

of the people, or any section thereof, to criticise the judiciary or other institution of the government is important as involving the larger question as to the relations that properly exist between the government and the people. Obviously, if the government be the creation of the people it is not only the right but the duty of the latter to criticise or commend the officials of the government, as circumstances may require. If that right and that duty can be successfully denied, such denial carries with it a proof that the government is no longer the servant of the people and has become its master.

. . . The only difference between the pros and the antis on the injunction question, in the matter of "maintaining the integrity of the courts," is one of method. The pro-injunctionists would accomplish that object by encouraging the courts to exceed their authority, thus inviting a conflict with the people. The anti-injunctionists, on the other hand, propose to maintain the integrity of the courts by maintaining the Constitutional limitations placed upon these bodies, which limitations must be respected if the equilibrium of our government system is to be maintained.

+ +

The Sham of Journalism.

The (St. Louis) Mirror (ind.), June 18.—Let any man mix up to any extent with the men who write the newspapers in any great city, and he will come away from such association with a rather sickening sense of the great sham of journalism. He will find from "the boys who write the news" just how the news is perverted, and just what influences control and direct the perversion in the case of any individual newspaper. There has recently been printed a book by a man named William Salisbury, called "My Career as a Journalist." It is a book badly written, or, as the New York Evening Post said, "a vulgar book, vulgarly written." But for all that, it is to the press of the United States very much what Upton Sinclair's book, "The Jungle," was to the meat packers. It exposes thoroughly the sham, falsity, fakery and corruption of the great newspapers. One of the chapters most illuminating is that in which the author tells of his experience as a reporter on the Chronicle, of Chicago, run by the late famous John R. Walsh. He describes how that paper was established by Walsh, simply to serve as an engine for the promotion of Walsh's own schemes in speculation and plundering. He points out the fact that there existed in the office a list of the men and institutions which were not, under any circumstances, to be criticised or opposed in any of their projects, simply because they were in more or less close alliance with Walsh. Mr. Walsh, through the possession of this newspaper, through the terror he was able to inspire with such a weapon, through the power he had to favor or subvert the schemes of other men like himself, became almost the dominant financial figure in Chicago. His paper made a great pretense of conservatism. It had much to say against the agitator whose political influence threatened the investments of "the widow and the orphans." He was ready with the epithet anarchist, socialist, and whatnot, against any man with an idea at variance with the accepted doctrines of those who adhere to the good old adage,

"they shall take who have the power, and he may keep who can." But not even the possession of a newspaper, standing for "the best interests," could save him from the results of his own devotion to the advanced business methods of these best interests. He used the money of the people, placed with him for safe keeping in his banks, floated flimsy enterprises in railroad and mining, and other things, and finally his sins found him out, and this great conservative journalist and friend of business is today under a sentence of five years in the penitentiary for violation of the bank laws, in the nature of larceny.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

LEO TOLSTOY.

What life hath crowded into eighty years
Such deeds as his, O Prophet of our time—
Scourging with bitter whips the priests of crime?
Two things have made those eighty years sublime—
A Tyrant's curses, and a Peasant's tears.

Two calls he heard—many, their souls enticed,
Have answered one—their numbers legion be:
"Whose servant thou? Lo, here are crowns for thee,
And wide dominions stretched from sea to sea.
Art Christ's, or Czar's?" He answered: "I am
Christ's."

Then from that mighty voice and mightier pen
Far o'er Siberian wastes his message rolled.
Then how they shook—those tyrannies grown old;
Then how they woke—passions of men long cold,
In every land, who love their fellow men!

And now he stands and calmly waits his rest,
Loving and loved and fearless, where alone,
Friendless and fearing though he fills a throne,
Another crouches behind walls of stone.

Tolstoy's or Romanoff's—which way is best?

JOSEPH DANA MILLER

+ + +

CREATING POVERTY.

For The Public.

Poverty is the curse of civilization. Until mothers and children are well fed, well clothed and well housed, we need not expect the human race to advance as it should, mentally or physically. This is true even of agricultural live stock, to say nothing of men and women. Every farmer who raises horses, cattle, sheep and hogs knows that much of the natural laws of animal life. The farmers know, too, that if their horses, cattle, sheep and hogs were compelled to release each day to one of their number who does no work at all, two thirds of their grass, even horses, cattle, sheep and hogs would feel the "sting of poverty" and retrograde, till one would not know to what breed they belonged. The few, using the sur-

plus without any exertion at all, would be called "thoroughbreds," but the herd would deteriorate.

Is it not plain that a civilization which forces the men who feed, clothe and house us to give up two-thirds of the wealth they produce, for the right to use the earth, will cause involuntary poverty?

A little over a year ago a man and wife with seven children went onto 240 acres of land in Jackson township, Lyon county, Kansas, and agreed to give \$12,000 for the tract of land, including about \$2,000 worth of improvements. And what improvements! You would rather have \$2,000 than those improvements. This man and his wife paid down in cash, from long years of savings, \$1,000 and gave a mortgage for \$11,000 at 6 per cent for deferred payment of rent. You will see that this man really bought \$2,000 of invested capital, which was a just transaction, and \$10,000 worth of land value, or deferred payment of rent, which, measured by the natural law or law of justice, is a most vicious and poverty producing transaction. A few days ago, the interest on this \$11,000 became due, and the man—your brother and mine—spent several days trying to borrow the money to pay the annual rent by mortgaging his wheat crop and all his personal property.

Look what a burden our civilization has placed on this bread winner and his family. What real capital he has borrowed does not amount to much. But we force him to pay \$600.00 each year for the right to feed his family. He is compelled to pay his share of township, school, county and State taxes. And the harder he works, and works his family, the less he eats; the more he saves and improves his land the higher will we tax him.

Then he is forced to pay his share of \$600,000.-000 governmental tax. Besides that, in buying lumber, hardware, farming implements and clothing he must pay \$125.00 more per annum for trust made goods, than they sell for 10,000 miles from home. Last but not least, he must pay off the \$10,000 deferred payment of rent. Now, under this barbarous contract how long will this hard working family feel the sting of involuntary poverty?

The man is 57 years old. During the next 10 years, with fair crops and no sickness or death, he may reduce the debt \$2,000 or \$3,000. He will have done well, if he does that. But the time will come, when from failure to meet a deferred payment of rent, the man and his family will be turned out of house and home.

The land will not produce a bushel of wheat or corn more to the acre, than it would 25 years ago, when the writer grazed sheep over it and it would not sell for \$2.00 per acre.

Don't tell me that the above story is an exception. I can write 200,000 of like kind in Kan-

sas. Some worse, some not so bad, but yet all bad.

This story is a plain fact very plainly stated. The truth is, regardless of our boasted prosperity, that in Kansas we have five dollars of mortgage for every one we had twenty years ago. And eighty per cent of them is for purchase money of land, deferred payment of rent—the same as the Irish tenant pays the English landlord.

R. T. SNEDIKER.

* * *

HOW NEW YORK TAXES ITSELF.

From an Interview With Lawson Purdy, President of the Department of Taxes and Assessments of the City of New York, Published in the London Daily News of Aug. 11.

"In 1903," said Mr. Purdy, "we secured an amendment of our New York law which requires a separate statement of the value of the land. The law became effective in the assessment of 1904. It entailed a considerable amount of work upon the employes of the Tax Department in making the assessment in this manner for the first time. But there was no difficulty or friction about it. The work was done, when the law required that it should be done, just as usual."

"And the effect?" I queried.

"The effect," said Mr. Purdy, "appeared in the very first assessment, in the higher assessment of vacant or poorly improved land. And I believe that annually since then the fairness of the assessment has improved. There is no wilful or intentional discrimination between classes of property today. The assessment of the land is a comparatively simple matter. The work is done generally by the establishment of unit values per lot, the unit lot being 25 feet by 100 feet, or per front foot of a hundred feet in depth.

"When the unit value is established the determination of the value of a lot of greater or less depth than 100 feet is little more than a mathematical computation based upon a scale in common use by real estate appraisers in the city of New York."

"Upon whom does the tax actually fall?"

"It is clear, doubtless, that where the land is unimproved and unused, the entire tax must fall upon the owner. Where land is improved it is, doubtless, true that the tax, so far as it is imposed upon the land itself, is borne entirely by the owner of the land. So far as the tax falls upon the building it tends to increase the rental which may be obtained for the building, because a tax on buildings may be shifted by a decrease in the erection of buildings. New buildings will not be erected unless the owner can secure a sufficient rental to yield the usual return upon capital so invested.

"We have periods of over-production of buildings. These are of very brief duration; but at