

imperialism and kings with a rope around their necks, never knowin' fer certain just when it was a goin' to be pulled. Look at 'em! Ain't they fine figgers? Nary one of 'em afraid of a rich man! No little Supreme Court questions of who goes first among them! Where ary one of them old McGregors sits down is the head of the table, an' right well he knows it; and he ain't botherin' his head about precedence. They were men, these fellers, free men. They were American citizens and honored the function. Land! I wisht I had a couple of hundred like 'em now! It would leaven the whole lump.

Instead of that, what have I got? Chaff, John, and peanut hulls! Fellers like G. Cleveland, who got rich bein' president, goin' around with an air of conscious holiness among sinners. Chaps like Theodore, who go about with the railroads a payin' their freight, and they with money in their pockets, and unashamed, leaders! Why, they cheapen humanity.

Well, I don't see, John, that you are a doin' any better. What possesses you, man! What made you slaughter those four hundred Thibetans? They were at their own home in their own country; you traveled thousands of miles away from yours, and went with superior arms in your hands. You know well what that means. If the English common law of murder were enforced by inflexible power, and with universal venue, thousands of gibbets would arise in Britain, and hundreds of thousands of your reputable citizens would be hanged by the neck until they were dead. What do you mean by havin' one law at home and another abroad? Eh! Same with me, I know, and lots of my boys would be hanged that ain't expectin' it, and think they are of the Lord's anointed; but I'm not a restin' easy under it—
I tell you that.

UNCLE SAM.

MUNICIPAL ART.

An extract from an article on "The Importance of Municipal Improvement," by Hon. John De Witt Warner, published in *The Craftsman* for Jan., 1904.

It can never be too often recalled that Art is not a thing to be done, but the right way to do whatever is to be done. Municipal Art is, therefore, simply the best way to make a city what it ought to be—best fitted for all ends of a city—a city of to-day—a city of the future.

First and most important of all are the means of ingress and egress, and of transport within the city. Upon such development of the former as makes it a center for a locality, a state,

a continent, a world—absolutely depend the possibilities of any given city. Upon the latter equally depends the economy of a city's life and business—in the long run the extent to which its possibilities shall be realized. These, therefore, are the first essentials of a city plan—the data with relation to which all development must be had.

These possibilities, however, are those of a home, a shop, a caravansary, a place for the life, the work, the culture and the entertainment of human beings, ever more and more free to choose the best opportunities anywhere offered. The prosperity of a city will, therefore, ever more and more depend upon the extent to which such demands are met. Next after the general features of a city's plan come, therefore, bright skies and abundant water; and—scarcely less essential—cheap fuel and clean streets.

No mistake could be greater than that which assumes Municipal Art engrossed with, or mainly interested in, mere decorative features. Rather is it true that in its more essential features, a city must fairly have achieved dignity and beauty and order and cleanliness and convenience, before it is fit to be generally decorated, or decoration can be made really effective. These essentials provided for, the beautiful—not as opposed to the useful, but useful in whole or in part because it is beautiful—can then well be sought, and such civic adornment had as shall serve religion—as at Athens; civic pride—as in Florence or Budapesth; or offer hospitable welcome and attraction for residence and amusement—as at Paris; or express national ideals—as at Washington or Berlin; or more or less equably meet or serve all these—as at Rome or Vienna.

Of this, perhaps the most essential item is proper emphasis of civic centers—the architectural treatment of the city considered as a whole. Indeed, this might well have been included in the prerequisites for adornment. And the finest examples of such emphasis, serving as they do the convenience and the dignity of the city, are striking arguments for the truth that, in its last analysis, fitness for use is the normal of beauty. That public business can best be transacted at the most natural place for greatest public resort; that the various classes of such business can be transacted most conveniently in the neighborhood of each other; that, in proportion to the variety and amount of public business to be provided for, economy permits and

popular sentiment dictates extensive and imposing architectural groups, with park and plaza treatment; and that foci thus developed are the points at which may best be located the more important transport connections—each is obvious. Combined, they show the ideal of a city to be that of an organism, rather than of an aggregation. From the standpoint of utility as well as of art, a thoroughly developed and dignified civic center with secondary local ones, as naturally characterizes an ideal "city" of to-day, and distinguishes it from the mere massing of humanity that has sometimes been called such, as does a definite head with well-defined subsidiary vital centers a man, as distinguished from a jelly fish.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LAND QUESTION TO THE ENGLISH LIBERAL PARTY.

A portion of an editorial on "The Coming Budget" in the *London Speaker*, of March 12, 1904. It is to be noted that in Great Britain "rates" are local; "taxes" are imperial.

The secretary of the Tariff Reform league has stated in a recent address that the taxation of land values is the only alternative which Mr. Chamberlain's opponents can find to his proposals, and adds that he is entirely opposed to any such reform. We welcome this challenge, and we are exceedingly happy to know that as we go to press important legislation on the subject is being submitted to the House of Commons. The Prime Minister said the other day that the taxation of land "may or may not be wise." Doubtless he has submitted at least two memoranda on the subject to the Cabinet—one for and the other against. Now, we suppose he will make his election, and we fancy that the lilies of the field will win the day. But whatever may be the result of the division, the principle has made great way in England during the last few years. Its history is curious. In 1871 Mr. Goschen introduced a bill to divide rates between the owner and the occupier; but the landed interest was too strong in the House of Commons. In 1885 Mr. Chamberlain worked up popular feeling in the towns on the question of unearned increment. The question was pretty thoroughly discussed, and was never forgotten, though for a decade the Irish question kept it in the second rank. But the Local Government acts of 1888 and 1894, which extended popular self-government from boroughs to parishes, districts and counties, have given an enormous impetus to local activity, and, incidentally,