit, we cannot see any *other*

citizen unit. The individual, literate or illiterate, wise or foolish, rich or poor, man or woman, is the citizen—one citizen, one vote.

Does this seem startlingly inclusive? Does it break down established and respected safeguards? Lest the timid still feel that such a vision can only be hoped for in a millennium, let me remind you of some considerations:

1. Under our advancing initiative and referendum electoral forms we vote more and more for principles and laws, and less for men; and under these methods the illiterate and the stupid are automatically disfranchised—not knowing how to vote, they either don't vote, or their votes pair off. Moreover, with no monopoly left—and we look for this state soon—and with no resultant impoverished masses, and degraded classes, how long will there remain a considerable number of stupid illiterate, or brutalized literate, to menace us?
2. Unsocial citizens who for the safety of society we are obliged to segregate, by the fact of their detention, just as now, will be unable to cast their ballots, which probably would not be so very dreadful if they could be cast. And so also with the feeble-minded and the insane. And, thank God, when "poverty and the fear of poverty," and debauching wealth, are swept away, there will not be so many of these sad citizens in our social world!
3. And the same thing is true of our infantile children—that they cannot go to the polls and cast their votes; that temporarily disfranchises them; but they are potential voters—just as the absentee voting citizen or the sick voting citizen is at present. And, of course, we can make a good argument for a fixed age at which potentiality shall be merged in actuality, as it is at present with our male children. But if we do not care to, we need not bother with that. We might let each child citizen—boy or girl—who is old enough to go alone into a booth and mark and cast a ballot, do this upon expression of the desire. Would not such participation in public affairs tend to develop on the part of our children civic intelligence and civic responsibilities? If the energetic boy of twelve or fifteen felt that his vote helped make the government of his city, do you think he would be so apt to regard the policeman on the corner as his natural enemy? Public playgrounds and citizenship responsibility may end the hoodlum gang terror long before the millennium, and might save many a powerful, resourceful, capable youth from a life of crime.

And who are left after eliminating the classes I have enumerated? Just plain men and women. I do not here need to urge the greatness, and breadth, and power of an electorate composed of the two elements of the human race—men and women—"male and female created He them."

I have been simply looking with you to find upon what the rightness of such an electorate bases itself. We have gone down the way from the group responsibilities having their righteous root in a love of the neighbor, to the individual responsibilities having their root in the facts of our creation by the God back of all things. But do not think for a moment that I wish to imply that group responsibilities are lost as we act under the impulse of the profounder vision. They assume deeper and finer forms as each member of the group becomes more powerfully individualized. Compare for a moment a family of the old type—the father earning the family living and doing his little political stunts, telling his wife nothing about business or politics because of course women could know nothing of such things; the wife running the house and talking gossip and playing off her petty accomplishments—compare such a family with one we would like to know here in Washington a few years hence, with father, mother and children living and sharing a common intelligent life, discussing together public affairs, and, as far as practicable, business affairs. You can imagine a grave-eyed little boy asking his father or his mother: "But why are you going to vote for that man, or that measure?" Can you imagine either of them telling him or telling each other that the vote was to be cast at the dictation of a boss? Is not this group greater as a group than the first?

And now in closing let us come back together to our gardens, that are in part of our own memories, and in part of the quaint old story of beginnings—the garden which is at the *end* as well as at the *beginning* of things—where the tree of life grows on the banks of the river, with fruits amid its healing leaves;—the garden where our own tender vague memories of childhood cluster around the dear fact of family protection and service; and the soul of that garden which is the garden of the race's childhood, where dwells with us the Lord God, speaking as conscience. There our individual life of responsibility for right and wrong is born. There we receive our birthright. There we must take up our separate, different, individual, sacred functionings for the common welfare; and for the necessary furtherance of these functionings we must each protect for ourselves, and for all others, our rights of existence upon the earth, and our individual unit rights of participation in the great organic social life of the world.



The bread line is a charity that should make civilization hang its head with shame for its own philanthropy.—Chicago Evening Post.



Poverty and ignorance are the chief destroyers of child life and child health, and from these two sources flow, in swelling streams, the injurious conditions which sweep the young to destruction.—Adolf Baginsky.

BROTHERHOOD.

John D. Barry, in "Harper's Bazar."

Not to be different, Lord,
I ask, from those that fare
Beside me on life's way;
But that my spirit shall accord
With their great purpose, that my share
Wholly I may fulfill,
In thought and will,
And that the simple creed
Of all men's right
Within Thy sight,
I may affirm
By word and deed.

O, save me from the blame
Of those who have forgot
Their brotherhood, and vaunt
Their birth or merit, and feel shame
For such as bear the common lot.
Make me, each day, to see,
If aught through me
Find favor in Thy ken,
'Tis but in part
The grace Thy heart
Pours richly on
My fellowmen.

BOOKS

President Lowell and Popular Government.

Public Opinion and Popular Government. By A. Lawrence Lowell. Published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1913. Price, \$2.25 net.

Had President Lowell of Harvard been writing of government and politics during the last quarter of the 18th century, something like this undoubtedly would have issued from the depths of his library:

... but it is open to serious doubt if this action of a small minority of the people of Boston in throwing the tea into the harbor represented a mature and adequately formed public opinion on the part of a majority of the colonists. A large number were totally indifferent and a very considerable proportion of our most intelligent citizens disapproved of it. Nor does it appear that the plan by which this unprecedented act was executed had been approved by an official board of competent experts. Some good is alleged to have come of it, but the possible danger of permitting a small fraction of irresponsible persons . . ."

At any rate this is the fashion in which the President of Harvard University holds forth upon the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, the Direct Primary, Commission Government, and so forth—in short, upon the great democratic movement of his own time. His latest book, "Public Opinion and Popular Government," contains two valuable contributions to the literature of his subject—an