

man must have within himself a sense of Inherent Right, or success will be an impossibility, for this sense of Inherent Right carries with it the appreciation of industry, application, energy, and an un-sullied, determined, never-wavering aim.

From the more comprehensive point of view, common sense tells us that there is an Inherent Right in the people to govern themselves as they see fit; that there is an Inherent Right for each man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Yet over these two principles seas of blood have been spilled by men of all nations and all ages.

In the infancy of the world men were not able to appreciate the rudimentary principles of Right; but as the individual progressed toward an understanding of it, he slowly carried the world with him. History becomes, therefore, simply the record of men's progress toward the complete recognition of an absolute and Inherent Right, first by the individual, and then an acknowledgment of this Right by the body politic.—William Bittle Wells, in *The Pacific Monthly*.

HOW TO OBTAIN FULL INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM.

An abstract of the address made by Mr. John Z. White, of Chicago, at a dinner given by the Single Taxers of Cleveland, O., at the Euclid hotel, on Thursday evening, August 4, 1904.

Individual freedom is the aim of those who support the doctrines advocated by Henry George. Taxation is the practical means whereby they hope to realize his ideals. In both inspiration and method they claim to be conservative—that is, to be in accord with the tendencies which have prevailed in the civilization of which they are a part.

The glory of modern civilization—the feature by which it is distinguished from all others—is the fuller recognition of individual freedom that now obtains. And this is but another way of asserting the more extended destruction of privilege. Privilege is the curse of society. How to adjust ourselves to the physical facts of the world, and at the same time avoid privilege, is the problem.

In the three relations in which men live—the religious or spiritual, the political or governmental, the material or physical—individual freedom is, in the United States, nearly complete. The small interference with individual freedom that still obtains is, however, vital. The resulting condition is like that following an attempt to swim a torrent—failure, no matter how small the margin, is fatal.

In the religious or spiritual field, thanks to the struggles of our forefathers, every man may now worship God in accord with the dictates of his own conscience, or avoid worship, as he wills. In religion we have secured individual freedom. In the political or governmental field every man may vote equally with every other man. In political affairs we have secured equal individual freedom.

In the physical or material field, however, we have but partly secured individual freedom. Man must eat to live. To secure food he must (directly or indirectly) cultivate the earth. Two things are here involved—the cultivator and the thing cultivated; that is, labor and land. The first of these has been freed. No longer is man a serf or a slave in his body. But all the labor in the world cannot of itself produce one ounce of food. Therefore, individual freedom in religion, individual freedom in government, individual freedom of the person, are of but little worth to him from whose grasp the land is held. The modern rule of equal individual right obtains in religion, in government, and as to the person; but the ancient rule of aristocratic privilege still dominates our regulations as to land, without the use of which individual rights enumerated as secured are as joys that vanish with possession.

Henry George proposed nothing more nor less than to continue in the pathway that hitherto has led to the realization of the distinctive characteristic of the modern world—individual freedom. We believe that we are properly called conservatives. Equal religious rights, equal social rights, equal rights to labor, must be supplemented by equal rights to land.

But while the American people love freedom, they are also intensely practical, and very properly insist on knowing just how this result may be achieved. And just here is the greatness of Henry George revealed. Poet and seer though he was, he yet gave to practical detail that careful attention without which no great work was ever accomplished. The practical proposal is simplicity itself: Land and labor are the primary factors of all production. Land is owned by a comparatively few. The product is therefore divided between those who labor and those who own land. The portion going to labor is earned. The portion going to landlords is the value of privilege. Privilege is unjust legal advantage. George proposed to turn privileged values into the public possession by abolishing all taxes on labor or its products, and concentrating all taxes for public revenue upon the value of land.

As a mere matter of getting public revenue this system has every argument in its favor. But the thought that gives it vitality and power is that through it we will obtain, in the economic, as in the religious and political field, complete individual freedom.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN OREGON.

For The Public.

Oregon has achieved the distinction, through its two statutes enacted last June by direct legislation, of being the first State in the Union to become, and exercise the prerogatives of, a pure democracy and thereby secure true political freedom.

The laws referred to were, one for direct primaries and one for liquor local option; and both were, as allowed by the initiative and referendum amendment of their State constitution, enacted by the people without the intervention of the Legislature.

The initiative petitions containing 8,500 signatures, which was about 1,500 more than the law required, were filed with the Oregon Secretary of State on the 5th of February, 1904. The election, which occurred on the 6th of last June, gave results as follows: For direct primaries, 56,205; against the same, 16,354; and for local option, 43,316; and against the same, 40,198. On the 24th of June the two laws, by proclamation of Gov. George E. Chamberlain, were declared to be "in full force and effect," both of them having received "an affirmative majority of the total number of votes cast on said measures."

The States of Utah and South Dakota have direct legislation amendments in their State constitutions, but Utah has as yet no enabling act to carry it into effect; and South Dakota, while it has an enabling act, has not as yet enacted any statute by initiative petition or demanded a referendum under the new amendment. The voters of South Dakota have thus far contented themselves with allowing their amendment to remain a dead letter except in its operation, which is an exceedingly important function, as a potential check on legislative misconduct. They as yet prefer to allow their amendment to stand (as *The Oregonian*, of Portland, last year declared their amendment stood in their State at that time) "as a safeguard in the people's hands against pernicious acts of an unworthy and a conniving governor."

In Oregon the direct legislation amendment to the constitution was adopted in June, 1902. "The first noticeable effect," says Hon. W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon City, in a late article in *The Arena* magazine, of Boston, "was a

large decrease in the number of paid lobbyists at the next session of the Legislative Assembly in January, 1903." Subsequently one of the circuit courts of Oregon declared the amendment unconstitutional, one of the grounds for the adverse decision being that it was in conflict with Section 4, Article 4, of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government.

In December, 1903, the Supreme Court of Oregon reversed the decision of the lower tribunal and confirmed the validity of the amendment. Mr. U'Ren, regarding this action, says:

No more important or far-reaching decision has ever been rendered by any court in our country, nor any that more ably represents and sustains the American ideals of government. The court said in part: "Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government. The representative character of the government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of government, or substituted another in its place."

Mr. U'Ren, in speaking of the bill for direct primaries, said it "is proposed by initiative petition because it is a more direct and certain method of obtaining the law than to wait for the Legislative Assembly, in which the party bosses have heretofore defeated all attempts to secure such a law." He continues:

So far as I can learn, the initiative and referendum is more popular with all classes in Oregon than it was two years ago. Capitalists and business men regard it as ample insurance against any revolutionary laws, socialistic or otherwise, which might be enacted by any political party that may obtain power, as well as affording a complete protection against any hasty, ill-advised or corrupt action of the legislative assembly. On the other hand, it is now demonstrated that the initiative gives the people power to propose and adopt or reject any reform laws that party bosses do not want or that politicians would fear to make in the legislative assembly, as well as furnishing a safe and practical method for reformers and agitators to get a decision directly from the people on their demands in the concrete form of a proposed law. The initiative and referendum is in the Oregon constitution to stay.

JAMES P. CADMAN.

Chicago.

Long-tailed Dog—Don't you get tired of everlastingly wagging that little stump of yours?

Stump-tailed Dog—No; it feels just as if the tail was all there, and I get just as much fun out of the exercise as you do, with a good deal less work—Chicago Tribune.

WHY JUDGE SEABURY WILL NOT VOTE FOR JUDGE PARKER.

Without fully indorsing the conclusions of the writer of the following letter, we reproduce it in full as an important and significant incident of the presidential campaign. The writer is Samuel Seabury, one of the judges of the City Court of New York city, and a Democrat of force, standing and deserved influence.

I shall not vote for Parker and Davis. The action of the convention in approving the crime committed in Illinois, the facts being clearly presented and being undisputed, showed that the convention preferred the rule of the political corruptionist rather than recognize that political conventions should be honestly conducted and that the majority should rule.

Judge Parker's persistent silence before he was nominated and his tricky telegram as soon as he had safely secured the nomination showed him to be an apt pupil of the political methods of David B. Hill. The deception to which Judge Parker and his friends resorted to secure the nomination and the repudiation of the compromises entered into in relation to the platform will, I believe, before the campaign is over, be made perfectly apparent. When the facts are appreciated they can excite no other feeling than disgust and contempt.

The convention was controlled by a union of monopoly and pro-slavery elements. It was impossible that any really democratic action could have proceeded from such a combination. Both the Republican and Democratic parties as at present constituted are controlled by plutocratic influences. The great corporations which depend for success upon special privileges, the existence of which impoverishes the masses, will in this campaign contribute impartially to both of the great political parties. No matter which party loses, monopoly is confident that it will win.

In the contest between Roosevelt and Parker no political issues are involved. It is a mere personal contest for place and power. This is the lowest plane upon which a political campaign can be fought.

The fact that Grover Cleveland and others who deserted the party when it became Democratic in 1896 are now in control of the party is a sure guarantee that the party will be administered for the benefit of a corrupt plutocracy, as it was during Cleveland's last administration.

The indictment which Mr. Bryan brings against the element which now

controls the Democratic party is in all respects true, and the fact that it is true shows that the party is unworthy of support. It seems to me unreasonable to assert that the Democratic party stands at present for policies which are destructive of free government, and at the same time to support that party upon the theory that the best way to reform a party is to intrust the plutocratic element in the party with the control of the government.

The best way to reform the party is to see to it, when it sells out to the plutocracy, as it has in this campaign, that it should go down to the defeat which it deserves. The Republican party stands for the same plutocratic influences which are behind Judge Parker, and for imperialism and militarism. There is no reason to believe that Judge Parker is any more opposed to imperialism and militarism than is President Roosevelt, but even if he is opposed to imperialism, and should be elected, no change in the present imperialistic policy could be secured without a similar change in the Senate, which cannot be secured in this election.

From my standpoint a choice of two evils is presented, and I shall choose neither. If Parker is defeated the Democratic party will be forced to adopt progressive and liberal democratic principles, or go out of existence and give place to some party which will give expression to these principles.

The principles are more important than the party. Mr. Watson, nominated by the People's party, is a worthy representative of the principles which I conceive to be truly democratic, and the adoption of which I believe to be essential to the preservation of democratic institutions in this country.

He is the only representative of these democratic principles in this campaign. I shall, therefore, cast my vote for him. I am informed that a full Watson electoral ticket will be nominated, and I believe it will receive a large vote.

FIGURES CAN'T LIE.

There lies before us—the word lies is used advisedly—The Tariff Handbook, compiled by the American Protective Tariff League, the association of grafters who have taught the Republican party to stand pat; a document largely devoted to showing the terrible effects of Democratic free trade.