

known that Senator Boies Penrose of Pennsylvania is opposed to the Singletax. He could not otherwise be the open and faithful adherent of monopoly his Senatorial record shows him to be. But his argument on the question is none the less interesting. Speaking at Pittsburgh, on April 27, he said: "The advocate of the Singletax would have the community control the increments to real estate, but he gives the holder of real estate no indemnity for his long period of anxious and often ruinous waiting, or in the event of deterioration and depression of value due to changed conditions in locality." Just what the Senator means by "increments to real estate" and what he means by "community control" of them he does not explain. Real estate consists of land and improvements and if the Senator knows of any case where there is any increment to improvements not due to labor performed upon them he should not keep such knowledge to himself. Increment which Singletaxers would have the community tax is the value of land, exclusive of improvements. The Senator complains that the Singletax would "give the holder of real estate no indemnity for his long period of anxious and often ruinous waiting." Well, if the holder while waiting has been putting the land to proper use he will have his indemnity in what has been produced therefrom, or he would have it if he were not taxed on his labor, as the Senator evidently wants him to be. If the land has not been used then indemnity, if due any one, is due the public which has been prevented by the holder from getting possible benefits out of the land. The Senator's argument about deterioration ignores the fact that the public is not merely entitled to increased value dating from a certain period, but to the entire value of land. So, under Singletax conditions, decrease in value must necessarily be a loss to the public, not to the individual holder.

S. D.



Getting Nearer to the Truth.

William Draper Lewis, dean of the University of Pennsylvania and candidate for the Progressive gubernatorial nomination, comes very close in his speeches to correctly pointing out the foundation of monopolistic power. Dean Lewis sees a valid distinction between monopolies and "combinations which make for efficient business methods and serve the public well." He mentions three proposed solutions of the monopoly question. One is to "regulate the prices of goods as is done with the public service corporations." Another is to dissolve the combination. He endorses neither but approves of a third one: "to deprive those who

possess monopolistic power of the basis or bases on which their power rests." This brings him so near to the fundamental solution that it is a pity to record his failure to suggest any more practical way to apply it than through an interstate trade commission proposed in a bill by Congressman Murdock of Kansas. Upon this commission will rest the duty of finding the basis of monopolistic power and removing it. While it shows a better understanding of the question than is displayed in the administration's anti-trust bills, there is still room for much improvement. All privileges should be unconditionally abolished. No commission should be empowered to condemn some and uphold others. Dean Lewis seems to have been switched off of the right track in endorsing the Murdock bill. He should retrace his way to the point where he discovered the cause of monopolistic power and go straight forward in demanding its complete abolition.

S. D.



Proof Against Experience.

As though the navy we have has not already caused enough trouble and brought us near to an inexcusable war with Mexico, Congress has just voted an appropriation for two more battleships. In disregard of actual occurrences of the past month some Congressmen repeated the threadbare assertion that a big navy guarantees peace. Congressmen Fess of Ohio, Knowland of California, Hobson of Alabama, and Padgett of Tennessee, especially distinguished themselves in this way, making clear that experience teaches them nothing.

S. D.



East Is East and West Is West.

The Indian Social Reformer, published at Bombay by K. Natarajan, and devoted to native interests, makes a suggestive comment on an editorial that appeared in The Public, February 27. The editorial in question was called forth by a controversy in the India press over the slaughter of cows for sacrificial purposes, and the regret expressed that the people should stand divided over non-essentials, instead of uniting in defense of their country. This prompts the editor of the Social Reformer to explain why the people of Europe and America should assume that the Indian people regard British rule as their enemy and not their friend. "None of them," the editor says, "would regard foreign rule, however efficient and benevolent, in their own cases except as an enemy. That this is not the case in India, that the bulk of the Indian population is sincerely loyal and de-

voted to British rule, notwithstanding that it was alien in its origin and is still virtually so to a considerable extent as regards the personnel of the higher branches of the Executive administration. is inconceivable to them and can be made plain, if at all, only by occasional public expressions of loyalty on the part of responsible leaders who cannot be suspected of a desire to flatter Government from interested motives. Perhaps, also, it will enable them to understand why India is an exception to the general rule in Western countries, if we explain that the people of India are divided by sectarian and provincial jealousies of an acute character which makes them, for all practical purposes, as much aliens to one another as the British are to them. . . . The only unifying force in the country at present, besides its geography, its sunshine and its general poverty, is British rule: all else is distractingly divided. And even British rule, unfortunately for us, and also, we think, for its own stability, is betraying a tendency to adapt itself to the separatist and fissiparous tendencies of Indian society rather than to maintain itself as a constraining influence on such tendencies."



This statement has a wider application than that made by the editor. It shows the danger that lies in the attempt of any people to aid by force the people of any other country, whether it be India or Mexico. It also shows the futility of the efforts of a small band of enthusiasts to establish by force political institutions for which the people, as a whole, are not ready. Government, like all things else, is subject to the law of evolution; and since it is wholly a human relation, it must necessarily be in accord with the people over whom it exercises authority. It cannot be in accord with all the people, but it must be in harmony with the major part. And when it is realized that the same substance may have various forms, and be known by different names, it will be seen how far away the Indian Republic is. As the English monarchy is just as liberal as the American Republic, so the British rule in India may, for the present, be more beneficial than that of native princes. The young men of India who have been educated in Europe and America, and who have become enamored of the western idea of individual liberty, return to preach the gospel of freedom to their countrymen. They are doing a great work through their press, and through their personal devotion. But they must not make the mistake of supposing that the change effected in them by a few years' residence abroad can be wrought in the masses at home in a like period. This is a work, not of years, but of

generations; and the best friends of India are not the impatient force-party, but those men and women who are working along educational lines.

S. C.



Cheap Education.

Insufficient as are teachers' salaries in this country, they are princely as compared with those of some other countries. English teachers, according to the findings of a member of Parliament, are paid almost incredibly low salaries. Men principals having certificates receive \$17 a week, women principals \$12; men assistants receive \$12.25, and women assistants \$9. Teachers without certificates receive as low as \$6.25 for men, and \$5 for women. What kind of talent and service can such a wage command? Is it any wonder that English servants "know their place"? When the aristocracy and the nobility have such splendid schools as Eaton and Harrow, Oxford and Cambridge, while the workers have but a few months under the tutelage of five-dollar-a-week teachers in crowded rooms, is there any likelihood of confusing the classes with the masses? These masses have made England the richest nation in the world; they support the largest military establishment and the wealthiest aristocracy; yet their children have a few months' schooling at the hands of scantily paid teachers. Truly, the stupidity of man is past comprehending!

S. C.



How News Is Manufactured.

How some newspapers misrepresent public sentiment is shown by a recent incident implicating John R. McLean's Cincinnati Enquirer. Recently the following telegram was received by the Elkhart, Indiana, Progressive Democrat:

Cincinnati, Ohio, April 10, 1914.

Some Reliable Newspaper Man, Elkhart, Ind.:

Please file early Friday evening 300 words showing unfavorable sentiment in your section toward President Wilson's stand on Panama canal tolls. Interview big business men and get them to say something hot.

ENQUIRER.

The newspaper men who received this particular message happen to be truly reliable, however they may appear from John R. McLean's point of view. They not only refused to become parties to this plot to deceive the public, but exposed it. It would be interesting to learn to what extent public opinion has been misrepresented through fake interviews obtained in this way. These methods have probably not been confined to the canal tolls question, nor to the Cincinnati Enquirer. How much