

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IX.

SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES AND REVIEWS.

HENRY GEORGE,—THE MAN AND REFORMER.

THE death of Mr. Henry George, the great apostle of single tax, will lead to a renewed temporary interest in his writings, and especially in his theory of placing all taxes on land values. The personal character of Mr. George was one thing, the character of his writings quite another. All who knew him unite in extolling his personal virtues, his amiable disposition, his lovely character. Mr. Thomas G. Shearman ranks the privilege of his friendship with that of Beecher, while such men as Bolton Hall and Willis G. Abbott are equally ardent in his praise.

Mr. George's books enjoyed enormous sales; and, in fact, his chief service to the world might be summed up in the amount and degree of intellectual activity he awakened on economic questions and especially among the common people. The clubs that are formed to study his books and propagate his teachings, their numbers and enthusiasm, are a testimony to an ability to excite interest that cannot be questioned. The explanation of this might be sought in the strong public demand for a cure for unjust social conditions, and Mr. George essayed to provide a cure for nearly all of society's ills; but his style of writing and the simplicity of his remedy lent a charm that found a great market for all that he said.

But what of his theories? It is important to distinguish between a man's personal character and the character of his teachings. A good man may teach vicious theories that, if put into practice, would end in revolution. John Bright was one of God's noblemen, the true friend of the common people, a noble friend of America; but in some of his speeches to his uneducated constituents he enunciated principles, as to the origin of value and the part labor plays in production, that were full of error, and vicious in the extreme. If he was right, his toiling constituents would have been justified in open revolution against existing conditions.

General Robert E. Lee and Thomas J. Jackson were Christian gentlemen with a sublime faith in God, and the latter went from his closet to the battle-field. It was cold comfort, however, to the Northern soldiers to know that the guns that made such fearful carnage were aimed and fired by men of amiable dispositions and lovely Christian characters.

They learned to beware of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees. The Rev. Thomas C. Hall, D.D. (son of the Rev. Dr. John Hall) is an eminent Christian pastor, a man of beautiful spirit and lovely disposition, yet his social teachings must ever be taken with a grain of salt. His article in the *Kingdom* on "The Divine Right of Begging" was a contradiction of the conclusions of the wisest and most scientific writers on almsgiving. The subject of charity has had thorough and scientific treatment in the last twenty-five years, and the soundest economic writers agree quite unanimately in their conclusions, that indiscriminate almsgiving is, on the whole, an evil. Yet Dr. Hall ignores all these conclusions, rushes into print with an article that is born of his emotions, because the ordinances of our city wisely prohibit begging upon the street.

And thus must we judge of Henry George's teachings. A refined gentleman, an able writer, a sincere friend of the poor and the downtrodden, loyal to his friends, peaceable and loving by nature, becomes the advocate and defender of the most vicious theories on rent and taxation that have vexed the best economic writers of to-day.

If error were endowed with personality, with intelligence and will, and wished to gain a foothold among the uneducated masses, who do the voting but not the thinking for the nation, it would seek just such outlets as men of lovely characters but of untrained minds. They are the most dangerous kind of teachers, for their lives lend a charm to their views. Any other kind of a teacher would have little influence.

In contrast, therefore, with Mr. George's personal character, we will here print the views of some of our ablest economists as to the economic, ethical, and political soundness of his teachings. We cannot judge him by the popularity of his books; for, judged by such a standard, Bellamy would become a scientific economist instead of an idle dreamer. In ten years the writings of Mr. George will be on the upper shelf, as they are now among reputable economists, and he will be remembered as one who awakened a vast amount of enthusiasm in a vicious theory, but left no permanent contribution to the world's economic thought, nor added any permanent momentum to the world's uplift or onward movement. He was perhaps a voice crying in the wilderness; but it was lost in the babble of half-educated social reformers, and his light went out in the darkness. We could multiply these economists' opinions, but append a few only, showing the views of Mr. George's teachings that are held by some of the ablest writers of to-day.

President Francis A. Walker, Ph. D., LL.D., *Late President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology:*—For the spirit in which the writer discusses the views of Henry George, who deliberately pro-

poses that Government shall confiscate the entire value of landed property, without compensation to those who, under the express sanction of Government itself, have inherited or bought their estates, the

author has no apology to offer. Every honest man will resent such a proposition as an insult.—*Land and its Rent*, p. vi.

No intelligent person will read far in a book in which such gross incapacity for economical thinking is exhibited, in which a scheme so mad and anarchical is brought forward. Surely society must long since have passed the point where it was necessary to discuss propositions like these, or to refute a writer who gives such ample warning of the dangerous nature of his doctrines.—*Ibid.*, p. 6.

Mr. George's attack upon landed property is twofold,—from the side of natural rights, and from the side of the economic interests of society.

Let those who feel competent to the task answer Mr. George's eloquent plea in behalf of the natural and inalienable right of all individual members of the human race indiscriminately to enter and enjoy at will each and every lot and parcel of land upon the globe, and every building which may have been or may hereafter be erected thereupon. I profess no qualifications for the work, never having lived in a state of nature myself, but having resided all my life in communities more or less civilized.—*Ibid.*, p. 141.

What is original in Mr. George's work is the enormous importance assigned to rent as an element in the distribution of wealth. Here Mr. George's admirers may rightfully claim for him all the credit of first discovery. No other writer, so far as I am aware, ever attribut-

ed to rent anything approaching the same degree of importance.—*Ibid.*, p. 146.

Mr. George's practical proposals require but brief notice. They differ from those of Mr. Mill only in the single respect that while Mr. Mill, like an honest man, contemplated the full compensation of the existing body of owners of land, according to the value of their several properties, at the time the scheme should be adopted and proclaimed by adequate authority, Mr. George repudiates any such obligation on the part of the State, and proposes to confiscate the entire value of the land. The attempted justification for this precious piece of villainy is found in the mere, bald assertion of Mr. Henry George, that the State never had the power to give a title to any parcel of land to any person, for any purpose; and that, therefore, all land titles are, from the beginning, void. . . So much for Mr. George's practical proposals. I will not insult my readers by discussing a project so steeped in infamy.—*Political Economy*, pp. 418-419.

Arthur T. Hadley, *Professor in Yale University*.—The single tax theory in its more pronounced forms would deprive the man who has made successful investments in real estate of any surplus above the current rate of interest. Would it guarantee him against losses? If it did not do so, it would destroy the motives to invest capital in projects of land improvement. The public could not expect to play with the investor at the well-

known game of "heads I win, tails you lose." If on the other hand it gave such a guarantee it would find itself compelled to make good an amount of loss so large as to do away with the expected gains from the system. Losses on real estate are large enough at present, when each man acts at his own risk; they would unquestionably be much greater if this risk was shifted to society as a whole. The amount and the certainty of economic rent are both habitually overestimated by the advocates of the single tax theory.

The ethical and political difficulties which stand in the way of the application of the single tax theory are even more pronounced than the economic ones. It is not a legal possibility to appropriate the whole unearned increment by any speedy process and to overturn, without compensation, a large number of recognized rights. The existence of law depends on the continuity of its application. The principle that private property must not be taken without compensation is no mere accidental phrase let fall by courts or constitution-makers. It is an axiom of political science.—*Economics*, p. 472.

Arnold Toynbee, Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford:—Mr. George is a disciple of Ricardo, both in his method and his conclusions; he has as great a contempt for facts and verifications as Ricardo himself. By this method he succeeds in formulating a law, according to which, in the progress of civilization, interest and wages will fall together and rents will rise. . . .

Do interest and wages always rise and fall together? As an historical fact they do not. Between 1715 and 1760, while rents (according to Professor Rogers) rose but slowly (Arthur Young denies that they rose at all), interest fell and wages rose. Between 1790 and 1815 rent doubled, interest doubled, wages fell. Between 1846 and 1882 rents have risen, interest has been stationary, wages have risen. Thus in all these three periods the facts contradict Mr. George's theory.

Coming to Mr. George's main position, that rent constantly tends to absorb the whole increase of national wealth, how does this look in the light of fact? We can prove by statistics that in England the capitalists' wealth has increased faster than that of the landowners.—*The Industrial Revolution*, p. 142.

Edward Atkinson:—Who pays the taxes? You do. You can't make the taxes stay where they are put. You may adopt Mr. George's plan of putting all the taxes on land, but you can't make them stay there. Nobody will buy, or hire, or occupy that land to build houses or shops on, unless they can charge the taxes to the tenant or occupant, or put the taxes into the price of the goods that are made in the factory or sold in the shop. If they couldn't collect the taxes put upon them, then they wouldn't get any profit on their capital invested in the houses or in the buildings; and, if there is no profit to be had in building houses or shops or works or factories, who but a fool would

build them? Would you?—*The Margin of Profits*, p. 25.

John Rae, M.A.:—It may be ungracious to disturb a peace won so sorely and offered so sincerely to others, but the truth is, Mr. George has simply lost his faith by one illusion and recovered it again by another. He first tormented his brain with imaginary facts, and has then restored it with erroneous theories. His argument is really little better than a prolonged and, we will own, athletic beating of the air, but since both the imaginary facts and the erroneous theories of which it is composed have obtained considerable vogue, it is well to subject it to a critical examination.—*Contemporary Socialism*, p. 385.

Professor William G. Sumner, LL.D., Yale College:—A great deal is said about the unearned increment from land. . . . The unearned increment from land appears in the United States as a gain to the first comers, who have here laid the foundations of a new State. Since the land is a monopoly, the unearned increment lies in the laws of nature. Then the only question is, Who shall have it?—the man who has the ownership by prescription, or some or all others?

It is a beneficent incident of the ownership of land that a pioneer who reduces it to use, and helps to lay the foundations of a new State, finds a profit in the increasing value of land as the new State grows up. It would be unjust to take that profit away from him, or from any successor to whom he has sold it. Moreover there is an

unearned increment on capital and on labor, due to the presence, around the capitalist and the laborer, of a great, industrious, and prosperous society.—*What Social Classes Owe to each Other*, pp. 48-49.

Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D., LL.D.:—And there is another side to this question which the land reformers do not always so clearly see. There is an unearned increment; there is also an uncompensated decrement. Land in cities and towns is often sold at prices which cannot be maintained, and in the shrinkage of land values purchasers are compelled to contribute out of their hard earnings a great deal of money for the benefit of the mechanics and traders in such communities. . . . And there is a great deal more of this uncompensated decrement, the country through, than we are apt to take account of. If, now, it is just to take away from proprietors the unearned increment, why is it not also just to restore to them the uncompensated decrement? It is evident that this would introduce some serious practical complications.—*Tools and the Man*, pp. 82-83.

Charles Gide, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Montpellier, France:—The system which was proposed by the two Mills, and has latterly been revived by Henry George under the name of the "one tax" system, would be to lay on landed property a progressive tax, the increase in which would be calculated to absorb the unearned increment or

surplus value as it is produced, and allow of the abolition of all other taxation.

The great practical objection to this plan is that there are usually two elements in the surplus value of land; one arises from the social and extrinsic causes already set forth, but the other may result from the owner's labor and from the advances he has made. Were we to establish such a tax, we should have to be careful to abstain from touching this sacred element; not only for fear of violating the principles of equity,—for this portion of the increment is the product of labor,—but also for fear of discouraging all initiative and all progress in agricultural operations, which, we are aware, even now go too much by way of routine. Now it is impossible to follow out such a plan.—*Political Economy*, pp. 463-464.

Herbert J. Davenport:—It is asserted [by Henry George] that the *unearned* increase—the share of its value not due to the owner or his predecessors—should be appropriated by society through taxation. Under this system the State would not become landlord—ownership would be preserved to individuals—but taxation would absorb for the State the larger part of the revenue of ownership. It goes without saying that as taxation lowered the owner's revenue, the market value of the land would proportionally fall.

This does not strike one as fair or honest with regard to the present values of land. No matter what their origin may have been,

investments in land now represent savings from all forms of human effort. . . . Wholesale appropriation of accrued values is wholesale robbery.—*Elementary Economics*, pp. 246-247.

Professor Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., LL.D.:—Henry George proposes that the State shall take the pure economic rent of land, and thinks that this will abolish poverty. It might prevent people who do not care to use the land from keeping land away from those who want to use it, but how it would bring about all the predicted blessings it is difficult for most people to understand. With the best will and with every desire to be unprejudiced the writer has never yet seen how pure economic rent of agricultural land can be separated from the annual value of the improvements on and in the land. Apart from all this, the confiscation of rent, or even if it be called by so gentle a name as appropriation of rent, by the public without compensation to present powers will never, in the writer's opinion, appeal to the conscience of the American public as a just thing. Abstract reasoning based on assumed natural rights will not convince a modern nation. It is but another illustration of the danger of reasoning based on natural rights.—*Political Economy*, p. 297.

The land-tax scheme of Henry George has been described as simply reform in taxation and it may be so considered, although, as already explained, he does not grant the existence of a general right of taxation. Thucydides said he was

a dangerous citizen who gave no attention to politics. When one considers the tremendous importance of taxation, one feels inclined to call him a dangerous citizen who gives no attention to the principles of taxation.—*Taxation in American States and Cities*, p. 62.

No economic writer now believes that a tax on rent is the only one that cannot be shifted.—*Ibid.*, p. 64.

Elisha Benjamin Andrews, D.D., LL.D., *President of Brown University*.—No particular tax can possibly be levied save with injustice here and there, weighting this man too heavily, the next too lightly. A single-tax system exaggerates every such unfairness to the utmost, while by burdening many things you tend to offset losses by gains.—*Institutes of Economics*, p. 221.

J. R. Elliott.—While Mr. George admits that the adoption of his scheme of taxation would destroy the selling value of the farmer's land he claims (*Social Problems*, p. 304) that it would increase the value of his improvements, and thus make his labor so much more remunerative that he would be more than compensated for the loss of his land. I think it would not only take from him the selling value of his land, but in many cases

be the cause of the loss of the improvements as well.—*American Farms*, p. 146.

R. R. Bowker.—The objection to Mr. George's plan (taxing land values) is seen in the fact that the man who owns land to-day may have bought it only yesterday with the direct earnings of his labor, and the confiscation of rent would practically deny to him the benefit of his earnings, and thus subvert the foundations of all private property.—*Economics for the People*, p. 137.

R. C. Rutherford.—Mr. George certainly promised much in the way of breaking through the crust of old errors and letting light into counsels darkened by the words of such illustrious writers as Smith, Mill, Ricardo, and other "great thinkers"; but it does not appear that he has redeemed his promises. He has not overthrown any principles or generally-accepted doctrine; he has not exposed any "fallacies," set up any new facts or presented any old ones in a new light,—has not solved any "problem," cleared up any mystery, nor suggested any original truths, unless we have to except his fruitless attempt to force the definition of the word "wages."—*Henry George vs. Henry George*, p. 326.

AN AMERICAN DICTATOR.

THE man who was virtually the receiver for the United States Government on two different occasions, during President Cleveland's administration, and who made many millions as the reward of his power, is now being clothed with such authority and influence by the railroads of this country that he will be able to become the commercial dictator of the United States. This man alone was able a year ago to advance the price

of anthracite coal, and as a result he took for the parties he represented over forty-two million dollars in extra profit out of the West alone. The retail price of coal in Chicago in 1895 was \$4.75 per ton, in 1896 it was \$6.25. One man made the change. Supply and demand had nothing to do with it. Who is this man? He is a devout churchman, but his creed never prevented him from taking the Government by the throat while he exacted the bond issues as the price of his power and then became guarantor to the Government that no one else should do the same thing for a specified length of time. The last issue, which he took in its entirety, netted him a profit of many millions in twice as many minutes, for the issue was all taken off his hands or resubscribed in fifteen minutes after it was offered to the public. The helplessness and impotency of the Government, when in his imperial presence, was humiliating to every loyal and patriotic citizen. It was a testimony to the power of combinations and trusts who could so simply and easily dictate terms even to the Government. Such powerful combinations are now receiving the financial and moral support of our ablest financiers and public men no less than of many economic writers and thinkers.

This same man now has practically under his control the leading railroads or trunk lines of the United States with a total mileage of over fifty thousand miles. He is fast acquiring the power that will enable him to dictate the prices of products and of property in this country. He can raise up one city and put down another.

The question before the people should be as to his right to such a power, by what process was it acquired; and not is he a model, capitalistic Christian giving back to philanthropy a tithe of what he has acquired by wrongful methods. A trust is not a combine that *does* raise the cost to the consumer of any given product, but one that *can* raise it. This power is of the essence of a trust. Must we now face the evils coming from the last stage in selfish and unholy combinations,—a railroad trust? At the very moment of this writing the telegraphic dispatches announce the closing of several collieries in order to limit the output of anthracite coal. The people have too much coal, it will not do to let coal become common and cheap, it will keep the poor warm at the expense of the combine. The people must not get too warm in winter. So the half-starved coal-miners are thrown out of work, the artificial price of coal to the consumer is then maintained; the millions of ill-gotten gain will roll in as a reward of their cunning and avarice, the laws will not touch the criminals, and the American people sit meekly by and see the merry game go on between dollars and death as partners in crime against human rights and life. The Lexow and Senate investigating committees will inquire into it, but all will end in words, not in action.

This railroad pool with this one man at the head is a menace to our institutions and to liberty. It threatens the life of the republic. Sup-

pose now that English capital unites, and the Canadian roads join in the combine? Then with the aid of Rockefeller (who now controls oil and sugar and is reaching for the other necessities of life), and Carnegie, who with Rockefeller is trying to control iron, the big lake vessels can be brought into the combine, and the question then will be not where did these men acquire their right to so combine against the public weal, but are they good Christians, are not such large enterprises beneficial to the public, and have not these men given liberally to charities. This chief dictator gave a million to a hospital less than two years ago. What a hollow mockery is the founding of a hospital when the business methods pursued by such a man are in direct violation of the first principles of ethics, and a denial of every suspicion of philanthropic or patriotic motives or instincts! If this railroad pool becomes an established combine, where will competition in transportation be? The farmers, the manufacturers, the entire people, will be subject to artificial prices for transportation; watered stocks will flood the market; fortunes will be made in stock gambling, not in industry; not hundred-millionaires, but thousand-millionaires will be the order of the day; national elections will be controlled by a few dozen men; venality in voting will increase, and the black clouds that forbode evil will begin to roll over this fair republic. Congressmen will be bought, the Senate will adhere to its precedents and speculate in the very stocks that are affected by its action. The Vanderbilt systems, the Baltimore and Ohio, the Chesapeake and Ohio, the Union Pacific, the Atchison and Topeka will control the situation.

Then comes the conflict. The end draweth nigh. The people will rise in their might and indignation. The issue will be short, sharp, and clear with the commercial enemies of this republic. For men of this character are arrant cowards. Thieves and robbers are never brave; they are the parasites of civilization; and a parasite, whether in religion or commerce, loves darkness rather than light. He never comes out into the open. A new democracy will arise over the horizon whose basic principles are akin to those that were emphasized when this republic was in its infancy,—a love of the spirit of the law, not of its letter (for the trusts keep the letter of the law); peace among men that is born of genuine good-will and of a sense of justice, not of expediency, much less of the love of money. There must be an immediate return to the heroic and simple principles of Christianity, the genuine and mountain-peak truths that have made great men not only in New England, but in every age. The day of worshipping beauty instead of law must go by; the accountability of men to God for the deeds done in the body needs a new emphasis; a fundamental and honest religious awakening that stirs to the depths, not simply the sensibilities of the nation but its conscience, its intellect, its will, must usher in a new reformation that will banish forever the unholy love of the almighty dollar that now paralyzes the marts of trade no less than the temples of religion. False ideals and standards of manhood have

been awakened that must be superseded by the Christian ideals of usefulness and of willingness to become servants, not masters. New York now controls many of the necessities of life; it is trying to control the transportation, the industries, and the finances of the nation; but when the American people once have their eyes opened to the dangers of such accumulated power, there will be a beginning of the end.

HADLEY'S ECONOMICS.¹

No scholar in this country is better equipped, both by natural gifts and by training, to write on Economics than Professor Arthur T. Hadley of Yale University. The only son of the great Greek scholar, who had an intellect like blue steel, his entire life has been spent in scholarly pursuits in the midst of intellectual surroundings and affiliations, in an atmosphere charged and surcharged with the love of investigation and the critical spirit. Both by heredity and environment, therefore, Professor Hadley has been endowed with powers and gifts for the great task which he has now completed, and is before us in the form of a book. It is not an exaggeration to say that he has performed his task with rarest skill, fidelity, and fairness, in a manner that is a high tribute to his judicial poise, his breadth of learning, and his keen power of analysis. The sententious style, its clearness and force, make the book more entertaining to the student in economics than any work of history or fiction to the ordinary reader.

It must soon find its way into every college class-room as the standard work on economics; and there is not a clergyman or theological student who can afford to be without it and to go over critically and carefully the routes of reasoning by which the author comes to his conclusions. Such a book should be read by Howells, Dr. Herron, Bellamy, and a host of such social critics and reformers who are cut off from their base of supplies, and are seeking sustenance from the surrounding country. Economics is here redeemed from the charge of being the dismal science, or pure empiricism, or deductive rather than inductive. It is a tribute to the enormous advances made in the science since the days of the physiocrats and of the two Mills. It brings scientific treatment and needed light to subjects that are intimately associated with the art of social control, if indeed this be not one of the lost arts. Such practical subjects as individualism, socialism, almsgiving, municipal ownership, causes of poverty, unemployed, taxation, etc., are here treated in a scientific way.

To those who have been accustomed to think of Professor Hadley as an ultra-conservative, almost an individualist, because of his New Eng-

¹ *Economics: An Account of the Relations between Private Property and Public Welfare.* By Arthur Twining Hadley. Pp. 496. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$2.50.

land heredity and training, his views on the limits of individualism and the debt we owe to socialism will find a warm welcome from all who admire breadth of vision and fairness of judgment. It gives his keen analysis of socialism all the more weight, and inspires confidence in his judicious treatment of the theme.

It has been well known that Professor Hadley is not an advocate of municipal ownership of the natural monopolies, or industrial enterprises, such as railroads, gas, water, electric light, telephone, etc. His reasons therefor are clearly set forth as follows:—

"If any government agency, local or national, is to be entrusted with the management of our industrial enterprise, a non-partisan civil service is absolutely essential for success. Even in so simple a case as the post-office, the abuses of patronage have been great, and only the enforced monopoly of the government, which shuts out private competition in letter carriage, prevents us from seeing how great is the waste which arises from this source. Much more must this danger make itself felt in industries with large capital accounts. Only when the traditions of the civil service are such that the best men of the country seek and gain admission to it, independent of party, can we hope that the advantages from government management of these industries might outweigh the evils. With the conditions as they exist in the United States, political reasons compel us to reduce government ownership of fixed capital to a minimum. . . . So long as an administration is to any extent swayed by partisan considerations instead of industrial ones, every extension of government activity to new fields must be regarded with grave apprehension" (p. 402, § 449).

Philadelphia is at present much in evidence as to the truth of Professor Hadley's general attitude toward municipal ownership of fixed capital; and if the honest old Quaker city has fallen among political thieves, the outlook for honesty in control of municipal affairs would seem to be dark. The New York and Chicago political machines are corrupt, owing to the heterogeneous population; but such cities as Boston, Philadelphia, and New Haven should now be in the control of honest officials, if they are ever going to be. If it is once established that honesty is the exception to the rule, in the government of our cities, then our manner of electing such officials is doomed. Waiting for principles of political honesty and decency to permeate the body politic and reach the masses has been found to be tedious.

But the transmission of the mails could never be left to private initiative. The cost of carrying the mails would bear no relation to the price demanded of the people, if once the business was left to private monopoly. The desire to acquire, or avarice, which is the form it assumes, would raise havoc with the mails for remote points like the Klondike, Alaska, or even San Francisco. Express charges for carrying small packages is in evidence. If the package exceeds four pounds in weight,

so that the government is not in competition, the charges are simply exorbitant to all points where the express company has a monopoly. The rates on such packages, however, are moderate, if the weight is less than four pounds. The subject is too large for discussion in detail here; but the writer is one of those who favor the Wanamaker plan for the government control of the telegraph at the earliest moment it can be brought about. The cost of sending messages may then be brought within the range where the masses can utilize the wires as they now do the mails. We may be a long way from the attainment of the ideal, but in course of time many industries that are now carried on for purposes of private gain must come under governmental or municipal control; for we believe, with Professor Hadley, that "human nature is better than it has been thought."

Professor Hadley says: "There is a specious argument in favor of public works for the relief of those who are temporarily unemployed. People say that such work would have to be done, sooner or later, in any event; that the unemployed must be helped in some shape or other; that even if those who are set to work upon these things do not earn the full amount of their wages, the little they may accomplish is better than nothing, as otherwise they would have to be wholly supported at public expense. They also add that employment on useful work of this kind preserves the self-respect of the laborer which the direct giving of charity tends to destroy. But this view of the matter is a somewhat dangerous one" (p. 56).

In the city of Chicago, during the fall and winter of 1893-94, this state of affairs confronted us: The financial panic had thrown thousands of workmen out of employment. They tramped the streets in vain looking for work. They asked it of the Mayor (the late Carter H. Harrison) as a last resort. He appointed a committee of citizens, of which the writer was vice-chairman, to do what was possible to help these worthy unemployed. It seemed imperative to furnish employment or charity. The city could not do the former; but, if necessary, the county was compelled to do the latter. The physical suffering seemed trivial, compared with the prospect of making by the score, paupers and willing recipients of charity out of men who had never taken their first lesson in such a school. Men like Marshall Field and Lyman J. Gage authorized, from private subscriptions, the payment of one dollar per day per man to two thousand men who were willing to clean the streets of Chicago. These men were set to work, and it was a pleasure to see them willing to do anything rather than become dependents. The drainage canal engaged thirty-five hundred more, although the foremen objected to green hands, even at such a low price. The contractor for rolling-chairs at the World's Fair took one thousand more, and the result was that the emergency was bridged over.

No one appreciates more fully than the writer the full force of Professor

Hadley's objections to a permanent plan of this sort adopted by law, controlled by politicians, and paid for out of the public treasury. But the state must devise ways and means not to rob the deserving poor of their self-respect by furnishing food gratuitously when it can furnish employment and give the food as a *quid pro quo*. The secret of success in any plan is to have the wages that are paid so low that it is uninviting to the laborer, and he uses the work only to bridge over until he can find employment that is permanent. Thus he keeps the wolf from the door, and maintains his independence. Simple employment, and plenty of it,—such as, street-cleaning, road-making, canal-digging, potato-raising, etc.,—can be furnished with little danger. The evils will not begin to compare in importance with the positive crime of making willing paupers and dependents by the wholesale by furnishing gratuitously food, raiment, and shelter, at the state's expense to men who are willing to work for it.

We give our readers a few quotations from Professor Hadley's book, selected at random, to show his sententious style, his clear and crisp way of putting things, and with these we must close this extended review, but all too brief, considering the genuine merit of the work, that is such a credit to its author and an honor to the University in which he is one of the instructors.

Z. S. H.

"A few centuries ago, the principle of individual freedom was not recognized in law or in morals any more than in trade. It was then thought liberty in trade meant avarice, that liberty in politics meant violence, and that liberty in morals meant blasphemous wickedness" (p. 14).

"The individualist has taught people not to confound public morality with a state church, public security with police activity, or public wealth with government property" (p. 14).

"The point of issue between individualism and socialism is not a question of means, but of ends" (p. 15). "Individualism is not a creed or a platform, but a way of looking at things; and the same may be said of socialism" (p. 17).

"But while the men of emotion may sometimes be right, and the men of reason wrong, the chances in matters of legislation are most decidedly the other way" (p. 17).

"We may fairly grant the claim of the socialist that capital originated in robbery. In like manner, labor originated in slavery. Neither fact has any appreciable bearing on present issues. Neither fact tends in the least to prove either that the capitalist is a thief or the laborer an inferior" (p. 30).

"Give the children of the shiftless, by thoughtless charity or various systems of poor relief, the right to eat the substance of the efficient and prudent, and you will soon lose both the capital and the morality under which that capital has been created" (p. 40).

"The number of people who ask relief, and are willing to take even light farm-work as a means of earning it, is exceedingly small" (p. 60).

"We cannot afford to countenance a system of morals or law which justifies the individual in looking to the community rather than to himself for support in age or infirmity" (p. 63).

MACY'S ENGLISH CONSTITUTION.¹

A TEACHER in an Ohio college was told, some years since, by his colleagues, that he could have five hours a week, during a term of twelve weeks, in which to deliver a course of lectures on the "History of the English Constitution." Compelled to be content with this scant allowance of time, he addressed himself, as well as he could, to his work. But he soon discovered that his pupils were not interested in the subject as thus announced. Whether their associations with it had been such as to make it seem dry; or whether, justly enough, they thought the lectures of the teacher not likely to be as instructive as Stubbs and Hallam and May, whom some of them had, more or less, read; or whether, as sometimes happens, they thought that was a subject which they already understood, it is impossible to state. Discovering this disinclination to his theme, he substituted for it, taking Homersham Cox and other standard writers as his authorities, an account of the "Present Working of the English Government in its Different Departments." He would show how that government is carried on in all its principal parts. This proposal was received with much favor by his class; and, in putting it into execution, he was really describing the present Constitution of England, referring to its past only so far as was necessary to explain its present character.

But now a new labor presented itself. Questions had been allowed in the class-room, and as the teacher passed from point to point in the English administration, he was constantly questioned as to the comparative merits of the practice under the administration of the United States. Thus his work for the term soon took the following form: He first described some feature of the English Government; next the corresponding feature of our own; and then engaged with the class in discussion—sometimes oral and sometimes written—as to the causes which might have led our country to adopt a different method from that of England, and the comparative merits of the two methods. The class pursued the study, as thus conducted, with enthusiasm, and the work of the term was a success. The system thus inaugurated was continued for a course of years, to the mutual satisfaction of teacher and pupils. At one time, he was under a temptation to prepare a text-book upon this plan—a temptation which, fortunately, he was able to resist, leaving the work to some younger man.

When Professor Macy's book was placed in his hands, for a moment he indulged the hope that the desired end had been accomplished. A brief examination, however, showed that this was not the case. Of fifty chapters there is one on "A Comparative View of the English and Amer-

¹The English Constitution: A Commentary on its Nature and Growth. By Jesse Macy, M.A., Professor of Political Science in Iowa College. Pp. xxiii, 534. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1897. \$2.00.

ican Constitutions," and there are some instances of comparison in other chapters. But this method is exceptional, and is not a part of the avowed plan of the work.

It must not be inferred, however, that because Professor Macy's volume did not meet expectation in one particular, it is not an excellent book of its kind. Divided into two parts, one on the "Nature" and the other on the "Growth" of the English Constitution, it is one of the best works that treat of those subjects. A principal object of the first part is to enable American readers, by being "well grounded" in English politics, to gain a better knowledge of their own. Part II. is not so much a history of the English Constitution as a commentary upon it. The point of view for each period is not that of the "contemporary society," but that of "present facts and experience." While fully acknowledging his indebtedness to great standard writers, the author presents facts and opinions with an original freshness and vivacity to which an extended residence in England has contributed, and which make the book unusually attractive. It is terse and condensed in statement, and has a clear and happy method. It is specially interesting in its illustrative matter, which always appears to be wisely chosen. It would be a satisfaction to know that it was largely introduced into American colleges, and widely read by American citizens.

The work abounds in thoughtful and suggestive statements. I close with a few examples of these.

The author tells us that, in the United States, constitutions are practically amended by interpretations of the courts—that the English courts, unlike our own, never make void an act of the legislature on the ground that it is unconstitutional—and that, in England, "Since the reform in the civil service, the party in power enjoys no important advantage, in its ability to influence votes, over the party in opposition." This furnishes such a startling contrast to our own system, that it is well worth our earnest consideration. I quote one more passage, which is full of meaning to a thoughtful student of history. In comparing the social conditions of France with those of England, before the French Revolution, the author says: "In France, society had divided horizontally, and the burdens were shifted upon the helpless understratum until the day of vengeance was matured. In England, a powerful class had always been pitted against other powerful classes, and the less fortunate had not been hopeless, because they had always enjoyed the favor of some of the stronger orders. The vertical division of society did not utterly crush the lowest ranks."

These propositions invite further comment, but our limited space does not permit it.

JAMES MONROE.

DENNIS'S CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.¹

IN this superb volume, with its ample bibliography, table of contents, and its sixty or seventy full-page photographic illustrations, we are supplied with one of the most interesting and instructive sociological studies which have ever been published. The author's long experience in missionary labor, and his skillful literary characteristics have eminently qualified him for the task which he has undertaken, only one-half of which is completed in the present volume.

The work is specially to be commended to those students of sociology who are enamored with the study of the material aspect of civilization and fail to see the relation of the moral forces to even the material development.

The volume treats, with accompanying full statistical notes, of the prevalence of individual vices and degrading family customs, tribal, professional, commercial, governmental and religious customs, closing with a penetrating discussion of the weakness of all remedies for heathenism which lie outside of Christianity and ignore Christianity. A pertinent supplement to this volume may be found in recent articles by Rendel Harris upon Armenia, Julian Hawthorne upon India, and Henry M. Stanley upon Africa, all of whom, upon personal inspection and contrary to their prejudices, are most emphatic in asserting that the spread among heathen nations of the conceptions of God and humanity, and of their relations to one another, presented in the Christian religion, is the only basis of hope for the social improvement of the heathen world. Man does not live by bread alone; his physical prospects are bound up in his moral condition.

HYDE'S PRACTICAL IDEALISM.²

WHEN President Hyde's "Practical Ethics" and his "Outlines of Social Theology" came from the press, they received the warmest praise. He has now issued "Practical Idealism," and it will at once be recognized as worthy of the same high commendation that greeted his former works. The Natural World is treated under the heads of The World of Sense-perception, The World of Association, The World of Science, and The World of Art.

The Spiritual World is treated under the heads of The World of Persons, The World of Institutions, The World of Morality, and The World

¹ Christian Missions and Social Progress: A Sociological Study of Foreign Missions. By the Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D., Students' Lecturer on Missions, Princeton, 1893 and 1896; author of "Foreign Missions after a Century"; Member of the American Presbyterian Mission, Beirut, Syria. In two volumes. Vol. I. Pp. xvi, 468. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. \$2.50.

² Practical Idealism. By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. Pp. 335. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

of Religion. He builds upon the fundamental truth set forth by Professor James, that each man must build his own world. "Practical Idealism is simply a presentation of the familiar facts of everyday life in their rational relations, as elements in a logical process and parts of an organic whole." This work is evidence of the much higher tone of thinking and superior scholarship that characterizes recent works along sociological lines than those that came from the press a few years ago. If this continues ten years more, the books that have been esteemed because of their popularity simply, would find no sale. The public mind is clarifying rapidly on such subjects, and President Hyde has been an important factor in this upward and onward movement.

Z. S. H.

DAVENPORT'S OUTLINES.¹

THIS little digest or epitome of the soundest views on economic questions is a most admirable text-book for high schools and classes that are not sufficiently advanced to study more scientific works. It is a clear, succinct, and intelligent treatment, in propositional form, of the main truths of the science, and is thoroughly conservative and sane. Mr. Davenport has no peculiar views to advance, no wheels to put in motion, and no axes to grind. He is inductive and scholarly. In the hands of a thoroughly well-informed teacher, the book could be used for more advanced classes, as its treatment of subjects could be unfolded and elaborated.

Mr. Davenport makes the time-honored blunder of confusing self-love with selfishness. He says: "Men now work under the incentive of want, incited and persuaded to effort by their interest in themselves and in those dependent upon them,—wives, children, relatives, and friends. Include all this activity under the head of selfishness, though the term seems, in some measure, an inept one," (p. 188). It not only seems an inept one, it is both inept and incorrect. Such an interest in one's own is not selfishness. It is self-love, and the distinction is as great as between reason and rationalism, love and lust, or any noble trait and its perversion.² The desire to acquire is not avarice, though it may pass on into that, and the sense of ownership, like that of self-preservation, is not the mark of a depraved nature. Selfishness is such, and under no circumstances can it be commended. Mr. Davenport should correct this mistake in the next edition.

Z. S. H.

¹ *Outlines of Elementary Economics.* By Herbert J. Davenport. Pp. 280. New York: The Macmillan Company. 80 cents.

² See *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1894, for a full exposition of this truth.