

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1901.

Number 159.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The principle of the new torism is, "Everything for the people, but nothing through the people or by the people." Hail, kindly masters!

Americans complain because the British foreign office and other governmental departments in London persistently speak and write of American citizens as "American subjects." Perhaps this is only the prophetic shadow of a coming fact.

Slowly but surely the facts about the white man's atrocities in China are coming to public knowledge. Among the heathen of the orient "Christian" and "savage" are doubtless by this time synonymous terms.

Suggestive comment is made by the La Crosse Daily Press—which declares for "hastening the day when all men shall be workingmen and no man a slave"—upon Gov. Altgeld's famous remark that "this country does not need two corruptionist parties; one is enough." The Press commends Altgeld's utterance "to those democrats who fear that the party is not strong enough with the plutocrats," and "to those republicans who occasionally marvel because it costs more to elect our presidents than to supply the American masses with bread."

Who was it that said saving doesn't pay? Here is a Toledo gentleman, Dr. Ash, who bought 160 acres of Wisconsin land in 1884 for \$1,000. It included the only natural harbor in the northern part of that state. Some men might have let it get away. But Dr. Ash saved it. Now he has his

reward; for Mr. Rockefeller has given him \$1,000,000 for the land. That experiment in saving did pay. Let poor men stop complaining and profit by Dr. Ash's thrifty example.

That the people of England are weary of Mr. Chamberlain's war in South Africa has long been apparent. The glory of it is all gone, but the enormous expense continues. If a parliamentary election were to occur to-day, it is almost certain that the "khaki" plan of campaign would be a humiliating failure. Had the English people been as thoughtful of this possibility when Chamberlain, Rhodes and the rest involved them so unnecessarily, not to say viciously, in the war for the destruction of the two republics, they would have less in the past to regret and less in the future to fear.

On the 23d and 24th of May an important tax conference is to be held at Buffalo under the auspices of the National Civic Federation. Governors of states are beginning to make quasi official appointments of delegates, and there is a probability that at least some sane suggestions will be made. It is to be hoped that the Australasian method of taxation now in successful operation will not be overlooked in the programme. The governor of Colorado could confer no greater benefit on the public of this country than by appointing Senator James W. Bucklin, the American expert on Australasian fiscal policies and methods, to go to Buffalo as a state delegate.

Pierpont Morgan's proposed chain of dry goods stores across the country is suggestive of the possibility of a trust without special privileges—in other words, of the production of a monopoly by a combination of com-

petitive businesses. It is a fact, however, that each of these combining establishments has legal advantages of various kinds, positive and negative, which are hidden in an economic network. But without considering them, it must be remembered that the same Pierpont Morgan who is organizing the dry goods store trust has organized the railroad trust. Does anyone doubt that Mr. Morgan's railroad trust will promote the interests of his dry goods store trust? And does not the railroad trust rest upon the legal monopoly of land—rights of way and terminal points?

The democratic reorganizers who are rejoicing over the election as mayor of St. Louis of that assistant republican, Rolla Wells, and notifying the democratic democrats of the country that they may "like this or lump it," but it is the kind of medicine they have got to take, overlook one thing. They shut their eyes to the fact that Lee Meriwether, the democratic democrat who contested the St. Louis election with Wells, polled a heavy vote as a third party candidate. It was so heavy that Wells would have been defeated by it, and badly, too, if he had not more than made up for democratic protests against him with the votes of his republican copartisans. Against a vote of 43,000 for Wells and 35,000 for the republican candidate, Meriwether polled 28,500.

The significance of Meriwether's vote, with reference to the next presidential campaign, is that a democratic candidate of the old proslavery and new plutocratic school cannot be elected. If victory is what the reorganizers want they cannot have it with a resurrected James Buchanan for candidate. Neither Grover Cleveland nor any of his set; neither David B. Hill nor any of his;

nor yet any other candidate whatever whom Wm. C. Whitney or the monopolistic crew of plutocratic republicans and their "democratic" partners whose financial interests Whitney represents in democratic politics,—none of these can be elected.

This does not mean that the silver question is alive or will be revived. The silver question is dead; though its heir is not the Wall street fetic, but something more radical and rational than silverism. Neither is this a foolish threat that a third party will be coaxed into being if the old crowd of monopoly mongers foist a candidate of their own upon the democratic party of the nation as they did upon the democratic party of St. Louis. It is not a threat of any kind, foolish or otherwise. It is simply a prediction—as easily made and as sure to be verified as the prediction that the sun will set to-night and rise to-morrow—a prediction that if the monopolists triumph in the national convention of 1904, a new party will instantly spring up which will be to the national election what Meriwether's was to the election in St. Louis, but with this difference, that the vote it polls, while possibly no larger relatively than Meriwether's, cannot be overcome by the aid of a republican machine. If the old democratic incubus cannot be thrown off at the convention it will be thrown off at the ballot box; and if its adherents or apologists have no higher ambition for the democratic party than to have it win at whatever sacrifice of true democratic principle, they had better let somebody else dictate the nomination than the Whitneys, the Clevelands, the Wellses or the Hills. They need not suppose that Bryan is dead because they have bought him a grave.

In his Jefferson day speech at Buffalo, David B. Hill declared, referring to the democratic party, that it has a right to be proud of its ancient political lineage. That is by no means a perfectly true declaration. It may indeed be proud of its Jeffersonian

origin. It may be proud of its Jacksonian reincarnation. It may be proud of its free trade work in the forties and fifties. But what of its pro-slavery record? Have true democrats any reason to be proud of that? And what of the record Mr. Hill would make for it with reference to plutocracy? In a cluster of antithetical phrases in his speech, he threw a bouquet to labor when oppressed, and asserted that the party "respects the vested rights of capital." What did he mean by that? He could not have meant merely the rights of capital. For rights are sacred whether vested or not. He must have intended the word "vested" to have a significance of its own. What then could he have meant but that he would respect what lawyers mean by the term "vested rights"? He must have meant that. But by that term lawyers mean anything, whether good or bad, whether a right or a privilege of destroying rights, provided only that it is vested, that a legal title to it has been acquired. It was precisely this view of rights and wrongs that allied the democratic party with the slave power. The masters had "vested rights" legally in slaves; therefore the slaves had "no rights that white men were bound to respect." And now Mr. Hill brings that narrow view of morality, that lawyer's view of morality, that state prison view of morality—do whatever you please so long as you keep out of the penitentiary—down to present day issues. To the extent that corporations and individuals have acquired, not rights morally, but "vested rights" legally, in powers of private taxation and public plunder, Mr. Hill would have the democratic party respect those "vested rights" no matter whose real rights suffer thereby. Mr. Hanna asks no more.

The Church Militant, official paper of the diocese of Massachusetts of the Episcopal church, takes up John Stuart Mill's old question of what he called "the unearned increment," with something like a

personal application. It seems that about 80 years ago the parish of St. Paul's church bought the property it now occupies on Tremont street for an amount which included a very small sum for the site. But for that site now—the building being regarded by proposing purchasers as of no value, but as an incumbrance—the parish is offered \$1,500,000. "This increase in value," says the Church Militant, "is what is called the 'unearned increment,' and therefore it asks the question: Does that 'unearned increment' belong to the community? Our religious contemporary is perfectly fair about the facts in the case. It concedes not only that the increase in value is pure land value, but also that it has been caused by "the movements of population and business in a given direction." Nevertheless it questions the right of the community to the increase. "If the community," it argues, "gets the increase in valuation of a given property, then equity demands that the community indemnify the citizen whose property has greatly decreased in value because people and business have moved away from him."

That point has never seemed sound to us, nor even logical. Why people whose business and commercial activities produce increased site values in one spot, should be deprived of them by site owners there, unless they indemnify site owners elsewhere for depreciation of site values caused by their own removal or that of others—why such an adjustment should be made passes our comprehension, either as a demand in equity or a proposition in logic. We can understand the contention that landlords are entitled to all land values; but we cannot understand it upon those "equitable" grounds. But the matter is hardly worthy of consideration upon the theory of an "increment" of \$1,500,000 or any other sum. There is no increment, and consequently there is no issue over its ownership.