

tion of the bill in behalf of which this patriotic outburst is made will answer the question. It is plutocratic patriotism.

The bill has two principal features: the tax feature and the bond feature. It proposes to raise the war fund by taxes which are expected to yield \$100,000,000 a year, and from the sale of interest bearing bonds to the amount of \$600,000,000. In both aspects, the bill is plutocratic. It is a scheme for placing the financial burdens of the war upon the masses of the people. It is drawn according to the ideals of those who favor government by and for the rich.

The taxation features of the bill are contrived upon the principles of indirect taxation, principles which contemplate the taking of money from the masses of the people without letting them know that pay it. When the masses were voiceless and powerless, the aristocracy unblushingly fleeced them by direct taxation. No pains were taken then to make them believe that the rich paid the taxes while they went free. They were bluntly told that it was their duty to pay the taxes while the rich went free. When the people got voice and put an end to this bold plundering, indirect taxation was adopted. By that means the poor were made to pay the taxes much as before, but they were fooled into the belief that they paid no taxes at all. A French statesman highly commended this system as a grand method of picking geese so as to get the most feathers with the least squawking. Could anything be more infamous? Yet it is the system of the war revenue bill, every objection to which is denounced as unpatriotic.

By taxing beer, this bill appears to tax brewers; but the brewers have already raised the price of beer, and the tax will be paid by beer consumers. By taxing cigars, it appears to tax cigar manufacturers, but every sane man who stops to think knows that the tax will be paid by smokers; and as there is but little difference between the tax on cheap cigars and that on expensive cigars, rich smokers will pay the least proportion of the tax. It is precisely so with pretty much all the taxes of this extremely patriotic bill.

That the burdens of war taxation

are thus to be cast chiefly upon the poor is well understood by plutocratic patriots. For example, the Chicago Tribune, a leading light in plutocratic patriotism, was recently discussing the proposed tonnage tax, and by way of defending it said:

But other ship owners are of the more sensible opinion that the extra dues will be added in good part to the freight rates, so that the customers of the carriers and not the carriers themselves will pay the tax ultimately.

Here is a distinct admission that taxes of this class are shifted from the persons who are ostensibly taxed, to the consumers of their goods. Yet the bill under which that is to be done is so sacred that it is treason to oppose it!

The extent to which that extraordinarily patriotic bill would favor the rich is summed up by Thomas G. Shearman in The Outlook for May 7th, on page 19. Mr. Shearman says:

Upon the whole, the burden of the new taxes will probably be divided in the proportion of ten per cent. upon the principal owners of invested wealth, 30 per cent. upon the middle class, who have some wealth but still mainly depend upon their earnings, and 60 per cent. upon those who depend exclusively upon their daily earnings.

Thus 90 per cent. of the war tax is to be put upon the middle and working classes, and only 10 per cent. upon the idle owners of invested wealth; and that by a bill which must not be opposed, under penalty of denunciation for treason. What kind of patriotism is it that defends such a measure, if it be not plutocratic?

But the bill in question does not stop with unjust indirect taxation. Its other feature, that with respect to the proposed bond issue, is even more plutocratic if possible than the tax feature. The interest on the bonds would be paid by means of indirect taxation—that is to say, in greatest proportion by the middle and the working classes, and in least proportion by the rich—and the principal, if paid at all, would be paid in the same way. But it is not intended that the principal shall be paid. What is aimed at is to perpetuate the public debt as a means of investment for the idle or worse than idle rich. The bond feature, then, would not only create a large and perpetual interest

burden to be paid in greatest proportion by the middle and working classes, but would create it for the benefit of the rich. Yet this bill we are told is patriotic! Yet the men who oppose it we are told are unpatriotic! In other words, antagonism to the unjust interests of the rich is treason to the country. What is that but plutocratic patriotism?

Is it said that there is no other way of raising a war fund than by taxing the middle and working classes for 90 per cent. of the amount, and stacking up a public debt as a basis for investment? That there is no other way without burdening unearned wealth, we freely concede. But why should unearned wealth be virtually exempt from war burdens? Why should it not pay them all? If Mammoth does the fighting, surely Mammoth might be made to foot the bill. And it could and would be made to do so if plutocratic patriotism were supplanted by patriotism of the right sort.

SPIRITUAL AND ECONOMIC LAW.

No one patiently disentangles the threads of social problems for long without discovering that the web of which they are a part does not end upon the earth where we find its beginning. Sooner or later the seeker finds that he is led to spiritual relationships and eternal laws. But because so much of our traditional teaching of religious things has been sentimental and pietistic, and because of the inherent difficulty of finding words in our natural language to give adequate impression of spiritual perceptions, he who has found that a new religious world within and back of the economic world has opened to his vision, must nevertheless oftenest content himself with vague perceptions, rather than with manifest reasons, and with visions rather than with the eternal realities.

So far as we know, no one has more perfectly bridged the gulf between economics and spiritual law than James E. Mills, whose paper on "The Two Great Commandments in Economics" has been published as a supplement to that excellent little periodical, The New Earth, and may be had of the editors of The New Earth, 540 Pearl street, New York.

Step by step, in the most logical fashion, Mr. Mills carries us from spiritual law to natural law, and then back to spiritual law.

To the following all will agree who believe in the two great commandments—love of God and love of man; but we warn them that Mr. Mills means actual law of life, and not sentimental devotion to persons.

The law of love, both love to God and love to man, finds its chief ultimate expression, and the basis on which it rests, and the means by which it comes into real existence, in service of man to man.

The law of service is the very organic law of society.

The industrial system, by far the grandest of all organizations of groups of men, embracing all peoples, except perhaps some of the most degraded savages, in an inconceivably vast and complete system of service and exchange of service, absorbing the greater part of the mental and physical activity of the race, is organized by the law of service. Whatever motive of worldliness or selfishness may impel the actors in this world-wide drama, its movements, from the very necessities of existence, fall into the rhythm of the law of service:

This law of service is therefore a basis upon which can be built up the life of the second great commandment.

So far as the vast system of service is true to the intrinsic law of its being, it is a training for love to the neighbor. It would make the school of life on earth the school of love. Its welcome to the youth would be the welcome of God to share with him the love of serving which is the motive power of creation, and the welcome of the world's best manhood to happy comradeship in doing the world's work. From the enthusiasm of boyhood through love of sweetheart and wife and children, and desire for fellowship and good standing with men, it would lead him to delight in doing his share of the world's work, and this is birth from above. Alone it could not indeed accomplish such changes. Environment alone cannot reach so far into the depths of character; but it would act in entire harmony with revealed truth, for it is meant to be itself the law of love in ultimate effect. It is the outer world where the new-born love of service first draws breath, and where it waxes strong and grows to the stature of spiritual manhood.

To him who has caught glimpses of the spiritual meaning and intent of

this law, what can be more astounding than its failure of its purpose? Yet

the world is resounding with the story of the wrongs and the miseries which the failure entails upon the workers, of human minds dwarfed and distorted, and human hearts hardened, of manhood robbed of honesty and womanhood of purity, of a mad scramble for wealth to escape the perils of poverty which no honest industry can confront with reasonable confidence of success.

The economist knows that the cause of the failure is "in the distribution of the products of labor, or the distribution of service among men;" and it seems easy to formulate the law that "service, and service only, entitles a man in normal conditions to share in the service of other men."

Then we come by straight and hard logic to the evil that is the antithesis of the good of service: "The wrong is privilege, or the ability conferred by law or custom upon some men or classes of men to secure the service of other men without rendering adequate service in return."

Through just as logical a sequence does Mr. Mills lead us from the spiritual relation of man to God—which lies back of and within the relation to the neighbor—to its natural expression in natural human rights, and to the especial wrong which thwarts those rights, which he thus states:

The principal privilege which so perverts the industrial system of the world, and robs it of its power to confer its highest blessings, and sickens it with injustice and misery, must lie near to the heart of the system. It must be some breach, not only of the law of service, or the second great commandment, but also of the law of relations of God to man, or the first great commandment. It is one that disturbs the relations of man to God and to the earth on which God has placed him and to his fellow-man. This privilege is the private and exclusive ownership of land, the monopoly by some men of the earth, which is the gift of God to all men.

Then in closing the author clearly and reasonably sets forth the only means for overcoming these disorderly conditions which he has shown us are more harmful to the development of the social, and consequently the individual spiritual life, than they are even injurious to our economic life.

To all who are seeking for the

higher laws which they feel must be in correspondence with fundamental natural law, we recommend this remarkable essay.

NEWS

Though the forts at the entrance to Santiago harbor were bombarded on the 31st by Com. Schley, no sufficient and trustworthy news has been received as we go to press upon which to base a definite report of the war situation in the West Indies.

On the 25th, when The Public went to press, though rumors were abundant, there was no trustworthy news as to the location of the American squadron nor as to that of the Spanish fleet under Cervera. The latter was supposed to be in the harbor of Santiago de Cuba, but it was uncertain. This indefiniteness continued for nearly a week. On the 26th it was reported from Madrid through censored channels that the general impression there was that Cervera had left Santiago. There was a definite report on the same day to the effect that the American squadrons operating in Cuban waters had been heard from at Key West; but as the report had it that Schley was "believed to be" off Santiago and Sampson in a position to proceed quickly to his assistance while remaining within striking distance of Havana—which is on the other side and at the farther end of Cuba—and as it gave no certain indications of Cervera's position, it was classed with "unconfirmed" rumors. Especially so, inasmuch as on that day no word had yet been received from Schley by the government. Neither had the government learned from any official source that Cervera was really in Santiago harbor. Aside from unofficial advices and confirmatory publications in Madrid and London, there was nothing to show that he had not escaped. For this reason and particularly as it should have been easy for Schley to ascertain through insurgents whether or not Cervera was really in Santiago, matters still remained in doubt, in the midst of which rumors of an intention to invade Cuba and Puerto Rico by land became oppressive until they were met by rumors to the effect that this movement would be postponed, lest Cervera might be at large and able to attack troop ships. So the puzzling question continued to be whether Cer-