

judgment has been biased by outside opinion; it is the picture itself and the idea which it represents for which they care. Overwrought sentiment, however, they will have none of and satire passes above their heads.

In the "slum" schools of Chicago the little pictures proved especially popular last year. Now that they may be purchased and carried home their popularity is expected to increase a thousandfold. The penny picture idea will be put into active operation immediately after the opening of the public school season.—The Chicago Tribune.

OUR SACRED STRAIGHT JACKET.

We believe that the constitution of the United States is the most excellent organic law ever adopted by any people, and we feel a just pride in the loyalty to it which the democratic party has ever shown, but we believe that the lapse of years and changed conditions have brought the time when further amendments to it should be brought forward for adoption. We hold that its provisions for its own amendment are utterly inadequate to give expression to the will of the people and we, therefore, favor the amendment of article 5 of the constitution of the United States, to the end that whenever a majority of both houses of congress shall deem it necessary the congress shall propose amendments to the constitution which shall be submitted to popular vote and shall be valid as part thereof when ratified by a majority of the votes of the people of the United States cast at any general or special election at which such question shall be submitted to vote.—Plank in the Iowa Democratic Platform.

The first few amendments engrafted upon the constitution were really a part of the original instrument and grew by unanimous consent out of the agitation which gave it birth. Not one of them touched upon any vested wrong or aroused the opposition of any private interest. These amendments which grew out of the civil war and to which any great opposition existed were only made possible by the civil war. I am convinced that unless we provide some better method of amendment, the people will again find their path to larger liberty blocked by a rigid constitution supported by an oligarchical judiciary and that the alternative will be presented of the submission of the will of the majority to the tyranny of the few, or a resort to force. In such a juncture we know what the Anglo-Saxon will do. He will

achieve liberty if it breaks the constitution.

What is the proposition in our platform? Simply that the majority shall rule. If there is anybody who denies their right to rule I have no argument with him. Let our whole history answer him. From those who concede the right of the majority to rule I can imagine no valid objection to the proposed reform. The American people are the only branch of the Anglo-Saxon race who have felt called upon to assume a constitutional straight jacket for fear of doing themselves some harm. When the majority of the people of Canada call for a law they get it, and there is no three-fourths majority section in any constitution to intervene and block the way of progress. The people of Australia have experienced no harm from having the will of the majority carried out at once. No one can call the government of England "a radical one of passion." In all these countries the people seem intelligent enough, sane enough and just enough to govern themselves without the interposition of the dead hand of ancestral legislation between the desire of the people and its fruition. Are the American people more passionate, less sane, less just or more untrustworthy than our English-speaking cousins? I deny it. The proposition is infamous. It is insulting to the American people. It is not put forward in good faith. Those who protest against speedy and unconsidered changes are in fact opposed to all change. In their ranks will be found all those who seek to deny to the people the power to reform their institutions. Every man who believes that the people are unfit for self-government, who holds that whenever the people complain the people are wrong, who casts longing eyes backward to monarchical institutions, who sees in the possession of wealth the insignia of the right to power, will be found opposing this plank of the democratic platform. On the other hand, wherever there is found a man in any party who trusts the people, who believes they have wrongs which should be righted, who holds that manhood confers the right to political power, who admits that there is anything in modern conditions which was not anticipated in the convention of 1787, who believes that when the people complain that they usually have cause for complaint, he will be found, however he may vote, supporting the principles of this plank of our platform.

Who will deny that if a majority of the people deliberately desire an in-

come tax they ought to have it? Yet an income tax can only be secured through an amendment to the constitution.

Who will say that when a majority of the people of the United States shall desire that federal taxes shall be raised by any system of direct taxation they ought not to be so raised? Yet there is but one system of direct taxation provided by the constitution, and that so palpably absurd and unjust that no people would ever tolerate it. Direct taxation can only be obtained through an amendment to the constitution.

Who will contend that if a majority of the people of the country desire elective federal courts or any change in the present judiciary system that their wishes should not rule? Yet, no such change can be brought about except through amendment to the constitution.

What likelihood is there that as against powerful private interests any one of these reforms could be brought about even though a majority of the people might favor them, so long as article 5 stands unamended, laying upon the people who seek relief the impossible task of carrying both houses of congress by a two-thirds vote and then securing a ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures. Such a task is enough to appal the most hopeful.—Mayor J. H. Quick, of Sioux City, Iowa, on the foregoing plank, in interview reported in Sioux City Journal.

THE NEW EARTH.

Extracts from a sermon on the subject, "All Things Made New," preached by the Rev. John S. Saul, of Chicago, September 11.

The New Jerusalem is descending from God out of heaven. As this becomes more firmly established upon the earth a new order of human society develops. In addition to what has already been done during the present century to bring about new conditions, we have a forecast of new and still greater things for mankind in the future. The divine truth is opening the human mind even on the earthly plane, to see that "society is an organism, and not a certain number of individuals;" that "individuals are members of the social body, and can be healthy only in the health of the whole body." Men are beginning to realize that "the laws and customs which govern the relations of individuals to each other, and which make up the collective life, are the larger and ever-increasing part of the life of each individual." These things were

taught by the Lord when he was on earth nearly two thousand years ago; but it is only now that mankind is coming to realize them to any great extent. They are now coming to the consciousness and perception of the world as new. And as the mind of the organic social man comes to realize the value of these great economic principles of heaven, they will be adopted as the laws of men upon earth. So the Lord's kingdom will come, and his will be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

If we pray the Lord's prayer sincerely, and study the divine law diligently, desiring to know what is right that we may do it, there is no room to doubt as to results. The Lord will see that through our efforts an orderly condition of things is brought about. He will give us to provide as a matter of duty toward society that the forcible appropriation of the resources of the people and of the products of their toil, are not secured to selfishness and greed, but that a just proportion shall go to all as they work for it.

Notwithstanding the great strides which civilization has taken in advance during the past century, our civil and social machinery is still terribly out of order. But there can be no doubt of the power of divine truth as now coming down from God out of heaven to renew it and set it right. This can only be done, however, through man's effort. As the truth comes into the enlightened understanding it must be applied to the conditions of human life for their betterment. Men are agitating and working for these improvements now as never before.

Let us all pray and work for them in ourselves as individuals. As our personal lives are made new, we shall come into the better state to help along the conditions we would like to see in the world around us. Then we shall cooperate with the Lord in the formation of the new heavens and the new earth, the former things having passed away.

JOBS AND MEN.

Men are too many, or jobs too few. That is the obtrusive fact in the labor question. It is the one fact which, however superficially, accounts to all minds for a condition in which so many men hunt in vain for work. To state it is merely to state in another form the problem of the unemployed. Because men are too many or jobs too few, there are at all times unemployed men. When that is so, the

wages of employed men are perpetually threatened and perpetually tend downward. Lack of employment, therefore, is at the root of the labor question.

If it were possible to bring about a condition in which there was no lack of employment, in which jobs were hunting for men instead of men hunting for jobs, the labor problem would be solved. It would solve itself. There would then be such a universal and insatiable demand for men to work that no one would work for less than he earned. Or, if any were willing to work for less than they earned they would be in such exceptional demand that their wages would rise to the earning point in spite of themselves.

This condition would be brought about by the single tax. If the single tax were in operation, men would no longer hunt for jobs; jobs would hunt for men.

The reason is plain. Only one thing is required to stop men hunting for jobs and set jobs a-hunting for men. That thing is the land. I speak now not only of individual workingmen, but of that complex industrial mass in all branches and grades, which is properly called "labor;" and I speak not merely of land in the sense of fertile soil, but of land in all its characteristics as the natural and social environment of man. Let labor have free access to this, and labor will provide itself with everything else. Deny this to labor, and though you provide it with everything else it will be helpless. If labor had all the money and all the machinery in the world it would be impotent without land; but if it had all the land in the world, all the money and all the machinery would be subject to its control as a matter of course. When labor has the freedom of the land it can plant and reap; it can dig and build; it can make machinery and use it; it can dictate its own money system; and the more work it does the more work it will be asked to do, and the higher, consequently, will wages rise.

This freedom of the land would be secured to labor by the single tax. That tax, though in form and name, and in substance, too, a method—the best, because the natural and just method—of raising public revenues, is also a radical industrial reform. By lifting taxes from labor and labor products, and putting them upon land in proportion, not to its area, but to its value, the single tax would take every year for common use approximately the actual and possible ground rent of all the land in the community. Land

not worth a high ground rent would not pay a high tax; but, be the ground rent high or low, it would be exacted, whether the land were in use or not. Obviously, then, no valuable land could be kept out of use. To keep it so would not pay. Unless put to use it would be eaten up every year or two by taxes. Landowners would have to use their land. But they could not do that without calling in labor to help them. Unaided they would find it impossible to use the land well enough to make their taxes good. So they would be compelled to hire workingmen; or, if workingmen wouldn't be hired, to take them into partnership. In one way, if not in another, the land that landlords now hold vacant would be utilized to its fullest capability. That would make jobs, and it would keep on making them time without end, faster than men would appear to do them.

Consider a moment. There are scores of thousands of acres of coal land of great value, which is now unworked. If its possible royalty were taken in taxes every year its owners would have to allow it to be worked. There are millions of acres of town and city lots of enormous value, which are bare of buildings, though the people who want buildings are like the sands of the sea shore for number. If the possible ground rents of these lots were exacted of the owners in taxes every year, the owners would have to allow them to be built upon. So, also, there are millions of acres of farming land, owned by railroads and syndicates, land of splendid fertility and tempting value, which is now lying fallow while farmhands beg for work and city workingmen struggle for bread. If the possible ground rent of that land were demanded every year in taxes, the owners would have to work it or abandon it to men who would. Think of the jobs which the consequent demands for workers would make!

The supply of workers would then augment demand for work, until no conceivable increase of population, nor any possible improvement in labor-saving machinery, could lessen it. It would find its only check in exorbitant wages—in wages, that is to say, which were in excess of the earnings for which they were demanded.

These are some indications of how the single tax would alter the most notable industrial condition of our time, that of men hunting for jobs, to a condition which would be characterized by the phenomenon of jobs hunting for men. By thus raising