

things in the history of human progress otherwise incomprehensible.

Having lived and prospered under a republican form of government for over a hundred years, Americans naturally think it the best. For an intelligent, reasonable, law-abiding people, without compromising precedents, without religious prejudices, that is probably the case. But what would the people of Russia, nine-tenths of whom were serfs only twenty years ago, do with our system? No one pretends to say that for the moment they are not better off as they are. To give a more forcible illustration—What would be the political condition of the Persians of Afghans if every man had the right of suffrage? Intelligent Americans believe in the right of every country to choose its own form of government. There are not wanting Americans who believe that universal suffrage is a mistake. It certainly has its disadvantages, notably in large cities, where it is sometimes in the power of the idle and vicious classes, who are ever ready for two or three francs, or from mere love of anarchy or disorder, to cast their votes for any adventurer like Boulanger.

In England suffrage is not universal, but nearly so. The exception makes it possible to exclude from political influence the greater part of the dangerous elements of London and the large provincial cities. The Layasta Cabinet in Spain has been endeavoring for the last year to render suffrage universal without even being able to hear the question discussed in the Cortes, owing to the disorderly opposition of the conservatives. The common people of that country are, by education and temperament, the least fitted of all the important continental populations of Europe to be endowed with so important a political right. In Germany the peasant classes care little for liberty in the abstract so long as they are permitted to drink their lager beer in peace. They are by instinct peaceable and law-abiding. In the cities it is different. There the working classes are more intelligent, more active and more impatient under restraint. They are socialists or anarchists, with ideas for the most part subversive of all government, and ready, if they had the power, to annihilate authority and get rid of their rulers, no matter by what means. This subjection or blotting out of the moral sentiment is the most significant fact in the history of nihilism and the different forms of socialism that are seen in all the countries of Europe. It is the belief that the right exists to achieve liberty, no matter by what means. The principle involves the right to take human life, by dynamite if necessary, and by wholesale if a crowd of innocent persons stand in the way.

Fortunately principles and opinions such as these are entertained by only a small minority in any country. There are in Russia, perhaps, 20,000 or 30,000 nihilists in a population of 100,000,000. In Ger-

many a few hundred thousand in a population of 40,000,000 entertain these extravagant ideas. In France the proportion is about the same. This is what makes the growth of socialism and the gospel of dynamite so extraordinary, for it is the denial of the first principle of democratic government—the right of the majority to rule. Socialism—or anarchism, as it should be called in some cases—claims the right not only of a minority, but of a scarcely perceptible minority, to dictate the laws and policy of the nation of which the clique forms a part. That is, the apostles of liberty, the believers in the greatest possible measure of it, deny to their countrymen their most obvious rights, while at the same time they strike at the very roots of legitimate authority and ordinary morality.

The moral world, in which one extreme is followed invariably by another, has a remedy for these evils, and in this case not the one that true lovers of liberty desire. Property, and established interests menaced with destruction unite for self-defense. Monarchs whose lives or whose authority is threatened combine against the common enemy. There is everywhere in Europe today—in Russia, in Austria, in Italy, in Germany—a reaction against the abuse of the theory of liberty. There is a general tendency toward absolutism which manifests itself not only toward the working classes, but aggravates the political situation and renders a general war more probable. As the crimes of the French Revolution set the whole world against France, so those of the socialism of today, resulting from vicious theories of liberty, threaten the very existence of the freedom the common people have with such difficulty obtained.

DR. ED. ISAACSON.

AMERICAN FORK, Nov. 26, 1889.

#### THAT "LIBERAL" PILL.

A long letter about Liberalism in Ogden appeared in yesterday's *Tribune*. It was evidently made to order, with the intention of misleading and deceiving; it is headed—"Liberalism is Wealth," "The magnificent showing made in Ogden City," and "Enormous gain in valuations." If this had been put truthfully and correctly it would have read, "Liberalism is Waste—Extravagant showing made in Ogden City—Enormous increase of taxes."

After having a fling at "Mormon" orators and the "Mormon" press, PIL (so he signs his name) tells us that he made a trip to the Junction City for the purpose of procuring from the public records facts and figures. He then asks us to "look at the assessed valuation of property and the amount of taxes collected during the years from 1886 to 1889, when the People's party held sway and compare it with this year, the Liberal party having come into power February 15, 1889."

That is just what all the taxpayers in Ogden have been doing; they

have been looking, and that with rueful countenances. Let us accept PIL's figures when he says the tax collected for the past four years is:

1886, Amount collected,	\$10,459.50
1887, " "	12,318.90
1888, " "	14,664.65
1889, " "	39,450.00

These figures show that the People's Party collected \$37,443.05 in three years and the "Liberals" \$39,450.00 in one—more than three dollars to one. But "PIL" says it will be seen from these figures that the rate of taxation has not increased! He says, in that respect, what is perfectly true, that "the rate of tax is the same, namely five mills on the dollar. But how have they got this enormous increase? "Oh," says "PIL," "the value of property has increased and gives these figures:

1886 assessed valuation	\$2,158,005.00
1887 " "	2,550,400.00
1888 " "	2,934,670.00
1889 " "	7,941,150.00

"PIL" says "these figures are almost staggering." They are not almost but altogether staggering to the Ogden tax payer. "PIL" says: "If the assessed valuation of property be one-third of its actual valuation, then in 1888 Ogden had in round numbers \$9,000,000 worth of property in her corporate limits—today she has in round numbers \$24,000,000."

If! There is a world of meaning in a simple "if." By "PIL's," if he begs the whole question, the truth being that the People's party taxed the city on a one third valuation, while the "Liberals" tax the city to its full valuation, and even beyond. Multiply the 1888 assessment by three, and you have \$7,804,010.00 as the true city value, against \$7,941,150.00 in 1889—an increase of one hundred and thirty thousand dollars only. "PIL" makes this small amount into fifteen millions. I will give two instances to prove that the city has been assessed by the "Liberals" to its full value. Take Z. C. M. I. building, corner of Main and Twenty-fourth streets. It was assessed by the People's officers at \$33,000 in 1888 and by the "Liberals" at \$100,000 in 1889! One hundred thousand dollars is more than its full value, and ground could be purchased and a better and larger building erected for that money today. As for \$300,000 being its value, that is simply absurd. Then take the dwelling house of Mr. Shurtliff, on Twenty-fourth Street. It was assessed at \$3000 in 1888, and at \$9000 in 1889. It was worth \$9000 in 1888 and has not increased in value to any extent; \$27,000 as its value is incorrect.

These are but two cases; "PIL" can have two hundred. He gives figures which show that from business, water and liquor licenses there has been an increase of some six per cent. These are probably correct; But "PIL" was in gross ignorance or wilfully wished to deceive when he wrote about property and real estate, hence his "If." Take his "if" away or answer his queries truthfully, and it is like sticking a pin in a bladder of wind—the whole thing collapses.

There are two other items referred