

him go to Boston on the invitation of Senator Lodge and make the same speech there. This was the speech in which Funston excited the Lotus eaters to cheers by suggesting that American anti-imperialists ought to be hanged. He says now that the suggestion was wholly abstract—quite Pickwickian; but it certainly had in it much of the spirit of the hangman. In the interview which Senator Patterson took for his text, Funston defended his method of capturing Aguinaldo as being within the rules of honorable warfare. It was to that point that Senator Patterson mainly addressed his speech; and when he finished, Funston's military crime had been laid bare. The speech appears in full at page 3,550 of the Congressional Record of March 27.

Gen. Sir Robert Stewart, the British military officer in charge of the "commercial" shipments of mules from the British army station at New Orleans, on board British transports, to the seat of war in South Africa, seems to have the proper notion about the matter. In an interview with a Chicago paper this week, while a guest at the Auditorium Annex, he said:

Mules will continue to be shipped to South Africa as long as the almighty dollar rules America. England is not at all alarmed over the investigation at New Orleans. There is no denying that mules and horses are shipped to South Africa by our government, and it is nonsense to talk of stopping it.

Gen. Sir Robert Stewart is not very complimentary, but he apparently understands the weakness of the nation of whose people the British government buys mules and horses.

The Nebraska Independent, of Lincoln, propounds a question which it says its editor has asked—

a thousand times of single taxers, and while he stands ready to be convinced, not one of them ever attempted to make reply.

The Independent's single tax acquaintances must be exceptionally reticent, or else the Independent's editor is not quite so open to conviction

as he thinks. This is the question in substance, for the Independent does not put it in question form:

Since the community or population gives value to everything, why is it not right to tax all values given by the community to the full amount, if it is right to tax to the full amount the value given by the community to land?

The Independent is confused by elliptical forms of expression. In the first place, the phrase "to tax values," is simply a short cut for expressing the idea of taxing in proportion to values. Values themselves are not taxed. Men are taxed. Values are only a basis of tax measurement; the question being whether we shall tax men in proportion only to their land values or to their other values. Again, when it is said that the community gives value to land, but that individual producers give value to such things as houses and merchandise, what is meant and what is by all students of the subject readily understood, might be fully expressed like this: The community alone gives value to land, since the thing to which that value attaches exists without human production; but the community and the individual producer together give value to such things as merchandise and houses, since value could not attach to them unless individuals produced them, value having no faculty for attaching itself to impossible things. In the case of land, the only factor is the value-producing power—the community; hence it is proper to say that the community gives value to land. No other thought is involved. But in the case of such things as merchandise and houses, there are two factors,—the value-producing factor, which is the community; and the house- or merchandise- or other wealth-producing factor, which comprehends only the workers who bring forth those things. And inasmuch as the wealth-producing factor is the prime factor—it alone making it possible for merchandise values, house values and other wealth values to exist,—we may with entire propriety speak elliptically of such values

as labor values. That is the principal thought involved. Consequently we say "labor values" in contradistinction to "land values." The reason why it is right to tax in proportion to land values, and not in proportion to labor values, though neither would exist but for society, is that the owners of land values neither cause them nor produce the thing to which they attach, the values being caused by society, and the thing, the land, being a common inheritance; whereas the owners of labor values (unless they have by force or fraud or laws of privilege—which are in the last analysis chiefly laws fostering land monopoly—unjustly acquired them from the producers) do produce the class of things to which those values attach, and without their having done so values would to that extent not exist. In its nature a tax in proportion to land values is a tax on monopoly, while a tax in proportion to labor values is a tax on labor

In common thought, air and light are supposed to have no value, and are not regarded as commodities at all. We speak of land as a commodity and know that it has varying values according to locality. And so accustomed are we to regarding it as a commodity that there seems to be no incongruity of suggestion in the phrase "my land," or "your land," as there would be in "my sunlight" or "your sunlight," "my air," or "your air," though private property in air or sunlight is essentially no more absurd than private property in land, all being common gifts. Nevertheless, air and sunlight are in fact private property and are valuable, as occasional instances of ownership remind us. One instance was recently reported by a New York paper. An unusually low structure, the Speyer building, is to be erected at Pine and Nassau streets, New York. As soon as it became certain that this low building would be a permanency, the adjoining lot, theretofore of equal value, was sold for \$75,000 more than

its former price. The paper which reports the fact thus explains it:

That extra \$75,000 represented the value added to the plot by the fact that a permanent three-story building was to be put upon the Speyer parcel. In other words, the projectors of the tall office building were assured a plentiful supply of light and air for an indefinite period, and were willing to pay an extra \$75,000 for this assurance.

It was a veritable transaction in air and sunlight to the extent of \$75,000; and the owner of the other natural element, the land which controlled the use of sunlight and air at that point, got the money.

Mayor Schmitz, of San Francisco, is to be congratulated upon the success of his mode of dealing with street car strikes. When the street car managers started in to put armed detectives upon the cars the mayor interfered. As was told last week in these columns, he gave warning that neither side to the strike would be allowed to arm. Had he followed the usual course, the street car managers would have provoked riots by this time, as they usually do. But owing to the commendably impartial and order-promoting policy adopted by the mayor they were thwarted. The strike has been absolutely peaceable. No disorder whatever is reported. And the street car managers, hopeless of provoking riots which they could swear off upon the strikers, have come promptly to a reasonable settlement. The San Francisco mayor's action in this street car strike furnishes a precedent in the labor conflict which cannot safely be departed from hereafter anywhere in the country. The public official who in the future allows street car companies to arm will be held responsible by public opinion for any resulting disorder.

There is much that is comical about all the fuss and feathers over legal proceedings against the meat trust. These proceedings are for all the world like the slapsticks of the vaudeville stage, which make a great deal of noise but hurt no-

body. The members of the meat trust themselves are merry over it. They say that if the injunction holds against the loose combination which they have formed they will form one that is not loose, one like that of the steel trust. And, sure enough, they could find safety in that way. For the steel trust, the greatest and strongest of all the trusts, is regarded by the powers that be as legally invulnerable, because it consists of one corporation owning a majority of the stock in all the subsidiary corporations. It is not a trust; it is a stockholder. Here then is a case of now you see it and then you don't. If the meat trust is held together by what a witty writer describes as "a gentleman's agreement among hogs," it is unlawful; but if it is held together by the charter of a New Jersey corporation, it is lawful. Yet there is no difference except in form.

The outcome of the Kettle Hill assault upon the meat trust will probably be an injunction, followed by applause from party organs for the "anti-trust" administration, and later by the safe reorganization of the enjoined trust under the New Jersey corporation laws. The whole thing is a farce. No official attention is paid to the recent report of the Interstate Commerce commission, which traced the power of the meat trust to secret agreements with monopoly railroad corporations; nor to the tariff which shields it in another direction. Something of this kind is the true secret of all trust power. It rests upon special privileges, upon some sort of special legal protection. Were highway monopolies and the tariff on meats abolished, the people could whistle at meat trusts whether incorporated or not. The trust evil will never be suppressed until the people understand that trusts are effects, not causes, of monopoly. Competition cannot produce monopoly, but monopoly can destroy competition.

If a recent news dispatch from Washington reports the action of the

postal department truly, another dangerous advance has been made in the direction of irresponsible postal censorship. According to that dispatch a business firm of Wilkesbarre, Pa., had started an endless chain of letters for the advertisement of a fountain pen. On the surface there appears to have been nothing fraudulent in the enterprise. It was apparently a new but effective method of advertising. So effective did it prove that the post office at Wilkesbarre is said to have been choked with mail matter inclosing money for the firm. "The postal authorities," runs the dispatch, "do not seem to be certain yet whether they can stop the business on the ground that it is illegal, but investigation is being made on this point." Then comes the nub of the announcement: "Meanwhile the business is suspended!" So, if the report is true, the postal authorities at Washington, though not at all certain that this mail order business is illegal, put a stop to it, to the probable ruin of the business, until they can find out. Government by postal bureau promises to become as obnoxious as government by injunction.

All who remember the days of the greenback agitation, following close upon the civil war, will recall the name of Jesse Harper. Mr. Harper died on the 24th of last month at Danville, Ill., at the age of nearly 80 years. He had been an intimate friend of Abraham Lincoln, and was a Republican of prominence until the advent of the Greenback party. This was the first political movement after the war, of a social or industrial character. It is often thought of only as a financial movement with unsound principles and false ideals; but it was something more than a financial movement. Whether the remedies it proposed were true remedies or not, the Greenback party did aim to eradicate industrial ills and to bring about order and equity in society; and much of the sentiment against privilege that now exists may be traced to the agitation which it began. In the