

upon the legislature to frame and submit a statute for final adoption. Judge Dunne asks why this simple amendment does not cover completely all the needs of a city like Chicago. It does. And it is in harmony with the line along which public opinion is forcing legislation. It would tend to establish home rule.

Mark Twain is severely criticized by friends of Dr. Ament, the Chinese missionary, for his condemnation of that gentleman's exploit in levying contributions upon Chinese villages with a "mailed hand." The missionary's friends protest that Dr. Ament "appealed" to the head men and the people of these villages for redress for the destruction by Boxers of the homes of Chinese Christians, and, to quote one of them, that "the villagers responded nobly to this appeal." That response must have been a sight for the gods. A whole people aroused to madness by foreign intrusion, and native Christians despised and hated and assailed as perverts to foreign superstitions; yet a foreign missionary collects from Chinese villages a large fund to reimburse these Chinese perverts for their losses, and does it by moral suasion alone! If that story were true, it would go far to prove that Chinese villagers are morally head and shoulders above other races of men. But it is much to be feared that Mark Twain's estimate of Dr. Ament's exploit is correct. All the probabilities point to the good doctor's use, in addition to moral suasion, of something like immoral threats.

That eminent professional regulator of poor people's lives, Jacob Riis, has been studying the inhabitants of Chicago's First ward, with a view to the possibilities of putting them under plutocratic tutelage. Having made observations at a ball of the First Ward Democratic association, he sagaciously concludes that these people are not fit to govern the most valuable two square miles west of the Alleghanies, and suggests that the owners of First ward property

should, regardless of where they live, be allowed to vote for First ward aldermen. This is the old British landlord idea of a vote to every landlord wherever he owns land. It is the manifest political evil which Anglo-Saxon common sense has resisted under the cry of "one man, one vote." Government is for men, not for valuable lots. When consulted about Mr. Riis's plutocratic proposition, several Chicago property owners thought it excellent. But one sensible downtown merchant, Otto Young, of the Fair, gave it a quietus. "According to law," said Mr. Young, "every man who lives in the ward has a vote, and that is all there is to it; you can't take his vote away from him, and you can't give a vote to a man who lives outside the ward." Mr. Young's remark is true, whether stated as matter of law or of good American horse sense. If the First ward property owners wish to vote in the First ward, they have only to move into it. As yet, men and not property are the voters in this country. That is a condition, however, which plutocrats, rich plutocrats and poor ones, are extremely anxious to reverse.

The disposition of the senate to retain the check stamp tax is another indication of the indifference of law makers to the rights of that part of the community which cannot or does not make its demands known forcibly. This stamp tax is a burden upon the ordinary man. To rich men it makes no difference. Their checks are so large that a two-cent tax on each is less than a bagatelle. And it is no inconvenience to them to invest ten dollars or more in books of ready-stamped checks. Even if it were, they have clerks to draw their checks; and the clerks would suffer all the bother of affixing and cancelling. Not so with the man of small means, who nevertheless uses checks for his payments, as all business men should. Unless he spends ten dollars in a lump sum for a stamped check book, he must "lick" and stick and cancel stamps every time he draws a check; and as

his checks are small, the tax of two cents on each is out of all proportion to the tax upon rich men's checks.

Addressing "the man with the hoe," by way of inculcating a general lesson on capital, that unique and bright little publication of New York, "The Straight Edge," says:

Do not imagine that your debt to all those fellow men and to those other thousands who have lived and died and left the products of their brain and skill to swell the common capital of the race, is paid when you hand 50 cents over the counter for a hoe!

The debt referred to is described as running against "the man with the hoe"—

to the brain and skill of thousands upon thousands of his fellow men, from the prehistoric inventor down to the miner who digs the iron out of the earth, the machinist who forges and tempers it, the woodsman who fells the tree from which the handle is made, the workman who turns the handle, the railroad that transports the products, with all the innumerable gangs of workmen who have a part in making the miner's pick and shovel, the machinist's forge and tools, the woodsman's ax and wagon, the turner's lathe and chisels, the railroad's engines and cars and signals and warehouses, etc.

But why is not that debt all paid when "the man with the hoe" hands 50 cents over the counter for that implement?

It is a very common thing for men of socialistic trend of mind to say that the debt is not paid, and to think so. The idea is common, too, with the university cult of economists and sociologists, whose chief aim in life it seems to be to blur the primary distinctions and obscure the elementary differences between mine and thine and ours. But we have yet to be shown in any rational way why "the man with the hoe" does not discharge all economic obligations when he hands his 50 cents over the counter for it. Being "the man with the hoe," he earns that 50 cents. It represents less than the value of his labor rather than more. Consequently, he starts fair. And as the merchant who sells him the hoe charges him 50 cents, that sum must fully represent all that has been paid for the labor of making

it and bringing it to the counter. That those who have contributed to this work have been underpaid, may be at once conceded. But they have been paid all that they were able to exact, and if they were crippled in their bargaining that raises a deeper yet simpler question than "The Straight Edge" suggests, and one which is foreign to the particular point here considered—the question of the buyer's title to the hoe. In the 50 cents that he hands over he satisfies every worker's exaction from miner and woodman to retail merchant.

But what about the "prehistoric inventor," and those "thousands who have lived and died and left the products of their brain and skill to swell the common capital of the race?" The simple and sufficient answer is that none of these made that particular hoe. Though they made other hoes, thus swelling the capital of the past which has been exhausted, they did not swell existing capital. What they really did for the buyer of the hoe was to swell the fund of human knowledge. From that fund we may draw if we will. From it the miner and the woodman, the machinist, the transporter, the merchant, all who figure in this illustration, have drawn; and their labor in doing so is more or less fully (according to circumstances not involved in this question of title) represented in the retail price of the hoe. As to the fund of knowledge itself, those dead and gone saints of industry who helped to heap it up make no charge for it. If anybody else does, it is because some law or social institution gives them a special privilege which ought to be abolished. Except for monopolies of that sort, the knowledge of the race is as free as air, subject only to the labor necessary to make it one's own—an appropriation which tends to increase rather than diminish the fund. To attempt to rest the economically confused and morally confusing doctrine of common ownership of labor products, upon the contributions of a dead past

to the race's fund of common knowledge, is to go far afield bringing nothing home.

Voters who supported McKinley at the late election but oppose imperialism, are invited to correspond with John A. O'Connor, box 212 Madison square branch, New York city, with a view to petitioning congress to adopt toward the Philippine islands the principles of the Cuban resolution of April 18, 1898, which we reprinted last week. There are some voters, doubtless, who fall into this category, though it is not altogether to the credit of their political intelligence. But the voters who put country above party by making this petition in the only effective way in which it could be made, by voting for Bryan, will appreciate even a late arrival of the rear guard, and welcome a long petition through Mr. O'Connor's agency.

North Carolina now furnishes its quota to the accumulating evidence of "prosperity." Cotton mill owners there have locked out organized labor and with the aid of non-union workmen maintained their lockout for months, so plentiful is the supply of labor seeking employment. The job that was hunting the man during the campaign last fall will find game abundant in North Carolina now.

John J. Lentz rendered a needed service Wednesday on the floor of congress. The occasion was the discussion of a proposition to pay not more than \$50 each for the capture of army deserters. Mr. Lentz took advantage of the opportunity to direct the attention of the house to the reports of barbarities perpetrated by American troops upon the Filipinos, which, he said, had so disgusted soldiers with humane sentiments as to account for their desertion. With reference to these barbarities he added: "If that is the sort of civilization that is being carried into the Philippines, it would take \$5,000 to prevent our soldiers from deserting." The

reply of the imperialists in the house was characteristic. Their spokesman was Congressman Cannon, of Illinois, a bellicose patriot who is ever ready to make sanguinary sacrifices upon the altar of his country with other people's blood. Mr. Cannon made no attempt to refute Lentz's charges of barbarity. He asked for no investigation into their truth. What he did was to call Lentz a traitor for making the charges. "You're a parallelogram!" said Dr. Johnson to the fishwife. The exact words of Mr. Cannon were:

Protected by his position in the American congress, the gentleman from Ohio has uttered words which, if he had uttered as an American citizen in the Philippine islands he would have been subject to drumhead court-martial and sentenced to be shot—and properly so."

At that the imperialist members in the house applauded vociferously. But what better confirmation of his charges could Lentz have desired? If an American in the Philippines can expose barbarous practices upon the natives by our troops, only at the risk of drumhead court-martial and military execution, though there is no legal war in progress, then it is high time that all congressmen who are patriots by some better token than the button they wear, take advantage of the privileges of their position to denounce the startling advances that imperial militarism is making.

The resolution of the lower house of the Illinois legislature to investigate Dowie's private bank and projected lace factory is an unwarranted invasion of private rights which it is to be hoped the courts will be courageous enough to stop. Not in the interest of Dowie, especially, but in the interest of the private rights of everybody, which are jeopardized by this proceeding. Dowie's bank and factory are not public institutions. They are as private as dry goods stores. There is no complaint that they are defrauding or oppressing. Everybody who puts money into either does so of his own accord. For all that