

the injunction in force. But immediately upon the dissolution of the injunction, and before the perfection of the appeal, there being no stay of their action meantime, the board added \$7,291,609 to the company's tax. These are the facts on which the contempt proceedings are based.

The action of the democratic convention of Iowa gives an indication of the extent to which Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has forced the subject of equitable taxation upon public attention. In its platform this convention declares:

The Democratic party believes that the burden of taxation should be borne equally by all taxable property subject to the jurisdiction of the state. We pledge our members of the general assembly to formulate and urge the adoption of such a law as will compel the burden of taxation to rest on corporate and individual property alike, without favor and exemption of any interest.

Weak as this declaration is, for railroad interests got into the democratic as well as into the republican convention of Iowa, it is nevertheless directly in line with the work that Johnson is doing in Ohio. Even the preliminary statement that "taxation should be borne equally by all taxable property," is in harmony, as far as it goes, with Johnson's fiscal principle. Though a careless reading might make it appear like a declaration in favor of the absurdly inequitable general property tax, to which Johnson is opposed, a second reading will disclose that it leaves open the question of what ought to be taxable property. The essence of the declaration is that all property which you make taxable you should tax equally. That is honest doctrine. But when it comes to the point of trying to tax all kinds of property equally the public will discover the necessity of distinguishing property that can be and ought to be taxable, from property that cannot be taxed fairly and ought not to be taxed at all.

The tax question is really the only issue in Iowa this year, as it is in Ohio,

though the republican platform of Iowa is vague and the democratic platform affirms the national platform of the party. But that affirmation became necessary because the reactionary conspirators of the party exploited Ohio, Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania as having abandoned the national platform when they did not reaffirm it, and were ready to make the same exploitation with reference to Iowa. This view, which we elaborated last week, is confirmed by the Dubuque Telegraph, the most representative democratic paper in Iowa, and a democratic paper which is democratic. It says:

If the Ohio convention had said nothing about national questions and limited its platform exclusively to state issues; and if its action and the action of Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland had not been construed and paraded by plutocrats and the plutocratic press as a deliberate repudiation of the national Democratic platform and leader, the democrats of Iowa might have waived reaffirmation and contented themselves with a platform dealing with state issues alone. But when what had preceded gave certain assurance that if they did this their action would be interpreted and heralded as proof that they also were against what they had supported in 1900 they refused to assent to anything short of reaffirmation. In ordinary circumstances, this being a year when no congressmen are chosen and a governor and a legislature are, they would not have objected to a purely state platform. They were unwilling, however, to pass the Kansas City platform without mention when they knew that the moment they had done so it would be proclaimed from one end of the land to the other that they had such an imperfect conception of and such little devotion to fundamental democratic principles as to be against them in 1901, though they had been for them in 1900. It was the plutocratic press of the country that made reaffirmation an unavoidable issue in Iowa, and Iowa's answer is unmistakable and worthy of its patriotism and intelligence.

The brave anti-independent speech of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, of Harvard, which was the principal speech at the annual alumni dinner of Sanderson academy, has attracted the critical attention of the Chicago

Chronicle. As the Chronicle is somewhat unsteady upon its political feet, a phenomenon which is due to dizziness in its political head, this criticism of Prof. Norton, both in its substance and in its spirit, is naturally enough somewhat incoherent. Prof. Norton had attributed to the Filipino patriots the same motives that controlled the American people in 1776. To that the Chronicle replies that the professor overlooks many important facts. It specifies two, describing them as of more than passing mention, which shows how important the others may be. The first is "the fact that there never was a time when the Filipino insurrection against Spain, and probably this is true also as against the United States, could not have been bought with money." But precisely that accusation might have been made, and with greater force, against the American patriots. For Great Britain did buy one of our greatest generals, Benedict Arnold, a purchase that would have ended the revolution but for the accidental capture of Andre; whereas our efforts to buy the Filipinos utterly failed, and the so-called sale to Spain was not a sale. Spain granted the reforms demanded by the Filipinos, which was the main consideration, and the money that passed was quite as legitimate as the money we paid to Spain for the Philippine islands. Moreover, it was all used to support the second rebellion, waged against Spain because she refused the reforms she had promised to grant. The other fact to which the Chronicle calls attention is equally weak as a criticism of Prof. Norton. The Chronicle says: "So far as we are advised, the noblest inspiration of the insurgents when they were in greatest force in front of Manila, shortly before its capture by the Americans, was that that city should be given up to pillage and its inhabitants put to the sword." Then the Chronicle is badly advised. This slander was an imperialistic afterthought. Even if it had been true, would the Filipinos appear thereby to have been worse than our own