

and \$12,412,180 for the land alone, irrespective of the improvements.

It is significant of our disordered social conditions when one little man can own all this value—\$15,712,490 at the very lowest, for the tax commission will not be accused of over appraisal. Think a moment of what \$15,712,490 means in the distribution of the world's wealth! It is more than one man could earn, at good wages as wages go, in 25,000 years. Does anybody believe that the elder Leiter, "single-handed and alone," has earned—mind! you, we say "earned," mark the word, "earned!"—as much in his little lifetime as one able-bodied two-dollar-a-day man could earn in 25,000 years? No one dare say it, and yet pretend to be both sane and honest. Or, to put the matter another way: Leiter's fortune in Chicago real estate equals the value of more than 7,000 average Illinois farms with all their improvements. Leiter could not have earned so much. This fortune of his must represent in great degree the earnings of other men, which have been attracted to his strong box. What the magnet of attraction has been may be seen when it is considered that of this \$15,712,490, no less than \$12,412,180 is in the value of lots—nothing but a capitalization of the power which his ownership of those little pieces of earth enables him to draw annually from the enterprise and industry that center in Chicago.

— There is another point about these figures from the Economist as to Leiter's Chicago realty. The site value is less, it will be noticed, than 22 per cent. of the whole, while the land value is more than 78 per cent. It cannot be, however, that the lots are nearly vacant. They are in the heart of the retail district, and on the whole are doubtless well built upon. So here we find another illustration of the fact that in places where industry is intense, the value of improvements upon land is but a small proportion of the value of the land. This should

be a useful illustration for Henry George men. If taxes were levied upon land values alone, the veriest tyro in fiscal matters knows that farmers and small house owners would pay lower taxes than they pay now. Their land values are far less than other values in which they are interested. But taxes so laid would exempt only 22 per cent. of Leiter's Chicago realty, while taxing 78 per cent. of it to the full.

The supreme court of Tennessee has decided that the law for a Greater Memphis is unconstitutional. It seems that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Memphis and its suburbs had decided to place themselves under a general municipal government, to the end chiefly that a general sanitary system might be established to ward off yellow fever. The only opposition came from certain real estate owners who saw in the change the possibilities of heavier taxation upon that "unearned increment" with which every community rewards its landlords for holding its site in place—it must be for holding the site in place, for they earn the reward in no other way yet described; and though they were badly beaten in the vote they have succeeded in the courts, which, under our system of written constitutions, have become a power above the people. In commenting upon the matter, the Memphis Scimitar significantly says that this defeat of the people by the lot owners "has not been a pleasant spectacle, nor one to encourage citizens who have no unearned increment to add to family estates—who must work for what they get, and who are hurt in a vital part by every injury done to the community."

Last week, when commenting upon the negro question in this country, and while expressing our sympathy with the equality side of it, we described it, nevertheless, as a minor question, saying in that connection that the prejudice against negroes

merely because they are negroes is fast dying out and will soon pass away. We spoke particularly of the tendency of this question to disappear at the South. Hardly was the ink of last week's issue dry, when our view, as to the South, was signally confirmed. While republican officials at the North were resorting to subterfuges innumerable to withhold military commissions from negro officers of negro troops, the strait-laced democratic governor of Virginia was appointing negro officers to the command of negro volunteers from the Old Dominion. This governor held that as the negroes he appointed had creditably passed their examinations, their comrades were entitled to chose them as officers precisely the same as if everybody concerned had been white. Clearly the color line in the United States is fast breaking down, and bigger questions than it brought forward are coming to the front.

"All agree," says the Chicago Tribune, speaking of the outcry of working men against the war tax, "that the failure to put the tax all on the other fellow is the only really objectionable point about the new revenue law." The Tribune forgets landlords. They make no such complaint. Nor have they any cause to; as to them there was no failure in putting "the tax all on the other fellow."

Not only do American warships "move majestically" while Spanish warships "prowl," but the Americans bring "ingenuity" to their aid while the Spanish serve their cause with "intrigue."

EUROPEAN SOCIALISM.

Prior to the French elections of last May, the number of socialists in the French chamber of deputies was only 62. But the number chosen at those elections rose to 263. In the German reichstag which has just been dissolved, there were 48 socialists. That this number has been increased by the elections just held in Germany is reasonably certain; and that the popular

vote for the socialist party, which was in 1871, only 124,655; in 1881, 311,961; in 1890, 1,427,298, and in 1893, 1,876,758, has been carried beyond 2,000,000, is conceded.

Nor are these two the only European countries in which socialists have developed strength in politics. Italy has a socialist vote of some 90,000, with 19 deputies in parliament; Denmark has over 25,000 votes, with nine members of the rigsdag, and Belgium has 461,000 votes with 29 representatives.

This is by no means the extent of the socialistic movement in European politics. In every European country socialist agitation is in progress, and in most of them votes in large numbers are cast for socialist candidates. But there is no important parliamentary representation except as enumerated above; and only in France and Germany is the representation strong enough to visibly affect parliamentary action. In those two countries, however, the socialists have become a factor in government. They were chiefly instrumental two weeks ago in ousting the Meline ministry in France; and in Germany, with a larger popular vote than any other party, though with a comparatively small parliamentary representation, there is no foretelling what trouble they may yet make for the imperialists, in a parliament in which there are several other opposition parties.

Neither in France nor Germany is the socialist party an exception to the universal rule, so far as its platform of principles goes. In both countries the party stands for "collectivism," as the socialistic phrase has it, meaning government ownership of all the implements for producing wealth; but it is not to its platform of principles that it owes its strength in either country. In France the socialist party is the only one which is not under the control of reactionary priests or the army ring, a fact which tends to draw to it those voters who, whether believers in "collectivism" or not, are hostile to the church and the army. It is to this, far more than to any exceptional advance of socialistic sentiment, that the growth of political socialism in France is attributable. Similar reasons account for the tremendous socialist vote in Germany.

The only way in which a German democrat can forcibly express himself against what he objects to in German government, is by voting with the socialists. He cannot vote effectively with any other party. The centrists are strictly a Roman Catholic party, composed of both aristocratic and democratic elements and living merely upon the recollection of Bismarck's oppressive laws against the church. A vote for that party is not a vote against German paternalism, nor even against imperial oppression, except Bismarck's oppression of the church. The liberal party is not only timid, but is hopelessly broken up into small independent parties. There are a number of other parties, but none of them is attractive to a man who has any deep inclinations to vote against the obtrusive paternalism of the emperor and the conservatives, and some of them are distinctly repugnant. To express emphatic opposition, therefore, one must vote with the social democratic party.

And this the German democrats, like the French democrats, are doing in increasing numbers. They bother themselves little if at all about "collectivism." What they wish to do, as a recent prominent German politician says, is "to express their feeling of political discontent with things as they exist by voting for the most violent opposition." And not only do they find that to be the socialist party, but the socialist party invites support irrespective of its collectivist ideas. It is to a degree an opportunist party, so much so that in its parliamentary action it steadily opposes any increase of the powers of government under the existing system, even when the powers proposed would, if the government were democratic, be in harmony with collectivism. The socialist party of Germany is, as its name implies, a social democracy. Its programme is democratic collectivism, and in political action it gives more emphasis to the adjective than to the noun—is more democratic than collectivist. It is in fact the democratic, the only democratic, party of Germany.

The increase of the socialist vote in Germany, as in France, is therefore not remarkable. It does not indicate that the idea of socialism is any more

nearly triumphant in those countries than elsewhere. If the political conditions which prevail there prevailed in the United States or in England, it is altogether improbable that the socialist party in either would be the ciphers they are. But socialistic ideas would in neither be any further advanced.

There is of course a stronger tendency to socialism in the continental mind than we in this country are familiar with; but after fully allowing for that, it must still be plain, upon considering political conditions, that the political growth of French and German socialism marks a growth in France and Germany of democratic rather than socialistic sentiment.

EMASCULATED ECONOMICS.

In his last work, "The Science of Political Economy," Henry George directed attention to the fact, which most intelligent observers may now plainly see, that the universities have cast political economy overboard and substituted for it what they call "economics." They are teaching the science of individual wealth, as distinguished from the science of social wealth.

The advantage of this to those universities which, in our plutocratic regime, are dependent upon individual accumulations of wealth due to legalized plundering, is not far to seek. Though both political economy and "economics" deal with the natural laws under which civilized men get a living, their scope is different. Political economy—the economy of social wholes—deals with the way in which a living is got by mankind; whereas "economics"—the economy of individuals as distinguished from the economy of social wholes—deals only with the way in which a living is got by particular men, regardless of the rights of other men.

Particular civilized men may get a living either by exchanging services with others, or by extorting services from others. But considered as social wholes, civilized men can get a living only by exchanging services. They cannot get it by extortion. This is evident upon a moment's reflection. The living that one