

"advice" of the voluntary committee. The committee wholly neglected its true function in regard to recommending candidates. It should have named them without regard to personal preferences, but solely upon the basis of personal merit with reference to capacity and political merit with reference to Democratic principles, and left the conventions to accept its advice or substitute machine favorites at their own peril. By the "sandwich" process, which the committee seems to have adopted somewhat extensively—one preordained machine candidate bunched in with two or more advisory committee candidates—it has done not a little to bring the advisory committee plan into contempt. It might have raised it to a high place of dignity and influence.

The platform of the Democratic party of Cook county, adopted on the 14th, and which is to be credited in its more important particulars to the advisory committee, is an excellent one. Besides the declarations of only formal and local concern, the following of general interest appear:

The notorious accumulation of vast corruption funds in the hands of trusts and corporations and the use thereof in debauching our legislatures and city councils render it imperatively necessary that the work of these legislative bodies be further safeguarded by bringing legislation closer to the source of all governmental authority—the people. We therefore declare in favor of: (1) Municipal ownership of all public utilities. (2) The initiative and referendum; and, (3) The direct nomination of all candidates for public office by direct ballot at the primaries; and we demand that the legislature of Illinois shall, at the earliest possible day, enact laws to inaugurate these reforms.

We further declare in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

We declare that local self-government is a basic principle in our civilization and vital to the safety and perpetuity of the republic. We therefore demand in all such matters as assessments for and collection of taxes, the appointment and control of municipal police, and the granting of municipal franchises, the strict application of the principle of home rule.

On the subject of Democratic platforms, that of the Liberal Democracy, which held its convention at New York on the 7th (p. 152), has the true democratic ring. Following is its statement of general principles:

We are fundamentally opposed to the present unjust distribution of wealth that creates a system of society in which the few get without working, while the many work without getting; a system which must result in either anarchy or despotism and the total destruction of our republic. This condition is due to the monopoly of natural opportunities and the creation of special privileges by law. We maintain that this government, which was dedicated by the fathers of the republic to freedom and equality of opportunity, shall fulfill its true mission. We demand the opening to all of the opportunities of nature and the abolition of all special privileges. In both of the great political parties of the nation are to be found two irreconcilable factions, one in favor of governmental usurpation, tending to the establishment of a new feudalism, and the other standing for industrial and political liberty. In the Democratic party of the nation lies the only hope of the perpetuation of Democratic institutions. Yet under the leadership of such traitors to Democracy as David B. Hill an attempt is being made under the guise of reorganization to dominate the party and to degrade it to the position of a mere tool of monopoly.

The platform then proceeds to ratify and reaffirm the Kansas City platform of the national Democratic party. Specifically it applies the principles of the Declaration of Independence to the Philippines; demands the "public ownership and operation of those public utilities which are in their nature natural monopolies, such as the railroad, telegraph, telephone, gas and electric lighting;" insists that "the right to issue and coin money is solely a function of the government;" and as to the "trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies," demands that "those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enable them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn." On the latter subject it holds that "corporations, being the creatures of government, should be subjected to such governmental regulation and control as will adequately

protect the public." This democratic-Democratic platform then goes on to declare that "the land belongs to the people;" and, as a means of recognizing this right, to "demand that land values only be taxed." It favors "the initiative and referendum, the former to the end that the people may compel the enactment of good laws, the latter to the end that the people may veto legislative measures;" and it urges "the direct nomination of candidates for elective public office by the people at the primaries, and the election of United States senators and Federal judges by the people," while in municipal affairs it favors "local self-government and nonpartisanship," and "the administration of municipal government upon the principle of 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none.'" The regular Democratic party is as yet hardly democratic enough to go to the people upon a platform like this of the Liberal Democracy of New York; but it is encouraging to find so important an element of the party determined upon pressing these fundamental issues within the body of the party itself. Such a platform, with nominations of a character to amount to guarantees of good faith, would unify the real democrats of both parties and compel the plutocrats of both to huddle by themselves.

The reference in the foregoing platform to the taxation of land values recalls the recent adoption of this reform by the Johannesburg (Transvaal colony) city council, briefly mentioned on page 27 as an item of news, of which full reports are now at hand. The reports come in the Johannesburg Star, which opposed the reform. In adopting it the city council appears to have acted with the deliberate understanding that it was establishing the Henry George system of taxation. The measure came before the council on the 26th of March, being part of the "rating bill," or as we should call it in this country if we had home rule in taxation, of the "local tax ordi-

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