

Resolved, that a committee of nine be appointed to investigate the relation of wages to taxation and report to the next convention of the International Typographical Union.

It is difficult to account for the refusal to make so sensible an inquiry. Of course, the socialists voted against it, as they did last year. Being committed to the narrow policy of drawing class lines, as the primary social reform, they would naturally oppose such an inquiry. To them it has a middle class flavor. But their vote was too small to account for the defeat of the resolutions. Other influences must have been at work. The professed objection was that the resolutions were political. Yet these very objectors voted to condemn "government by injunction," which is more distinctly political. However, there was a gratifying increase in the affirmative vote, over that of last year; and the Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' union, which met in international convention in the same city and at the same time, adopted the resolutions and appointed a committee to make the inquiry and report next year.

How much more alert than the Typographical union are the labor organizations of the mining regions near Johannesburg in the Transvaal. They have adopted a declaration of principles in which an emphatic demand is for "the taxation of land values, irrespective of improvements."

Mr. Bryan has set the "reorganizers" guessing again. In answer to an inquiry from the Times-Democrat of New Orleans, he writes:

I shall not be a candidate for the Presidency in the next campaign and, I may add, I have no choice beyond the desire to see some one nominated who was loyal, not only to the ticket, but to the platform in 1896 and 1900, and who, if elected, could be trusted to stand by the people in their struggle against organized wealth.

The latest astute explanation of Mr. Bryan's attitude is that he expects the party to be defeated in 1904 and is in training for 1908! Such guesses are vastly easier to people with ma-

ture and lusty prejudices than the simple and obvious explanation that Mr. Bryan's chief anxiety is that when the Democratic party does win at the election it shall not lose after the inauguration. Indeed, one experience of that kind ought to be enough for all Democrats who are not assistant Republicans.

#### THE FOUNDATION PRINCIPLE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.\*

There are only two general classes of government, whether for nation, state or municipality. One is autocratic, or government by superior power and without responsibility to the people governed. The other is democratic, or government by the people themselves through their own responsible agents. In greater or less degree every government on the face of the earth, large or small, national or local, has one or the other or both of these characteristics. And in establishing new governments, including new charters for cities, it is impossible to avoid adopting one or the other, or in a weak spirit of compromise confusing the two.

The question at such a time is which of these great opposing principles to prefer. Thomas Jefferson very distinctly preferred the democratic. He taught that government derives its just powers solely from the consent of the people governed. So did Abraham Lincoln, for his ideal was government of the people for the people and by the people. It may seem academic to quote these men and appeal to these principles. But have we not reached a point in the problem of municipal government where consideration of first principles, even at the risk of being thought academic, is imperatively demanded?

Experimentation in municipal government without regard to elementary principles, which has been the rule in this country since the question of municipal government became a problem, is a proved fail-

\* Written by Louis F. Post. Reprinted from the Columbus (O.) Daily Press of August 11, 1902, for which it was expressly prepared. The Press is edited by Ellis O. Jones, is the official organ of the city of Columbus, and is one of the most aggressive Democratic papers of Ohio. Its Democracy is democratic.

ure. Then why grope any longer? Why not make our further experiments in the light of the principle that Jefferson taught and Lincoln proclaimed, and that most men of all parties accept as true?

One of the most notorious failures in municipal administration is administration by state boards, having no responsibility to the people whose municipal affairs they administer. It is a system that finds favor only with politicians, especially with those whose party is in the minority in the home city, but in power in the state. Over and over again it has been demonstrated that the board-governed city is a boss-ridden city.

But a boss-ridden city is something to be avoided. Are we not repeatedly reminded that the municipal boss is the head-devil of municipal mischief? Then the cause of this mischief, or at least one great cause, must be the board system from which the boss so easily springs. If bossism is to be prevented, then, board government must be avoided. Instead of board rule we must have home rule.

Home rule is the ideal for city government. Let there be a municipal constitution, brief and general, applicable to all the cities of a state, which leaves the people of each as free to manage their own municipal affairs in their own way as the state constitution permits, and the problem of municipal government will soon solve itself. This does not require every municipal office to be elective. A system in which there are too many elective offices destroys responsibility by dividing it. Efficiency is thereby diminished, the popular judgment is confused, and many of the objectionable peculiarities of board rule are developed.

Responsibility to the people of a municipality is best secured not by electing every official, but by electing a council and a mayor, and making subordinate officers appointive. If they are appointed by an elective officer he is responsible to the people for them as well as for himself. This is the essence of popular government. While parliamentary power is best for legislation, one-man power is

best for administration, provided the one man is fully responsible directly to the people of the municipality whose affairs he administers.

With a constitution drawn upon the lines indicated above, including authority, of course, to establish the initiative and referendum as a check upon corruption in the councils, the cities of the state adopting it would soon become mædels for municipal government everywhere. And why shouldn't the state of Ohio make this experiment—this experiment in harmony with sound political principles, and the only one that has not yet failed? Now that the way is clear for almost ideal municipal legislation in Ohio, why cling to the systemless experimentation which has everywhere and in all its variations only made the baffling problem of municipal government still more baffling? Why not turn to first principles and give the rest of the country an example of an elastic municipal system, of a true home rule system, of a system of municipal government by the people governed?

Under such a system every Ohio city would be free to express the degree of civilization to which its inhabitants aspire, and through it the spirit of emulation and local pride would tend to lift them all to a realization of better and better things in municipal affairs.

### THE DEPENDENT MASSES.

Man thinks by necessity.

The coal strike and the beef trust, to their credit be it said, are making people think who were till then, to all appearance, incapable of that operation.

Every kick makes the donkey travel. And even a donkey can see that a cordon of monopoly is being drawn tightly around the American people as elaborately and effectively as those which Lord Kitchener's forces used in entrapping the Boers—a cordon which surely and inevitably reduces them to the condition of a garrison on the point of capitulation.

The people are beginning to open their eyes at last.

They are usually asleep at election times. Their periodical visits to the

polling booth resemble a somnambulist procession.

Now they have a bone to pick with the capitalist monopolists and "we shall see what we shall see."

"Well, but surely people can do what they like with their own," your smooth-tongued, full-bellied, empty-headed, trust-bamboozled simpleton will say.

Of course they can.

Where is the security for property if a man can't "wallop his own nigger?" or lock up at his own sweet will the mine that God specially created for the exclusive benefit of himself and his heirs in perpetuity? There is none.

If the public are in any way inconvenienced by the prospect of anthracite coal reaching the respectable figure of \$14 a ton, the public will please remember that their welfare formed no part of the intention embodied in the special creation above referred to; and that it is thankful they ought to be that these coal barons, out of the goodness of their hearts and not as a matter of legal compulsion, do sometimes keep their mines open, and allow the people to purchase these "black diamonds" if they have the money.

Really, democracy, thy name is ingratitude!

For think for a moment of the obligations you are under to these owners of the earth. Instead of keeping to themselves every square inch of the country, as they might have done, they actually allow you, the public—yes, you, the common scum of humanity; the accident of accidents whom a breath might make as a breath has made—to use the city streets and the country roads, aye and the railroads, too, for a consideration, as though your names were written in the original charter conferred upon these superior beings.

Is there need of more evidence?

Well, then, let us take the tariff wall. These same classes said to you: "Let us build this wall to keep the foreigner out; for if the blamed foreigner gets a chance he will fling coal, beef and other deadly missiles not provided for in the Geneva convention, at your unprotected heads, until the necessaries of life become so

dirt cheap that you can't afford to buy them because you will have no work to do."

This was quite right. Men from whom, as above shown, you derive your permission to live, deserve all the help that little microbes like you can give them.

But now here comes the rub.

A few degenerate parasites, grossly unworthy of the patronage and protection thus extended to them, are not ashamed to assert now, that the tariff wall was built, not to keep the foreigner out, but to shut the American citizen in! Can ingratitude and audacity go further than that?

Is there any sufficient reason why these worse-than-anarchists should not be hanged? None at all—unless it be that ropes are too expensive owing to the trust having, in obedience to fashion, sent up their price.

They are always crying out for justice, these agitators.

But they have had more than justice, they have had mercy!

And for that they must thank the trusts.

T. SCANLON.

## NEWS

The civil war in Hayti (p. 296) appears now to have extended all over the republic, and conditions are reported as growing worse daily. Government troops under Gen. Nord Alexis were defeated again on the 14th in a battle at San Miguel, which they burned upon retreating. But notwithstanding the military situation, the new chamber of deputies was organized at Port au Prince on the 19th, with Deetjen Senequist as president of the chamber; and proceedings for the election by the chamber of one-third of the senators, pursuant to the constitution of 1889, were begun.

The attack upon Cumana, on the north coast of Venezuela, in the State of Cumana, and not of "Bermudez," as accidentally misstated last week (p. 296), culminated on the 19th in the defeat of the government forces and the occupation of the city by the revolutionists, who now hold several customs ports, including Cumana, La Guairas, Angustora, Vela, and Barcelona. At Angustora three