

they receive similar treatment, will probably never be entertained by any court. The principle of equality before the law is not applied as generally as it ought to be.

S. D.



### Still Explaining.

Explanations are still flooding the newspaper offices concerning dealings with strikers by the mine owners of Colorado. Since the Ludlow affair a press bureau has been busy sending out these explanations. There surely seems to be much to explain. The explanations are designed to show that devotion to principle and the interests of their employes underlies the mine owners' course. There is so much skepticism concerning that, that voluminous explanations are necessary. But why try to prove anything so difficult? Why do not the mine owners frankly admit that they are looking out for themselves first of all? That existing conditions give them power to adopt the course they have adopted, and that course happens to be the one which seems the best for their own financial interests? No reasonable person would think of questioning such an explanation. They can further say that the conditions which so favor them are the kind that the people of Colorado have declined to change. Consequently, as mine owners, they are not responsible for the existence of such conditions; and they intend to keep on taking advantage of them until the people deprive them of their advantage. Such an explanation would not only be believable but commendably candid as well.

S. D.



### Where the Credit Belongs.

The proceeds of a number of heavy taxes levied on the American people are to be used in buying food for starving Belgians. The tax has not been levied by the government but by the Rockefeller interests backed by the power of certain privileges conferred by Federal and State governments. The Rockefeller Foundation will attend to all details of the distribution, and does not seem averse to assuming credit for the philanthropic act, which belongs properly to the overtaxed American people.

S. D.



### The Gentle Art of Making Mendicants.

Those sturdy Norsemen who frowned upon the introduction of the Church because it brought beggars would have their patience sorely tried, had they lived in this day and age. Not only do we have beggars, but we have asylums, poor farms,

and pensions. We started with free schools, but now the children have free text books, free medical service, and free dentistry; and the adults have free hospitals, free visiting nurses, free clinics, and free dispensaries, not to mention free libraries, free employment agencies, and free lodging houses. Those English Socialists who are declaring for free bread are not so very far ahead of us. Nor should it be a cause for astonishment when two sons with large property holdings billet their aged mother on the county farm, nor that a woman with an income of twenty-five dollars a week should draw fifteen dollars a month from the county agent. And those persons who express surprise at the number of rich and well-to-do people who attend the free clinics and patronize the free dispensaries simply betray their ignorance of human nature.



It may well be said that no child should be handicapped in his start in life. He should not be deprived of the fullest possibilities of the free schools for want of text books. And if the child's bad teeth lead to poor health, they should be mended. The London school board discovered that some children could not study because of lack of food, and so provided free lunches. The same logic might find that ragged children suffered a mental depression that interfered with their study, and so require free clothing. There seems, indeed, no place to stop logically short of universal communism. But if we do not stop, where shall we end? What will be the moral effect upon the people? If unearned wealth tends to corrupt the rich, will not unearned public largesses weaken the moral stamina of the poor? The rich have many alternatives, if they will to save themselves; but the poor have but one, and we have made that one very difficult.



Why so much "assistance"? Men and women made a descent living in this country a hundred years ago. There was then very little call for public assistance. Families were not then afraid of having children. Judging from the number, they invention have added enormously to the power of were welcome. They were an asset, instead of a liability. Between that day and this science and labor in the production of wealth. Yet, with all this added power at his command, the laborer is unable to lay by anything for sickness or old age. If he dies in his prime he does not leave enough to educate his children. The comforts of modern civilization are beyond his reach, and he must depend upon the charitable rich or the State for

necessities. Some, the strong, the able, and those surrounded by fortuitous circumstances, succeed; but the large and increasing number that fail should give us pause. The poor have enough at best to contend against in the struggle of life without being subjected to the enervating influences of charity. We have drifted into unnatural conditions, and we should lose no time in getting back to sound principles. Charity never was a substitute for justice, and it becomes increasingly inadequate as the complexities of society increase. This is a time for plain, honest thinking. S. C.



### South Carolina's New Tax on Industry.

Taxation of industry has been applied pretty generally with results that have been exceedingly harmful. But South Carolina has just legislated to extend the application. The farmer planting more than a third of his land in cotton will be liable to a heavy fine, over and above the ordinary tax on industry. Presumably there are in South Carolina, as elsewhere, farmers who have never cultivated more than a third of their land for any purpose, while others have used every inch of their tracts. So this law, if enforced, will necessarily fall most heavily on the more industrious farmers. Experience will show that this new tax will only intensify the distress it was unreasonably designed to relieve.

S. D.



### Failure of the "Practical Experts."

Neither surprising nor regrettable is the failure of the income tax law to produce results commensurate with estimates of alleged experts. The law has so many unjust features and authorizes so much inquisition into matters which do not properly concern the government, that resentment and resistance were to be expected. One trouble with the law is that it was drawn by so-called practical men who "have no use for theories." Their contempt for theories led them to disregard all consideration for any other human characteristic than that of fear. In planning to collect the tax they figured on using the government's physical power in a way that carries with it the same disregard of ethics and the same unconcern for the future, as distinguish the methods of a highwayman or burglar. Any theorist could have told them that such methods must either fail or must prove disastrous in case of success. Many theorists did in fact place such information before the Ways and Means Committee. But while one can lead a horse—or a donkey—to water, no one can force him to drink. The "practical" men on the committee listened to the

practical "experts" and turned contemptuously away from the "mere theorists"—the men who insist that statute laws to be successful must be in conformity with correct economic principles.



One suggestion offered by theorists and disregarded by the practical men was that there should be a distinction between earned and unearned incomes. There is no justification whatever for a tax on earned incomes whatever their amount. The recipients of such incomes have performed service of equal value therefor. The government is not entitled to any part of them. A tax on such incomes is a tax on industry. Whether the tax be large or small it is morally theft. Another suggestion was that unearned incomes be reached at their true source. As passed the law apparently made some effort to do this. In fact it did nothing of the kind. The true source of an income is not at the place where it is finally drawn. It is at the place where it is produced. Because the thoroughly practical men, who drew up the law, ignored this theory they failed to reach many incomes, especially unearned ones. Only forty-four incomes have been found in excess of \$1,000,000 a year. Yet a student of the question, H. H. Klein, author of "Standard Oil and the People," declares that there are more than forty-four stockholders of the Standard Oil Company alone drawing incomes of that amount. These could not have evaded the tax, had it been levied at the true source, on the rental value of land held by the monopoly and on franchise values of pipe lines and railroads. The same applies to other unearned incomes. The most essential requirement to the drawing up of a law, that will do the work intended, is the presence in Congress of more theorists, of men able to reason from cause to effect and equipped with thorough knowledge of economic laws. Practical men with no use for theories have failed. No "mere theorist" could fail more completely if he tried. It is time to give the theorist a trial.

S. D.



### Statistics for Archaic Economists.

Those political economists who hold that countries prosper as exports exceed imports, because, as President McKinley put it, the balance is paid in gold, will find interesting data in the trade of the Transvaal in South Africa. The imports of the Transvaal in 1909 were \$98,200,000 and the exports \$170,600,000, leaving a balance in favor of the Transvaal to be paid in gold of \$72,400,000. But unfortunately for the theory of the balance of