

ing at the stake. It contented itself with commonplace hanging, thereby earning the commendation, we presume, of those good preachers who found nothing to condemn in the Colorado lynching but the fact that the mob burned their victim instead of murdering him humanely. There were three victims in the Indiana case. All of them were negroes. One of them confessed to having committed the murder the mob had set out to avenge. But he confessed under duress and in terror. The law books agree that confessions made under such circumstances are worthless. But the Indiana mobbers were not particular about the value of confessions. They wanted "the nigger," and his confession was good enough for all practical purposes. So they hanged him. And as this negro had in his confession implicated another of his race, the mob hanged him, too. The confessor had also implicated a third negro, who was yet at liberty. But the sheriff put him in jail and held him there securely until the mob came again. Without encountering the least resistance from any official, it dragged the new prisoner out and hanged him also. This was all done in the most orderly and genteel manner imaginable by a mob of all classes, some of the most respectable men of the locality participating, and no masks were worn. When the Colorado lynching occurred its apologists explained it on the theory that the abolition of capital punishment in Colorado has made it necessary for mobs to administer the extreme penalty in aggravated cases. But as capital punishment has not been abolished in Indiana the Colorado excuse will not serve there. The simple explanation of all these lynchings, north and south, is the unreasonable and unreasoning, not to say unchristian, contempt for negroes which prevails among white people. Negroes are lynched not because of their crimes, but because a crime by a negro is felt to be more heinous than the same crime by a white man. So strong is this feeling that even the safeguards

which the law adopts to shield the innocent are regarded as superfluties when invoked in behalf of a negro. In the Indiana lynching case, for instance, the mob hanged three men upon the uncorroborated confession of one, the other two protesting their innocence. Even if lynching could be justified under any circumstances, lynching upon no better evidence of guilt than that would condemn the lynchers for criminal lack of intelligence.

Representative Crumpacker, a republican of Indiana, has again introduced a bill reducing congressional representation to the basis of voting population. It is in this way that he proposes to punish states that disfranchise the negro. And it is the only way in which the federal government can punish them. Yet President McKinley opposes Crumpacker's bill. When that gentleman proposed it last year it was pigeon-holed. And such will doubtless be its fate again this year unless Mr. McKinley can be persuaded to favor its adoption. Here is an opportunity for northern negroes who object to the disfranchisement of their race in the southern states. Let them bring their influence to bear in support of the Crumpacker bill. If they neglect to do so, if they allow that bill to be again pigeon-holed without a protest from their leaders or their press, without so much as a petition in its favor, they must not be surprised if the public come to suspect them of having a deeper interest in the plums of republican machine politics than in the maintenance of their constitutional rights as a race.

On the occasion of the public announcement this week of a gift of \$1,500,000 to the University of Chicago from John D. Rockefeller, the president of the university, Mr. Harper, took advantage of the opportunity to express his opinion about freedom of speech and its abuse by uni-

versity professors. The allusion was obvious, of course. Hard upon the heels of the dismissal of Prof. Ross, of Leland Stanford, Jr., university, for giving expression to views on street car monopolies and coolie labor at variance with those entertained by Mrs. Stanford, the "angel" of the institution, Mr. Harper could not with very good grace have boasted of so munificent a donation of \$1,500,000 from the most notoriously absorptive parasite of our monopoly era, without offering assurances that the gift was really and truly a gift and not a bribe.

This assurance Mr. Harper offered specifically. "Mr. Rockefeller has never," he said, "by a single word or act, indicated his dissatisfaction with the instruction given to the students in the university or with the public expression of opinion made by an officer of the university." One could have wished the assurance to be more specific. But Mr. Harper doubtless meant to assert that Mr. Rockefeller's donations have no influence upon sociological instruction at the institution, and in the absence of counter testimony it may be assumed that this is so. When, however, the evils of the system with which Mr. Rockefeller has identified himself and through which he manages to absorb millions of wealth that other men earn, are more clearly recognized and freely exposed at the University of Chicago, there will be less difficulty in believing that there is not some vague and unconscious connection between the policy of the school and the magnitude of Rockefeller's donations.

Of Mr. Harper's abstract views on free speech by professors in their class rooms, it is possible to speak strongly and favorably. Headvoted freedom of expression, even though it be abused. "For the abuse of such liberty," he said, "is not so great an evil as its restriction." That is unqualifiedly true. And in defining abuse of free speech by professors Mr.

Harper did not lay himself open to serious criticism. On the contrary, his views essentially are perfectly sound. We quote his words:

A professor is guilty of abuse who promulgates as truth opinions which have not been scientifically tested by his colleagues in the same department of research. A professor abuses his liberty who takes advantage of the classroom to promulgate the partisan views of one or another of the political parties. A professor should not speak with authority on subjects not connected with his department of work. A professor abuses his freedom of expression when he speaks without exercising that quality which it must be confessed in some cases the professor lacks, ordinarily called common sense.

If fidelity to these rules were conditions of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts to the university, the public could make no complaint on that account. Yet it is fair to ask, how long it might be before the opinions of a courageous professor of economics, if they happened to run counter to Mr. Rockefeller's pecuniary interests, would be "scientifically tested" by his less courageous "colleagues in the same department of research."

Charles Francis Adams, the distinguished Bostonian, has evoked extended comment by his endorsement of the taxation doctrines of Henry George. This is no new departure by him. Several years ago he put himself on record to the same effect in a letter to a Washington banquet to which he had been invited. But his recent letter, addressed to C. B. Fillebrown, president of the Massachusetts Single Tax league, and printed in full in the Boston papers early in the present month, embodies an extended argument in support of the George idea. Although he says but little on the moral aspects of the question, about which, as he observes, a great deal might be said, Mr. Adams declares it to be the most important side of all, and one that admits, so far as he can see, of but one opinion, and that in favor of the proposed reform. Even from the selfish point of view he sees an advantage in the single tax, though he fears that at first it might bear

harshly upon farmers. Mr. Adams's fear in this respect is doubtless due to his assumption that the exemption of improvements and personal property of farmers would not be so great as the increased tax that would fall upon their land. He also ignores the effects of the greater business activity that would instantly follow the release from taxes of business enterprise, and the discouragement by heavier taxation of mere speculation in land. It is fairly certain that every working farmer whose land is farm land and is reasonably improved, would pay lower taxes under the George system than he pays now. But, as Mr. Adams says, "with the single tax as with many other things, the adage, no less fitting than it is homely and old, would probably be found true: "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." And that proof seems now to be not so far out of reach as only a few years ago it was. The frank declarations of men like Mr. Adams, the report of the Colorado tax commission, the approval in greater or less degree of such influential papers as the Springfield Republican, the Boston Herald, the Boston Post, and the Boston Beacon, and the greater willingness of conscientious men of affairs everywhere to consider the subject, all indicate the possibility of an early adoption of this system, at least to the extent to which it has been adopted and found satisfactory in Australasia.

Galveston furnishes an example of the direction in which the pecuniary benefits of public improvements go. Since the destruction of that city by the tidal wave last fall, Galveston building lots have had hardly any value. But the talk of a sea wall has put a little life into land speculation. The actual erection of a sea wall would add millions to the value of those lots. Real estate dealers understand this, whether the public does or not. One of them advertised in the Galveston News about a month ago, soliciting purchasers of lots on the expectation of congressional improve-

ments. "Buy property now and here," his advertisements read; "Galveston will have a gigantic sea wall in front, a mammoth moat in rear, a channel 36 feet deep and 1,200 feet wide in front of docks. The present republican congress will build it. Hurrah for McKinley and the sea wall!! Bargain No. 1," etc., etc. Thoughtful people may fairly ask why congress should pay for these improvements out of the funds of all the people, when the private building lots of Galveston will be enhanced in value to a far greater amount than the cost of the improvements. Why not give the benefited property owners of Galveston, instead of the non-benefited taxpayers of the United States, the privilege of paying for the improvements?

When the Salisbury government passed the act of 1896 for the relief of British farmers, the farmers were warned by the keener sighted and more outspoken liberals that the act was in truth one for the relief of landlords. Instead of lifting taxes from the working farmers who farm farms, they predicted that it would relieve the idle farmers who farm farmers. This prediction has now been verified. Before the act, so the London Speaker explains, landlords were constrained to make the tenants a rebate from their rent equal to half their tax. But after the act, which remitted to farmers half their tax, the landlords exacted full rent. It is the landlords, therefore, and not the tenants, who profit by the act for the relief of agricultural distress. There is a lesson in this. It is sharply suggestive of a truth that admits of no intelligent controversy, namely, that financial benefits conferred by government invariably tend to the enrichment of landowners.

On the subject of municipal taxation, the American League of Municipalities, which closed its sessions at Charleston, adopted sensible resolutions. Premising that "the fundamental principle of free institutions