

(Ia.) Telegraph-Herald, of December 3.

VENEZUELA IS CHILD'S SIZE.

Of course it is impossible to treat an irresponsible government the same as a full-grown nation. One should reverence the rights of a child as much as a man's, but when the child gets merry with a bean shooter one naturally varies slightly the attitude of formal courtesy that is borne towards a compeer. But even a mischievous child is not to be choked black in the face, not by a gentleman, still less by a Christian.

The brutal bearing of the allies was wholly inexcusable.

They set out to collect a debt in the first place, partly the arrears of government loans and partly claims for war indemnity. The first step was to seize the Venezuelan navy.

Now Turkey has owed all the nations of the world every sort of debt for years and years. No harsh measures have been taken, partly because it would stir up European jealousy and partly because the Turks would have no compunctions about butchering all the Christians within reach if provocation was offered. European powers have treated Turkey tenderly because they dared not use rough handling. Venezuela is civilized enough so there is no fear of rude reprisals, weak enough so there is no fear of immediate retribution, isolated so there is no danger of upsetting the European balance of power. Wherefore if England and Germany have a mind to administer a swift kick, nothing hinders.

Italy once had a grievance against the United States—for the mafia massacre. Did Italy send a fleet blustering to the gates of New Orleans with notice that the custom house would be blown up if satisfaction was not given in 17 minutes by the clock? Hardly. It would not have been discreet. It would have been a sin against the comity of nations.

We had claims against Great Britain once for the damages done by the Alabama, but we were politeness itself in settling it, notwithstanding there have been gibes about American diplomacy in shirtsleeves. England is man's size. — The Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

Again, if the world had heard of the gospel of Jesus, England and Germany would not be uniting to bullyrag Venezuela.—The Red Wing Argus.

GROUND RENT AND THE SINGLE TAX.

Editorial in the number for December 13, of the Beacon, a Boston weekly magazine edited by Huntington Smith.

It is rare that one finds in this country a band of reformers so persistent and enthusiastic in their advocacy of an idea and yet so uniformly broad minded and good tempered in carrying on their agitation as the members of the Massachusetts Single Tax league. One rather fancies that this agreeable combination of earnestness and optimism arises very largely from the mental attitude of the president of the league, Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, who has been for years a pioneer in economic reform and who has won to his side a group of vigorous thinkers made up of men of quite varied callings. The methods of the Single Tax league are educational and not revolutionary. Its members are sincere believers in the mechanical power of the wedge as being in the long run superior to dynamite, and they believe in getting in the small end of the wedge first. Notwithstanding the tendency of college professors to lend their support to the single tax idea, it will not do to call the movement academic. As far as it appeals to thinking men at all it appeals on the basis of common sense. At the conference of last Monday night, in which eight professional economists took part, the discussion turned on the question of ground rent and much that was illuminating was said on the possible distinctions between land and other forms of capital, and between rent and interest. All this was interesting, instructive and suggestive, but in the end we come back to the basic fact that land is the one form of capital which may lie utterly idle and yet enhance in value to the benefit of the individual owner simply through the cooperative activities of the entire community. It is this unearned increment in the value of land that is the disturbing element in the theories of the economists, and although numerous efforts have been made to account for it and at the same time to class land as productive capital, the attempts have not on the whole been successful. Once grant the premise of the advocates of the single tax, that land, like air and sunshine, is the common inheritance of the human race, and that land has been made a monopoly simply because of its tangible quality and through the ability of the strongest to seize and hold it

—once grant this, and the logic of the single tax irresistibly follows. Upon this much at least every reasonable person is agreed, that our existing tax system is about as bad as it can be and that almost any kind of a change would be a change for the better. The suggestion made some time ago that the general court grant to all towns and cities in the commonwealth the privilege of local option in matters of taxation is still worth considering. It is barely possible that if this privilege were granted some community would experiment with the single tax as a relief from existing extortions and inequalities, and in that case we should get some very significant data for legislators as well as economists to consider.

WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Editorial in the number for Dec. 11, of City and State, the Philadelphia weekly paper ably edited by Herbert Welsh.

All our people have a plain duty to perform regarding the murder of "Father Augustine," the Filipino priest who was done to death by torture at Banate, Iloilo, Panay, December 9, 1900. It is a very disagreeable duty, but they cannot get away from it, one and all, from the greatest to the least, any more than Father Augustine could get away from the grip of Cornelius M. Brownell, of Burlington, Vt., formerly of "Paine's Celery Compound," but now in the insurance business—when he was "giving the nigger" his last dose preparatory to putting him underground. As we have been asked many times by our friends, "would you have us scuttle, desert our new responsibilities?" No, by no means, we reply; you must meet them. One of the responsibilities is this in the year 3 of the Empire; since the flag is not hauled down in the Philippines, you are responsible for the murder of this Roman Catholic priest, committed under its protecting folds, not by one of your officers alone, but by one evidently in conspiracy with others. Your authorities, instead of doing justice to the murdered man and to you—you for the time disgraced before the world by that crime—have steadily run away from justice and are running now despite what they say to hide that fact. They declare openly that all criminals have been punished, but we have demonstrated that there are many who have not