

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

troops in their behavior toward other Filipino towns? Some were pillaged by our troops; and if the inhabitants were not put to the sword they were slaughtered, without the usual notice of bombardment, by American shot and shell.

Very courteously and with a perfectly candid presentation of our side of the case, the Boston Beacon replies to our article (p. 274) on excessive exports. We discover in this reply, however, only two or three points that call for a response. One of them is to this effect: Even if foreigners, having invested in this country, do derive large returns, and "our excess of exports goes largely to balance the account," it does not follow "that by this process the country is becoming impoverished." We think it does follow, to the degree of the excess. To the extent that our exports represent incomes to foreigners, they represent an outgo to us. We may be paying for an old import that once enriched us, but the return payment is a drain—that is, it in itself is evidence of depletion and not of enrichment. Yet protectionists, and even the Beacon itself, refer to this outgo as in itself evidence of prosperity. We advise them to reflect upon the suggestiveness of Puck's first page cartoon of August 28. So much for one point.

Before taking up the next, let us warn the Beacon against incautiously misleading its readers, and possibly itself, by assuming that the American excess of exports consists only of merchandise. It is not merely an excess of merchandise, but, taking merchandise, gold and silver altogether, still the export balance is enormous. We give the Beacon this reminder because it says that—
an enormous increase in exports of merchandise means an enormous expansion of industry to meet the demands of the markets of the world.
 This would imply that the balance of exports consists of merchandise alone, leaving uninformed readers to infer that it is paid for with silver and gold. At this place also we should

like to interject a question: How can "an enormous expansion of industry to meet the demands of the markets of the world," when caused by "an enormous increase of exports of merchandise," for the value of which we get back only a small return in merchandise, silver and gold—how can that in itself enhance the prosperity of this country?

Now as to the next point. The Beacon unqualifiedly asserts that "the exporting countries are the rich and prosperous countries, and the importing countries are the countries that are impoverished." We make no concealment of our astonishment at that assertion. The reverse has long been accepted as true, and we should be sincerely obliged for a reference to the statistics upon which the Beacon bases its novel assertion. The statistics that are accessible to us show that India, for example, a very type of an impoverished country, is an exporting country. It appears from the Statesman's Year Book for 1901, page 151, to have been an exporting country for at least 40 years. The same reference book, at page 80, shows Great Britain—the conventional type of a prosperous country—to have had a steady excess of imports for ten years. In fact, Great Britain has been an importing country fully half a century.

Answering the Beacon's question, "Suppose, for instance, that the balance were the other way, and that our imports exceeded our exports, would the editor of the Public argue that the country was growing richer?" we say, By no means. Unlike those who boast of excessive exports, he would want to know more about what the figures meant. Excessive imports, as a fact by itself, does imply greater wealth; while excessive exports, as a fact by itself, implies a drain. This is only another way of saying that income in itself implies wealth and outgo in itself implies drain. Inasmuch, however, as excessive exporting may be for investment, and (as we showed

three months ago at page 51) thereby be the cause of excessive importing in the future, so excessive importing may be thriftless borrowing and thereby be the cause of excessive exporting in the future. In those circumstances excessive exporting would be in the direction of enhancing wealth, while excessive importing would be in the direction of diminishing it. But our criticism with reference to all this boasting about excessive exports, is not that excessive exporting is necessarily a drain, other considerations being taken into account, but that the boasters do not take other considerations into account. They put forth the fact that exports are excessive, and then, assuming that excessive exporting is in itself profitable, conclude that prosperity is thereby proved. And in this the Beacon also is an offender. In its very last number it quotes the latest statistics of enormously excessive exportation, with an implication that they in themselves mean prosperity. The burden is upon it, therefore, to show what are the conditions that turn our enormous and continuous excess of exports, which in itself would be evidence of a drain, into evidence of prosperity.

We note that J. Sterling Morton's Conservative has reached the conclusion that opportunities for success in life are better than ever. Mr. Morton means, of course, not that success is more easily achieved, but that the successes possible now are greater in magnitude than those which used to be possible. This is true. Business success, though harder to achieve, is more magnificent than ever. But that is not the point that should interest social students. The great masses are not concerned so much with glittering prizes which in the nature of things only a few can grasp. They are concerned with the living that all may make. That there is still room at the top we may grant. That the top is higher up and harder to reach Mr. Morton must concede. But how about the bottom? What peo-