

nance." The member who moved the measure, explained that the principle underlying it was that the only taxable property should be land in respect of its value, and that buildings should not be taxed. He argued that the value of land within the municipal area is not due to the individual enterprise of the owners, but to the collective industry and enterprise of the community and the expenditure of public money, and that by making land values the basis of assessment, the community would share, if only to an infinitesimal extent, in the value due to its industry and enterprise, and the expenditure of its own revenues. The seconder emphasized the point that, while the taxation of land value tends to reduce both the rental and selling price of land, the taxation of buildings tends to make rents higher and accommodation worse. One of the members who spoke against the measure characterized it as an expression of "the single-tax heresy so favored by Henry George and the Sand Lot orators of San Francisco, but discredited by thoughtful economists;" to which a councilman friendly to the reform replied, expressing surprise at any deprecatory allusions to "one of the greatest men America had produced in modern times." When the measure came before the council for final action, April 2, a motion to include buildings in the schedule of taxable property was defeated.

A shameful event at Harrisburg, Ill., confirms what we have more than once had occasion to say, that the undemocratic treatment of the Negro race in the South indicates no sentiment peculiar to that part of the country. This race animosity is universal in the United States. It finds expression in the North infrequently, as compared with the South, because Negroes are too few in number in the North, relatively to the whites, to make the race question a burning one there. But northerners going South to live, quickly become pronounced "nigger-haters;" Negro families in

northern cities, respectable people and good neighbors though they be, are forced out of respectable neighborhoods. Even wealth does not protect them. If three or four wealthy Negro families were to move into a wealthy neighborhood, everybody would leave unless the Negroes could be induced to. Everywhere—in church, school, theater, hotel, street car, railway trains, notably in sleeping cars, and in the North as well as in the South—this race antipathy is in some irritating or oppressive way exhibited.

We call it race antipathy for convenience. What it really is is antipathy to the badge of slavery. On the one hand, had the Negro race never been enslaved, the antipathy would not exist. It does not exist in England, where his enslavement is only a matter of book knowledge and not of actual experience or tradition. Or, on the other hand, if the Negro did not wear in the color of his skin the tell-tale badge of ancestral servitude, the antipathy would have been by this time forgotten. To attribute to race antipathy or personal repugnance the white man's unwillingness, for instance, to eat in the company of Negroes, when he is willing to eat under their personal service—a much closer relationship physically—is nonsense. It is a shame that our race should resent its own wickedness in having lived off the unpaid labor of the Negro, by holding him in contempt. But it affords a striking exemplification of the saying that it is hard to forgive any one we have injured. And when the shameful bigotry goes to the extent of actually depriving the Negro of his civil rights, of mobbing and lynching his person and destroying his property, there are no words to fitly characterize it. It is both criminal and mean.

For many years partisan Republicans, themselves no friends of the Negro except for political purposes, have charged the South with outraging his rights. Only a few weeks ago Mr. Roosevelt made a speech in

which he went far out of his way to allude to Negro lynching as if it were peculiar to the South and the Democratic party. Yet the shameful event at Harrisburg to which we refer above, occurred in the Republican state of Illinois, and in the county of Saline, which is Republican by 300 majority. In this Republican locality Negro inhabitants, people of respectability and good order, have had their school mobbed, their clergyman attacked in his home, and themselves threatened with lynching. They have been obliged to move away, though their only crime is that they are Negroes. The Republican governor and the Republican attorney general have indeed ordered the Republican local authorities to proceed against the criminal mob. But Southern governors have done that much in similar cases. The essential point is that in the North as in the South, in Republican as in Democratic localities, the old and infamous notion still holds, that the Negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect. Whether these outrages occur in Georgia or in Illinois, in Texas or in Kansas, in Republican or in Democratic localities, they are undemocratic, un-American and a disgrace to the community that tolerates them. It remains to be seen whether the state of Illinois will allow the outrage by whites upon blacks in Saline county to go unpunished.

Civil service reform has apparently come to be a convenient device with the Republican machine for keeping its own henchmen in clerkships under hostile administrations and putting adversaries out under friendly ones. President McKinley dealt this reform a staggering blow almost as soon as he came into office for his first term, in order to facilitate Mr. Hanna's operations; and President Roosevelt, himself a professed civil service reformer, has gone on with the knock-down policy. We realize, of course, that it has all been for "patriotic" reasons and the "good of the service." The spoils system always was, if the

naked word of spoilsmen may go unchallenged. But what is the good of this pious pretense? Here for instance is the Rebecca J. Taylor case, to which we referred (pp. 147, 151) last week. Notice the tender way in which those good friends of civil service reform, the present administration and its supporters, have in that case treated civil service rules.

Miss Taylor had written and published a newspaper letter condemning the imperialist policy and criticizing Mr. Roosevelt's "stay put" speech. She was a classified clerk in the war department, but had written her letter "out of hours." In order to discharge her without officially assigning this insufficient cause, or any other, the President made a new civil service rule which throws down the bars to spoilsmen as completely as they could wish. In effect he orders that no reasons need be assigned provided the discharge is not for political or religious reasons. But when no reasons need be assigned, the discharge may be for political or religious reasons as well as any other. Miss Taylor's was for political reasons—because she was an anti-imperialist and said so. In consequence a resolution was offered in the lower house of Congress calling for an explanation; but this has been headed off by the committee on civil service which tabled the resolution by a strict party vote. A letter from the secretary of war was read, however, in which he said:

No head of a department can maintain effective administration if he is obliged to depend upon the services of clerks who are so violently opposed to the success of the work in which they are engaged that they are unable to refrain from public denunciation of the purpose of the work and public insult to the President.

That letter has a plausible sound, but will it bear examination from any other point of view than that of a thorough-going spoilsman? We think not.

To consider the last point first, every one would probably concede that no clerk should remain in gov-

ernment employment who publicly insults the President. Neither should he remain if he publicly insults any other superior, or an equal, or an inferior in the service. But, unless the spoils system is to be perpetuated, the specific reason for his discharge should be given, with its appropriate characterization, so that it may be known whether the discharge was made by a faithful head of a department for the good of the service, or by a faithful spoilsman for the good of the party. In this particular case, Miss Taylor did not insult the President. She criticized a speech of his in which he had publicly insulted his political adversaries, but she did so while off duty, as a citizen and not as a clerk, and with propriety and restraint. For such conduct she would not be amenable to discipline under any bona fide merit system in the civil service; and of this the President seems to have been well aware, for he wrecked the rules in order to discharge her for her politics without officially assigning reasons.

Mr. Root's other point is that "no head of a department can maintain effective administration if he is obliged to depend upon the services of clerks who are so violently opposed to the success of the work in which they are engaged that they are unable to refrain from public denunciation of the purpose of the work." Divested of its insinuating verbiage what does this mean? Nothing more than that it is contrary to the good of the service for government clerks to be so violently opposed to the policy of the party in power that they are unable to refrain from publicly opposing it! According to Mr. Root, then, government clerks must not criticize the party in power, though "out of hours," and though their clerical work be well done. Yet it is well known that they may safely applaud the party in power at all times, and denounce parties out of power even to the extent of calling them "cranks" and "traitors." They retain their rights of citizenship if they adopt the polit-

ical policy of the party in power; they lose them if they reject it. So we see that stability of tenure under Mr. Roosevelt's civil service reform system differs very little, if any, from what it was under the spoils system. Fidelity to the policy of the party in power is still a condition of clerical tenures. Or, as Mr. Root would probably express it, "public denunciation" of "the purpose of the work" upon which government clerks are engaged is "incompatible with the good of the service." If pious pretense should go out of fashion in the Republican party, what would become of some Republican leaders? Habits once formed are hard to get rid of.

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has won the first battle in the courts over the "ripper" legislation adopted by the Republican legislature of Ohio last winter. Johnson, it will be remembered (p. 141) had appointed a city board of tax review which attempted to tax the franchise corporations on the same basis of valuation with other property. A Republican state board, beneficiaries of railroad favors, came to the rescue, and annulled the action of the city board, thereby making the basis of franchise taxation only about a quarter as high as that of ordinary property. But it was known that the Cleveland board would raise the taxes of the privileged corporations again this year; so the plutocratic element of Cleveland, led by Senator Hanna, got the legislature to "rip" the board by passing a law authorizing the county auditor, a railway pass beneficiary, to call upon the state board, in his discretion, to appoint a tax board for Cleveland. Upon that being done the mayor's board was to be out of office. The auditor of the Cleveland county, acting under this "ripper" law, applied for a new board; and accordingly a board, manifestly calculated to serve the plutocratic interests was appointed. But the mayor's board promptly carried the matter into the courts. It applied to the auditor for clerks and messengers,