

## WHO LOVES THE TREES BEST?

Who loves the trees best?  
"I," said the Spring.  
"Their leaves so beautiful  
To them I bring."

Who loves the trees best?  
"I," Summer said.  
"I give them blossoms,  
White, yellow, red."

Who loves the trees best?  
"I," said the Fall.  
"I give lucious fruits,  
Bright tints to all."

Who loves the trees best?  
"I love them best,"  
Harsh Winter answered,  
"I give them rest."

—ALICE MAY DOUGLAS,  
In The Independent.

## BRYAN STILL AT IT.

Our prediction was a safe one to make that the discussion of laws suppressive of anarchy would occasion a revival of demagoguery.

Mr. Bryan, discussing such laws, says: "While we are legislating to prevent any manifestation of the anarchistic spirit on American soil, we should avoid those things which breed anarchy. Partiality in government kindles discontent—the exaltation of money above human rights, the fattening of a few at the expense of the many, the making of artificial distinctions between citizens and the lessening of the sacredness of human life—all these in their full development breed anarchy."

That is an exact and condensed statement of the creed of anarchy and its reason for being. Gori and Bakounin in collaboration could not have more exactly stated the reason for the anarchist organization of "the propaganda of the deed."

Mr. Bryan's statement of it means that his school of politicians intend to persist in the propagation of anarchy by persistent misstatement of conditions and of the responsibility of government therefor. He declares the conditions which he describes to exist in this country, and ascribes their existence to the favor of the government—that is to say, to the administration of which the murdered president was lately the head. His expression is in generalities. "Partiality of government"—what is it? In what special act or acts of the government is it manifested? Who are its beneficiaries and on whom does it place burdens that justify murder? Mr. Bryan gives no bill of particulars. He makes a statement, sinister and misleading, against his own country, and every man who for any reason, usually, because of his own incapacity, is not successful as he wishes, immediately shifts the blame from himself to the government and becomes a potential anarchist. Then Mr. Bryan continues to rub the blister

he has raised by proclaiming that the government has compelled the "exaltation of money above human rights."

Again, a murder-inciting phrase is used, with no specifications. Where in all the world are human rights as well protected, as much respected and as secure as here? Where, indeed, is money as much subordinated and property as much subjected to the absolute control of the whole people as here?

Nothing can be held as property, as wealth, except by the consent and creation of society. Here the voice of society is uttered with power by the majority, which rules. The safety of property in the United States lies in the fact that here more men own property than elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Bryan's third argument for anarchy, "the fattening of the few at the expense of the many," is an untruthful statement. The enterprise of the people, wrought upon the richest natural resources in the world, has made the few rich and the many prosperous, and this nothing can prevent except repeal of all laws creating and protecting property. In the direction of such repeal Mr. Bryan has appealed to the people for eight years unsuccessfully. He has failed, not because too few have property, but too many for his purpose. If the conditions he pictures existed anywhere except in his inflamed and vagrant fancy, his impassioned appeals would have produced results, not in murder, but in a political revolution. As they did not exist, his appeals have touched only the idle, thriftless and criminal minority, who would not be industrious, thrifty and law-abiding under any conditions nor under any form of government.

We do not charge that Mr. Bryan has intended it to be so. Shallow and ignorant as he is, he may be able to cognize as facts the creations of his fancy. His intentions may have been good, but all that does not change the fact that he has defamed his own country by misrepresenting conditions which he ascribes to the administrations of its government.

We have no partisan motive in saying these things. Indeed, the New York World, lately a bitter partisan of Mr. Bryan, rebukes him with great energy, and says: "It is by fostering such ideas that shallow speakers and reckless newspapers do infinite harm. This is the best country in the world for workingmen, as the constantly inflowing tide of immigration proves. Instead of teaching that 'we should avoid those things that breed anarchy,' all public speakers and teachers ought to proclaim the truth that there is never any excuse for anarchy, nor is anarchy a remedy for any evil

or wrong that exists anywhere in the world."

When his own partisans tell Mr. Bryan directly that he is excusing anarchy by an untruthful statement, in impeachment of his own country, it would seem to be time for him to recall his raw fancies and grill them awhile over the fires of common sense.—San Francisco Call.

## SINGLE TAX.

Editor of The Conservative:

Mr. James D. Hancock, who writes upon the practicability of the single tax, is evidently sincere; and his statement of what the single tax is, and what it proposes, is admirable.

He asks two questions, the answers to which, as to all other questions on the single tax, will be found in Mr. Louis F. Post's pamphlet called "The Single Tax," published by Frank Vierth, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. But we will answer them here: He asks:

"After some practical experience in connection with the subject, I know but one method of collecting taxes upon land. The assessors or other proper officers of the community or county, visit and fix the commercial value of every piece of land within their jurisdiction. The financial officers of the community or county, having made an estimate of the expenses of the government to which they are applicable, then settle the ratio of taxation to valuation. If this ratio is fixed so high as to wipe out the land value, or in other words, its commercial value, what basis have we for any future valuation?" Answer: What it would rent for, less the amount that any improvements in it would rent for.

As to the opposition expected from "land owners and lovers of good order and morals," that has not materialized in New Zealand and other places where they are beginning the single tax plan.

I would be glad to send free of charge to anyone who asks for it, a pamphlet showing what progress has been made in this direction.

BOLTON HALL,  
111 Broadway, N. Y., Sept. 9, 1901.

A book on Holland, it goes without saying, has a flavor of the quaint and picturesque. The authors and illustrator of "Old Dutch Towns," by Van W. J. Tuin and W. O. J. Nieuwenkamp, have contrived to bring within the limits of one large volume perhaps a greater proportion of what is truly artistic and characteristic of its subject than have any of their predecessors. The eye of the artist and sympathy with the position of those who have little artistic training have directed the writing of these pages of delightful description. The illustrations are all that might be asked for. There are thirty-two full-page wood cuts, 8¼x 6 inches, and these have been reproduced upon heavy paper. Published by J. B. Lippincott Company.