

"movements to regulate the taxing machinery of the city are foreign to the functions of the teacher." Although he concedes that upon rare occasions such movements might find temporary justification, when the city failed to provide for the proper support of schools, his declaration is regarded, as it was probably intended to be, as a rebuke to the Chicago teachers. At any rate, it sounds much like an echo of those newspapers of Chicago which, representing the corporate tax-dodging interests, have openly condemned the teachers as tax-eaters who have no business to meddle with the affairs of taxpayers. Doubtless there is wisdom in President Draper's recommendation that teachers, as a general rule, avoid associations which are not for their professional improvement. But it savors more of worldly wisdom than of civic virtue.

Several weeks ago we commented (page 437) upon a criticism by the Fairhope (Ala.) Courier of Gov. Roosevelt as a landlord. The Courier insisted, against a contention we had previously made apropos of Roosevelt, that he is personally to blame for availing himself of the benefits of the "unearned increment" of the land he owns. In response we challenged the Courier to state what Mr. Roosevelt could or ought to do, not as a citizen, but as a landlord, to divest himself of these benefits—what he could do simply as a matter of justice and not of philanthropy. Accepting this challenge, the Courier suggests two courses that Roosevelt might pursue. For one thing, it says, he might turn his unearned income over to the people of New York, either by administering it as a trustee for their benefit or by putting it into the public treasury. An all sufficient objection to this course is anticipated by the Courier itself. It foresees that as a net result Roosevelt would only benefit other landlords without at all benefiting the people. But to its own objection it replies that Roosevelt is bound in honesty to follow this course

whatever the result. That is something we cannot concede. Roosevelt is at liberty to do so, but he is not bound to. The reply assumes that Roosevelt himself has no right in justice to land values. But he has such a right; an equal right with his fellow citizens—not only in the values of his own land, but in those of all other land in the same community. And that right he would abandon by complying with the Courier's demand. Since there is no way, short of communal action, of distinguishing his right to land values from the right of others, and the community insists upon a policy which confuses those rights, no principle of honesty requires him to give up to others his own in order to rid himself of what is not his. To do so would be an act of personal generosity and not an act of justice.

The other course which the Courier suggests to Gov. Roosevelt is that he appoint himself "a trustee to administer the unearned increment, which has come or shall come to the lands under his control, for the benefit of those whose presence and enterprise have given rise to it." But this suggestion, besides being impracticable, and open to the objection to the first suggestion, begs the question. No one has any right to demand that Roosevelt or any other individual become a trustee. Roosevelt might try it or not as he pleased; and if he pleased not to, his refusal would violate no principle of justice. He would simply decline to be a paternal philanthropist. So the whole matter comes back to the point at which we started, namely, that while it is within no one's right to criticize any landlord for appropriating unearned increment which society insists upon treating as private property, it is everyone's right to criticize anybody who uses his civil power and influence to perpetuate that unjust policy.

The results of the municipal ownership and operation of the public

lighting plant in Detroit, to which we referred at page 497, are even more satisfactory than we there indicated. We spoke of the reduction in the expense of public lighting as 13 per cent. since the establishment of the municipal system. In fact, however, there has been an annual reduction, that of last year being 13 per cent. as compared with the expense of the previous year. The price per arc light of 2,000 candle power, paid for the last year under private contract, 1896, was \$133.80; but in 1897, the first year of public lighting under municipal ownership and operation, the operating expense per arc light of 2,000 candle power was only \$51.85, making a gross expense, after allowing for fixed charges (interest at four per cent., depreciation at three per cent. and loss of taxes on the investment), of only \$83.50—a clear saving of over \$50. Since 1897 this gross expense has been reduced annually, until in 1899 it was down to \$66.45. Deducting incomes from that amount—such as rentals for poles, conduits, etc.—the gross cost was only \$61.76, while the cash cost to the taxpayer was but \$37.13. Moreover, a better service has been secured than under private contract; and in the opinion of the president of the Detroit public lighting commission, the expense would be very much further reduced and the public very much better served, if the commission were allowed to do commercial lighting in competition with the private companies.

In view of the troubles in the anthracite coal region which are certain to recur in the no distant future it will be well to remember that the recent strike was settled under political compulsion. The monopolists dared not allow it to go on during the presidential campaign. They feared its effect upon their candidate—McKinley. We have this upon the authority of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, a leading Wall street organ of finance and plutocracy which supported McKinley and his plutocratic managers with vigilance and vigor.

In its issue of November 3 it claimed editorially that—

if there ever was a case where the consent to terms of settlement was secured by duress, the coal strike settlement is such an occurrence. The miners' union very shrewdly selected the occasion of a presidential election involving questions seriously affecting all industrial interests to push their scheme.

The same paper, in the same article, confessed that the condition of settlement imposed by the strikers, that the increased wages should continue for six months, was also forced upon the monopolists by the political situation, and that if it had not been demanded, the increase of wages would have been reversed after election, and the strikers made fools of. Premising that the fact already stated that the settlement was forced by the political conditions is also seen from the fact that the directors of the strike required the mine owners to pledge themselves to maintain the increased pay until the 1st of April, 1901, it proceeds:

That is to say, the strikers knew the arrangement was forced and was not an acknowledgment on the part of the operators that what they had been receiving was less than their proportionate share of the market price of the product. They feared that when the force was removed and the election passed the advance would be quickly rescinded. Hence, understanding the situation fully, they appended the time limit.

That is an interesting disclosure of the frustrated intention of the coal monopolists to outwit the strikers, and it is candid.

#### THE NEXT CAMPAIGN.

Since the presidential election the daily press has voiced once more the sentiment of many people, often expressed before, to the effect that our national campaigns are altogether too long. It is said that they interfere with trade and disturb business. They ought, it is declared, to be cut down to 30 days or even less. Why cannot we in this regard pattern after our English cousins?

Yes, there is no doubt about it, our presidential campaigns do, to a certain extent, disturb business and interfere with trade. So do our Sun-

days. So, also, do our holidays. So does sleep. All purely educational movements, as well as all pure forms of recreation, disassociated from professionalism, interfere somewhat with business and disturb or interrupt the onward sweep of trade. Why not abolish all these things? What do we live for, if not to engage in trade? Is not life for business, and not business for life? Away, then, with all such trade disturbances and interferences with business as our Sabbaths and the few holidays we have! Down with Thanksgiving day, Christmas, Washington's birthday and the Fourth of July! What can the paramount representatives of "the strenuous life" want with holidays? Instead of any longer saying, with Sancho Panza, "God bless the man who first invented sleep," let us offer a large reward for the invention or discovery of some machine or method which will utterly abolish sleep, because sleep does seriously interfere with trade and, in most lines, not simply disturbs but, for eight hours out of every 24, actually puts a stop to business. It is much worse, even, than a presidential campaign, from a purely business standing point.

To all, however, to whom such "strenuous" reasoning does not appeal, and who are still so old-fashioned as to believe that life is more important than business and more valuable than trade, it must be evident that our national campaigns are a great educational agency. They arouse thought, they impart instruction, they develop intellectual activity in relation to national affairs. It is not true in regard to the late campaign that "all was lost save honor." Its educational value was immense. Seed was sown which will never die. Other years, and perhaps other hands than ours, will reap the good harvest; but this is the way with all reform movements. They are not sudden conversions, nor speedy grafts, but slow growths.

It is true that the democracy did not succeed in educating up to the right point, during the campaign just closed, a majority of the voters. One great reason for this, of course, was lack of resources; still another was lack of time. Our national cam-

paigns, instead of being shorter, should be longer. They should be conducted with more deliberation, through a longer period of time, and consequently with more educational power.

Yet it is true, of course, that there is always some discount upon the educational value of work done in a political campaign. Let speakers speak and writers write as fairly, as earnestly and as conscientiously as they possibly can, hearers will hear and readers will read with a certain or uncertain amount of partisan bias specially difficult to overcome. The best educational work is probably done, therefore, through non-partisan channels and outside of specific political campaigns.

Of these non-partisan channels the new democracy (which is the old Lincoln republicanism and the older Jeffersonian democracy) should learn to make more use. Independent organizations, journals, platforms and pulpits should be utilized to the full.

Using the word campaign to connote this greater movement to educate the people up to a full comprehension of their rights and duties as citizens, up to a full understanding of what true democracy is and necessitates, when should the next campaign begin?

At once.

Now is not the time for inaction, much less is it the time for discouragement or despair.

True, educational processes, strictly speaking, cannot reach all minds.

Said one citizen to another the day after election: "Now I will put my money back into the bank."

"Did you take it out?"

"Yes," and with that he pulled from his pocket a great roll of bills.

"What did you do that for?"

"Well, I was afraid Bryan would be elected, and then I could not get my money!"

What can you do to educate such a mind? Nothing. The only kind of education that man could appreciate would be a squeezing between the upper millstone of monopoly and the nether millstone of destitution, and he will probably get it in due time.