

wealth of Christian precept and their poverty of Christian example, to criticise "Golden Rule" Jones. He earnestly sought, at any rate, to demonstrate the efficacy of the golden rule as a law of social life. Whether or not he sought in the right direction, he at all events refused refuge in the indolent explanation that the precepts of Christianity and the necessities of civilization make a paradox which only the Lord can reconcile.

Mr. Jones was commonly classified as a socialist. Not alone was this done by those to whom "socialist" is only a handy epithet to hurl at everyone who ventures to protest against the present social disorder. He was supposed to be a socialist by socialists themselves, although not regarded as orthodox by the "scientific" cult.

In truth, however, Jones was most distinctly an individualist, notwithstanding the fact that he believed in social solidarity. He conceived of social solidarity as the natural product of individual love. To appreciate his golden rule philosophy in its relation to society, one must consider the three theories into which social philosophy is capable of being finally analyzed.

There is at one extreme pure individualism, which considers social life as an expression merely of individual life in the aggregate, and regards the individual as paramount, admitting of no principle of coercion of the individual by agents of organized society. At the other extreme is socialism, which considers social life as an organic whole, and regards society as paramount, contemplating control of the individual by organized society through coercion. Between these extremes is the third concept of human relationships, which distinguishes individual affairs from common concerns, regarding the individual as paramount in the former and society in the latter, and contemplating coercion in legitimate spheres of common action, but excluding it from legitimate spheres of individual action.

It is evident that the social philosophy of "Golden Rule" Jones cannot be assigned to the intermediate theory defined above. He made no distinction between indi-

vidual and common concerns. The larger wages he earned by his labor as an organizer of production were the same in his eyes as the royalties he received from privileges of which he was a beneficiary. He saw no better private title to the one than to the other, and claimed none to either.

Neither can his social philosophy be assigned to the class distinguished as socialism. The individual of flesh and blood and nerve, of thought and feeling and spiritual possibilities, was too big, in his theory of the scheme universal, to be regarded as nothing more than a cell in the social organism. Coercion, moreover, was abhorrent to him.

His abhorrence of coercion was so strong that he rejected the individual modes of coercion which most individualists admit into their philosophy. The only force for which he stood was the melting, fusing force of love. He was an individualist whose principle of social progress was expressed by the golden rule.

In our view Mr. Jones would have given greater effect to his efforts at practicing the golden rule, had he clearly distinguished between private right and private privilege, between private affairs and common concerns, between private earnings and common benefits.

The golden rule is not an admonition to do to others as they would selfishly have us do to them, nor as we would selfishly have them do to us. It is as our ideas of fairness between man and man would prompt us to have others do to us that the golden rule would have us do by them. This Christian rule is not a sentimental apothegm; it is a vital law of justice, in the administration of which each individual is commissioned, not as an amiable autocrat but as a just judge, to decide the other man's case as if it were his own. The test question under it must always be like this: "Were I the other and were he I, what would I have him do to me if I were governed in my desire by my sense of fairness?"

But Samuel M. Jones, however it may have been with his theory of the golden rule, whether unsound or sound, sentimental or

wise, had the full confidence and courage of his convictions, and lived without faltering, as well as one might in the social disorder that surrounded him, the life which it was given him to see as the truest.

If as a magistrate he was no harsher with poor and disreputable criminals than other magistrates are with rich and respectable ones, it is as yet to appear that crime has been fostered thereby.

If as a rich manufacturer he adjusted his business as best he could under the circumstances so as to distribute some of the profits among the workmen, it is yet to appear that those workmen have been "pauperized" thereby.

If as a citizen he steadfastly refused to be bound by party ties, it is yet to appear that this may not be the most efficacious way of dissipating dangerous party power.

If as a man he tried to live by the golden rule, instead of acquiring a churchly reputation, it is yet to appear that he may not thereby have set a better example of Christian faith.

As a captain of industry his life was one of great usefulness. As a philanthropist his methods were superior and his example unique. As a citizen and public official his record is an inspiration. As one who loved his fellow men he will not soon be forgotten.

#### "OOM PAUL."

With the death of Paul Kruger, President of the South African Republic before its subjugation by British arms, the most dramatic personage of that sad history passes away.

Although Kruger personified Boer resistance to British conquest, and in a sense personified the republic of which he was president, he did not personify the spirit of that republic. He was provincial and conservative; the spirit of the republic was fast becoming cosmopolitan and democratic. Kruger held his place in spite of what he represented, because his long public service had endeared him personally to the people. With his death the South African Republic of religious bigotry and provincial aristocracy, would have given way to a

South African Republic of religious liberality and political democracy?

But the plutocratic ring of which Cecil Rhodes was head center, could not wait for this. Perhaps it would be truer to say that they feared it. According to their philosophy the possibilities of making the British flag in South Africa "a more valuable commercial asset" would be stronger if the Boer republic were subjugated before the democratic spirit to which it was yielding could fully develop. So Kruger was crowded with diplomatic maneuvers, and British troops were advanced to ward the frontier. Thus the little republic was made to see that it must risk destruction by striking at once, or make destruction certain by allowing the British army to hem it in and British diplomats to extort terms to suit themselves. So the war began, the republic was overthrown, a British colony was erected in its stead, and the plutocrats who instigated this policy of conquest are in full control.

Kruger's death serves to revive interest in the havoc they wrought. Not only have they subjugated a people who were fast tending toward democracy, and established upon the ruins of their republic a despotic colonial system, but they have begun to fasten upon the people a system of coolie slavery. Chinese coolies are being imported in droves, not merely because of the fact that the Chinese workman is cheap, says the Manchester Guardian, but "also that he would not have a vote and his labor would keep out the labor of British emigrants who would want votes and take them and use them perhaps to the disquietude of the Rudds, Beits, Ecksteins, Albus." Into the subjugated Transvaal, of which the British so recently complained that full naturalization could be had only after some fourteen years' residence, and made that an excuse for warring against the Boers, an overwhelming population of Chinese is to be brought, who are to be denied not alone citizenship for fourteen years, but citizenship forever, and, as the London Speaker describes it, "are to be forbidden all the civil rights of ordinary men."

This species of helotism is the

wretched outcome of those spasms of British "patriotism" which overawed free speech in England, and of the flow of British blood which enriched the African veldt.

Yet there is nothing unique about it all. The civilized world is passing through an era of plutocracy, of which the South African war was only part. The recent history of South Africa is but a paragraph in the history of this world-wide struggle to overthrow democracy. In South Africa the plutocrats have won a battle and disclosed their destructive designs upon human freedom. Elsewhere the fight is still going on.

Let democracy everywhere turn, then, to the spectacle of the subjugated Boer republic, and out of the brave fight of the Boers, which Kruger's death recalls, draw inspiration for the greater sacrifices that are yet to be demanded of those who hold in trust the rights of generations to come after them. And let no one forget that plutocracy fights not with guns alone, nor only upon bloody battlefields. Elections, legislatures, churches, schools, colleges, political conventions, all offer it opportunities and no opportunity is ever neglected. Of the aggressions of plutocracy the passing of Paul Kruger should be a constant reminder.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### TORONTO.

Toronto, Ont., July 14.—What may prove to be a contest of more than provincial importance is on in Toronto. Single taxers under the leadership of W. A. Douglas, Alan C. Thompson and the Roebuck brothers are conducting a campaign which may prove to be a turning point in the battle for just taxation.

At the last municipal election here these tax reformers addressed inquiries to all the candidates for the city council, asking them to declare for the right of the council to exempt residential improvements up to \$700 in value.

Although this is a Conservative city, about two-thirds of the councilmen who were elected pledged themselves to vote in favor of such exemption and to urge the municipal council to petition the provincial parliament (Ontario) for the right to so exempt. Favorable action by the council along these lines is expected at an early date.

Immediately this action is had the tax reformers will inaugurate a series of street meetings all over the city, mak-

ing this question of exemption of small home improvements the burden of their talks, the object being to impress both the municipal council, the Toronto members of parliament and the entire provincial legislature with the strength of the demand for this reform. It is their opinion that the voters of Toronto would declare in favor of this exemption by a vote of at least five to one. The demand they will make of parliament will be for local option in taxation for the entire Province, but they may have to content themselves with the entering wedge—local option for Toronto only. They are fairly confident of securing at least this much, as the government has only a majority of three in the legislature, while it contains several members decidedly friendly to the single tax, although none are declared adherents.

In view of the fact that neither law nor custom compels a candidate for either the Provincial or the Dominion parliament to be a resident of the district which he contests, it would seem that the single tax men of Canada might long ago have picked out the constituency offering the best chance of success and run one of their own number as a candidate. One of the indirect effects of the absence of this prohibition of candidacy except by residents of the particular district wherein the candidate was running, has been to duplicate the experience of Great Britain, where a very large proportion of the members are residents of London, without even a "faggot" vote in the English county or borough which they represent in Parliament.

In Ontario, as in England, many members from rural constituencies live in the cities or the large towns, and because of this they have enacted a law which directs the assessment of land in five acre patches or over as farm land. How this operates in a large city like Toronto can be easily imagined, especially when its extended area is considered. This is one of the matters which the Ontario tax reformers will endeavor to remedy as soon as they have secured local option in taxation.

How unequal and unjust the present assessment in this city is, is indicated by a typical assessment. The King Edward hotel is the finest and most costly in the city and was but recently completed at what is stated to be an outlay for ground and building of \$1,300,000. It is assessed at the odd \$300,000, the million being ignored; in other words, at not to exceed 25 per cent. of its value. And this in a city where the home of the mechanic, the laborer and the clerk, up to \$2,000 or \$3,000, is assessed in many cases at 100 per cent.

Nor is the King Edward hotel an exceptional illustration of inequality in assessment. What is regarded as the most costly residence in the city belongs to a distiller, is said to have cost (and