

"movements to regulate the taxing machinery of the city are foreign to the functions of the teacher." Although he concedes that upon rare occasions such movements might find temporary justification, when the city failed to provide for the proper support of schools, his declaration is regarded, as it was probably intended to be, as a rebuke to the Chicago teachers. At any rate, it sounds much like an echo of those newspapers of Chicago which, representing the corporate tax-dodging interests, have openly condemned the teachers as tax-eaters who have no business to meddle with the affairs of taxpayers. Doubtless there is wisdom in President Draper's recommendation that teachers, as a general rule, avoid associations which are not for their professional improvement. But it savors more of worldly wisdom than of civic virtue.

Several weeks ago we commented (page 437) upon a criticism by the Fairhope (Ala.) Courier of Gov. Roosevelt as a landlord. The Courier insisted, against a contention we had previously made apropos of Roosevelt, that he is personally to blame for availing himself of the benefits of the "unearned increment" of the land he owns. In response we challenged the Courier to state what Mr. Roosevelt could or ought to do, not as a citizen, but as a landlord, to divest himself of these benefits—what he could do simply as a matter of justice and not of philanthropy. Accepting this challenge, the Courier suggests two courses that Roosevelt might pursue. For one thing, it says, he might turn his unearned income over to the people of New York, either by administering it as a trustee for their benefit or by putting it into the public treasury. An all sufficient objection to this course is anticipated by the Courier itself. It foresees that as a net result Roosevelt would only benefit other landlords without at all benefiting the people. But to its own objection it replies that Roosevelt is bound in honesty to follow this course

whatever the result. That is something we cannot concede. Roosevelt is at liberty to do so, but he is not bound to. The reply assumes that Roosevelt himself has no right in justice to land values. But he has such a right; an equal right with his fellow citizens—not only in the values of his own land, but in those of all other land in the same community. And that right he would abandon by complying with the Courier's demand. Since there is no way, short of communal action, of distinguishing his right to land values from the right of others, and the community insists upon a policy which confuses those rights, no principle of honesty requires him to give up to others his own in order to rid himself of what is not his. To do so would be an act of personal generosity and not an act of justice.

The other course which the Courier suggests to Gov. Roosevelt is that he appoint himself "a trustee to administer the unearned increment, which has come or shall come to the lands under his control, for the benefit of those whose presence and enterprise have given rise to it." But this suggestion, besides being impracticable, and open to the objection to the first suggestion, begs the question. No one has any right to demand that Roosevelt or any other individual become a trustee. Roosevelt might try it or not as he pleased; and if he pleased not to, his refusal would violate no principle of justice. He would simply decline to be a paternal philanthropist. So the whole matter comes back to the point at which we started, namely, that while it is within no one's right to criticize any landlord for appropriating unearned increment which society insists upon treating as private property, it is everyone's right to criticize anybody who uses his civil power and influence to perpetuate that unjust policy.

The results of the municipal ownership and operation of the public

lighting plant in Detroit, to which we referred at page 497, are even more satisfactory than we there indicated. We spoke of the reduction in the expense of public lighting as 13 per cent. since the establishment of the municipal system. In fact, however, there has been an annual reduction, that of last year being 13 per cent. as compared with the expense of the previous year. The price per arc light of 2,000 candle power, paid for the last year under private contract, 1896, was \$133.80; but in 1897, the first year of public lighting under municipal ownership and operation, the operating expense per arc light of 2,000 candle power was only \$51.85, making a gross expense, after allowing for fixed charges (interest at four per cent., depreciation at three per cent. and loss of taxes on the investment), of only \$83.50—a clear saving of over \$50. Since 1897 this gross expense has been reduced annually, until in 1899 it was down to \$66.45. Deducting incomes from that amount—such as rentals for poles, conduits, etc.—the gross cost was only \$61.76, while the cash cost to the taxpayer was but \$37.13. Moreover, a better service has been secured than under private contract; and in the opinion of the president of the Detroit public lighting commission, the expense would be very much further reduced and the public very much better served, if the commission were allowed to do commercial lighting in competition with the private companies.

In view of the troubles in the anthracite coal region which are certain to recur in the no distant future it will be well to remember that the recent strike was settled under political compulsion. The monopolists dared not allow it to go on during the presidential campaign. They feared its effect upon their candidate—McKinley. We have this upon the authority of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, a leading Wall street organ of finance and plutocracy which supported McKinley and his plutocratic managers with vigilance and vigor.