

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1902.

Number 209.

**LOUIS F. POST, Editor.**

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Congressman Cannon has vigorously and successfully opposed Congressman Sulzer's motion for an appropriation to keep alight the torch of "Liberty Enlightening the World," the colossal statue in New York harbor. The motion was defeated by 67 votes to 61. This decision was appropriate. The political party which by its world power policy of war and conquest has put out the old light of American liberty enlightening the world by force of example, shows a due regard for the eternal fitness of things when it darkens the torch of the great statue which, with its face turned to the open sea, symbolizes to all the world a true American spirit of peace and gentle conquest.

A remarkable policy of commercial retaliation is outlined this week by the Washington correspondents of administration papers. It is said that the Secretary of Agriculture is about to publish a list of imports from Europe, which, being deleterious to health, may be excluded under the Dingley law. This list is expected to "give Europe something to ponder over." Its publication is proposed as a warning to "all the European nations, especially Germany, of the tremendous power lodged in the hands of the United States government, which can be used to retaliate effectively against any nation which, by unjust discrimination, excludes American products of farm and factory from its markets." Our quotations are from the Chicago Tribune's Washington correspondence of the 30th, published on the 31st. If the correspondent is to be trusted, we have here in contemplation a policy

which ought to make Americans ponder much more seriously than Europeans. The listed imports, it will be observed, are deleterious to health—to the health of our own people. Yet they are to be admitted or excluded with reference, not to this fact, but, with this fact serving merely as the excuse, for the purpose of waging a war of markets. Americans may continue to suffer from deleterious food and be blessed accordingly, provided Europe does not shut out American exports; but if Europe does that, then the administration will retaliate by excluding unwholesome goods, which, but for the retaliatory necessity, it would continue to admit.

That was a great victory for the future of good government which was won in Chicago at the municipal election this week. Not the election of good men to office, though several of those elected are good men. Not that, for good men often go wrong if they really were good or get found out if they were not. The real victory was the heavy referendum vote on abstract questions of city government, proving that the people do express themselves on questions referred when they have a chance. And that great victory was made all the greater by the large majority on the right side of the questions submitted. The credit for this day's work belongs chiefly to Allen Ripley Foote, who drafted the advisory referendum law under which it was achieved; to Clayton E. Crafts, who, as a member of the legislature a year ago, secured its passage; to Daniel Cruice, who organized the machinery for securing the huge petition and directed the work to its consummation; and, among the newspapers, to the American, the only Chicago paper that did not either openly or covertly oppose the movement or damn it with

faint praise. The American was unceasing in its activity in promoting the work of the referendum league. Great credit belongs to thousands of others, but these can be named without making invidious distinctions. It now behooves the city council and the mayor to go slow, with an exceeding great slowness, in further extending the profitable street privileges of private corporations.

One of the most refreshing legal decisions recently made was rendered last week by Judge Tuley, of Chicago, in a street car franchise tax case. The traction companies of Chicago had applied for an injunction to prevent the collection of the taxes assessed against them for local purposes, which, thanks to the school-teachers' fight (p. 650), were assessed upon full valuations. Two points were made. One was that the legislature has no power to allow a state board to assess corporations in any one county for purely local purposes. Judge Tuley made quick and decisive work of that point, holding that the legislature has full power to invest a state board or any other official body with authority to levy county taxes so long as the taxes are uniform. But it was the other point that excited his judicial indignation. The companies contended that inasmuch as the property of the taxpayer in Cook county is assessed at only 60 per cent. of its value, that of the companies ought to be assessed at no more than 60 per cent. It seems that a new generation of lawyers has grown up with a distorted notion that the law requiring full valuations has no standing in court against this fraudulent 60 per cent. custom of assessors. But Judge Tuley is old enough to know what the law was before corporation lawyers got to twisting it, and he read the lawyers in this case a

lesson. He told them that the attempt of their clients to evade their taxes in this way was "clearly not founded either in good law or in sound morals." Because other taxpayers escape, he explained, is no valid reason why these companies should escape. Their remedy is to take steps to have the other tax dodgers properly assessed. It is to be hoped that the company may act upon that suggestion. If the school-teachers' prosecution of the traction companies for tax dodging should set the traction companies on the trail of the big real estate tax dodgers, a mighty ball would have been set a-rolling, and the Chicago treasury would no longer be empty.

In the course of his opinion on the traction case Judge Tuley directed attention to the anomalous situation in Chicago regarding public revenues. What he said was right to the point and was too compactly expressed to admit of further condensation:

The "net assessed value" of property in Chicago for 1901, with a population of over 2,000,000, was \$374,000,000 and the assessed value of property for taxable purposes in Chicago in 1873, when this city was but an infant, with a population of about 300,000, was over \$312,000,000, with no limitation as to rate. Between 1873 and 1901 the city has extended its limits and more than doubled the area liable to taxation; and, while it is not shown by the evidence in this case, no one who knew the city in 1873 and knows it now can doubt that the aggregate wealth of its present extended area is more than ten times that of 1873, and that the "net assessed value" of property for taxation should have been more than twice that returned in 1901. It is a notorious fact that much property is assessed too low and that much property in some way or other escapes being listed; also that property in nearly all parts of the city is now paying less taxes than it has in any year for the last 15 years. The consequence is insufficient revenue for both city and county purposes. Our police force, always inadequate, must be reduced; our fire department must be crippled, our schools must be closed, the salaries of the school teachers must be cut and both city and county find themselves in a deplorable situation for want of the necessary revenue to pay ordinary and necessary expenses. Somebody is to blame for this. Aside from "tax-dodging," which has be-

come epidemic, almost the entire responsibility therefor must rest upon the State Board of Equalization, and the boards of assessors and review, whose duty it is to find property that is liable to assessment, assess it and assess it at its "full valuation," upon one-fifth of which only can taxes (limited as to rate) be imposed. If these officials have failed in this duty—as they apparently have, but not with any fraudulent intent so far as shown—the remedy is not in a court of chancery. It is no part of the duty of a court of chancery to raise revenue or defeat the raising of revenue. If there is any remedy for this state of affairs it does not lie with the courts, but with the voters. It is for them to apply the remedy. In conclusion I can only say that from the evidence now before the court this bill to enjoin the payment of taxes assessed against the complainant's property is clearly not founded in good law nor in good morals.

The currency provisions of the Lodge Philippine bill do seem like an attempt with reference to the silver question, to "try it on the dog." Should this bill pass, a mint is to be established at Manila for the free coinage of silver dollars containing 416 grains of standard silver 900 fine, which is about the ratio with gold of 16 to 1. It is explained by friends of the bill that this is not "Bryanism," because these dollars will be estimated in foreign trade at bullion value; as if that would not have been done with Bryan silver dollars, as if it is not always done with all metal money, gold included. The explanation is altogether too gauzy. It explains no more than that the Philippine dollars are not to be good by law beyond the territory where the law is effective, which is a begging of the question. As they are to be legal tender at face value in the Philippines, the plan appears to contemplate "the free and unlimited coinage" of silver in these islands at the ratio of 16 to 1 with gold, "without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation." If that is not "Bryanism" on the money question, it is only because there is no provision for coining gold as well as silver. The motive for this Republican departure on the money question is somewhat obscure; and probably the Chica-

go Evening Post, a Republican paper, makes a close guess when it suggests that it is a "bribe to the silver States." In other words, the Republicans realize that the silver question is not as dead as they affect to believe, and in dealing with it directly by legislation, even for the far-off Philippines, they are just a bit tender-footed.

Nevertheless, the proposed Philippine coinage is not a 16 to 1 proposition. It lacks the vital thing noted above. By not providing for gold coinage with silver coinage, and on the same terms at the given ratio, it leaves out the element of "Bryanism." The essence of the whole thing is this, that it is not proposed to coin dollars at all, but half dollars—there or thereabouts—if we regard gold dollars as the dollar unit. For the Philippines are upon a silver basis, pure and simple. When you buy a "dollar's worth" there, you can pay the bill twice over with a gold dollar or its equivalent. A Philippine silver dollar, then, is, with reference to the gold dollar as the unit, only half a dollar; and it is these half dollars that it is proposed to coin, under the name of dollars. Some apologist for the bill explains that the new coinage is intended to displace the wornout, poorly minted and overalloyed Mexican pieces, with nice new American silver of full standard purity. That would be a feat, indeed; for if it were done, what would become of the invariable Gresham law, according to which the poorer money always drives out the better. Wouldn't the inferior Mexican drive out the superior American as fast as it was coined?

The following extract from the Indianapolis Journal probably expresses with brevity and accuracy the prevailing ignorance on the subject of breach of neutrality in connection with the Boer war which this country is permitting at New Orleans:

All the talk against the purchase of supplies by Great Britain in this country as being in violation of international law is due to ignorance or demagoguery. Since the beginning of the republic foodstuffs, horses and all prod-

ucts except munitions of war have been permitted to be sold to belligerents by the provisions of international law.

Now this is one of those half truths which are "ever the worst of lies." It is true that foodstuffs, horses, etc., may be sold in this country to belligerents without breach of neutrality. It is true, also, that belligerents may freely buy them. The same is true of powder and guns. There is no such difference, as the Journal would imply, between guns, etc., and horses, etc., to be used for belligerent purposes. Everything to be so used comes within the category of "munitions of war," with the exception only of money and men. Nor has anyone complained of the sale by Americans of horses and mules to the British. What is complained of, and what constitutes the breach of neutrality, is not the purchase of these munitions, but their shipment by British army agents, at an American port, on board British transports, to the seat of the war.

Questions of neutrality in connection with the shipment of war supplies from any neutral country are determined by the simple consideration of whether, when shipped, they are commercial commodities in the regular channels of trade, or war supplies in the possession of a belligerent. The horses and mules purchased in this country cease to be commercial commodities the instant they come into the possession of British army agents for British army use. They are then no longer commodities in the channels of trade, but army supplies in the possession of a belligerent. And if the belligerent loads them upon one of his own army ships, in a neutral port, for shipment to the seat of the war, the neutral nation knowingly permitting him to do so is guilty of breach of neutrality. This is an old principle of international law, which was acknowledged by the treaty of Washington when it declared that—

A neutral government is bound . . . not to permit or suffer either belliger-

ent to make use of its ports or waters . . . for the purpose of renewal or augmentation of military supplies. . . .

#### THE CAUSE OF THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA.

British partisans place the responsibility for the South African war upon the Boers, pointing to the Boer ultimatum of October 9, 1899 and the Boer invasion of Natal of a few days later, as its wanton beginning. But intelligent nonpartisan investigators into the origin and causes of the war have long since concluded that it began virtually with the Jameson raid of 1895-96. The Boer ultimatum and the Natal invasion were inevitable effects of the same British spirit of aggression that caused the raid. They were defensive acts against the manifest policy of the Salisbury government of forcing all South Africa into the British empire; and the Jameson raid was the first overt act in furtherance of this aggressive policy.

That the British government disavows all responsibility for the Jameson raid makes no difference. The plea of "not guilty" is as common in the history of national as of individual crime, and as insignificant except for the purpose of putting the prosecution to its proofs. What is of real importance is that this criminal responsibility is fixed upon the British government by the conceded facts.

For instance, the latest defender of the British government, Dr. Conan Doyle, that ingenious creator of the slippery Sherlock Holmes, while he disavows British responsibility for the raid in his partisan argument, discloses it most plainly in his statement of facts, incomplete as that statement is. Referring to the aliens resident at Johannesburg, who wanted to be citizens of the South African Republic without forswearing allegiance to the British crown, and were plotting to overturn the existing republican government, Dr. Doyle says:

Unfortunately they had complicated matters by asking for outside help. Mr. Cecil Rhodes was premier of the Cape, a man of intense energy and one who had rendered great services to the empire. The motives of his action are obscure—certainly, we may say, that they were not sordid, for he has always been a man whose thoughts

were large and whose habits were simple. But whatever they may have been—whether an ill-regulated desire to consolidate South Africa under British rule, or a burning sympathy with the uitlanders—

meaning aliens—

in their fight against injustice—it is certain that he allowed his lieutenant, Dr. Jameson, to assemble the mounted police of the Chartered company—

one of those hybrid commercial corporations with comprehensive governmental functions, which have made so much of British history hateful—

of which Rhodes was founder and director, for the purpose of cooperating with the rebels at Johannesburg. Moreover, when the revolt at Johannesburg was postponed on account of a disagreement as to which flag they were to rise under—

whether under that of the South African Republic or that of Great Britain—

it appears that Jameson (with or without the order of Rhodes) forced the hand of the conspirators by invading the country with a force absurdly inadequate to the work which he had taken in hand. Five hundred policemen and two field guns made up the forlorn hope who started from near Mafeking and crossed the Transvaal border upon December 25, 1895. On January 2 they were surrounded by the Boers amid the broken country near Dornkop, and after losing many of their number killed and wounded, without food and with spent forces, they were compelled to lay down their arms.

Dr. Doyle does not say so, but it is a well-authenticated and undisputed fact, that this invading force, sent out by Cecil Rhodes, head of the Chartered company which exercised political authority in the British territory that it exploited commercially and which bordered on the Transvaal, included officers as well as privates of the British army and carried the British flag.

That would seem, *prima facie*, to make the British government itself responsible for the raid; and from this *prima facie* responsibility there is no escape short of serious criminal proceedings by that government for what, if not authorized, was a gross misuse of the British army and the British flag. Such proceedings were indeed instituted. But only against the mere tools of Rhodes—Jameson and a few of his raiding band. Even these proceedings were not for an offense so se-

rious as the use of the army and the flag for levying unauthorized war upon a friendly power. They were for a simple misdemeanor such as any filibustering civilian might have been charged with, and the accused were most mildly and delicately, not to say lovingly punished. As to Rhodes, the head-devil of the raid (as Doyle admits him to be, though in more deferential language), no proceedings at all were instituted against him. His misuse of British officers and the British flag, as head of the Chartered company, was ignored. Nevertheless, Dr. Doyle has the temerity to argue that the British government was not responsible for that raid.

The simple and incomplete facts which he himself narrates stand out in plain refutation of his own argument. That the British government did not connive at the raids affirmatively and openly, is, of course, quite true. No one accuses it of having done that. The point is that Cecil Rhodes, acting in pursuance of one of those "understandings between statesmen" which constitute part of Mr. Chamberlain's stock in trade, went ahead with a policy of which the Jameson raid was part, leaving the British government to disavow the raid if it failed and to adopt its results if it succeeded. Rhodes imitated the near-sighted Yankee sportsman whose rifle was so adjusted that when he aimed at an animal he would hit it if it was a deer and miss it if it was a cow.

There was no difference in this particular between the Jameson raid of 1895-96 and the Shepstone raid of nearly two decades earlier, except that in Shepstone's case the game proved to be a deer instead of a cow. Shepstone had no more authority from the home government to invade the Transvaal than had Rhodes. Had he been as unfortunate in calculating the Boer strength at that time, and, like Rhodes and his accomplice, Jameson, gone about the matter "with a force absurdly inadequate," his raid also could have been disavowed and doubtless would have been. But Shepstone, whatever may have been the size of his force, had one that was adequate for the occasion; and when he, without right, without authority, contrary to the principles of international law, and, as Dr. Doyle admits,

against a formal protest signed by "a majority of the Boer inhabitants," annexed their territory to the British crown, the home government adopted his act and accepted his conquest until, three years later, the Boer victory at Majuba hill had forced a compromise.

There is no reason for believing that the home government would not likewise have adopted the Rhodes-Jameson raid of 1895-96, had it been successful. On the contrary, there are many good reasons for believing that it would have done so.

One of these reasons is a statement by Cecil Rhodes, made public in Rhodes's own phrases since his death. We quote from a cable dispatch from London to the Chicago Tribune, dated March 2, 1902, and published in the Tribune of the 28th:

Cecil Rhodes never publicly avowed the reasons why he organized the Jameson raid. They are now set forth in his own words by one of his biographers. He quotes Mr. Rhodes as saying:

"There were three reasons. In the first place, I found that old Kruger was an insuperable obstacle to the union of South Africa, even for commercial purposes and for the development of the country. I tried him in every way I could on what you may call Afrikaner principles, but it was of no use, and so long as he ruled the Transvaal the brake was put on all progress in South Africa.

"The second reason was that there was an English-speaking minority opposed to Kruger, but at least as much opposed to seeing South Africa under the British flag. That was then a small minority, but a growing one, and, if left to develop, it would have become a majority. When the hour came to get rid of Kruger that would have balked the policy for which I had struggled all my life—to make South Africa an integral part of the British empire.

"The third reason was, you cannot make revolutions in these days without money, and I had at my command at that time a combination of millionaires ready to support me whom I might never be able to get together again.

This post mortem approval is not necessary to prove Rhodes's responsibility for the raid. The proof on that point is abundant enough without confessions. It is, however, a helpful interpretation of the circumstances which so connect the Jameson raid of 1895-96 with the war of 1899-1902

as to make the raid in reality the first battle of the war.

Consider the second reason Mr. Rhodes is quoted as having given. There was a minority in the South African Republic, which was opposed to Kruger's hostility to South African progress. But this progressive minority was also as much opposed as Kruger "to seeing South Africa under the British flag." And it was a growing minority. "If left to develop it would have become a majority." Consequently, "when the hour came to get rid of Kruger," his retirement and the reversal of his unprogressive policy would not have been signalized by the flying of the British flag over the South African Republic. The republic would have been all the stronger in its independence. With a progressive party in power there, there would have been no excuse, not even the flimsy ones that are now urged, for a British conquest. The progressive minority party once developed into a majority party would, as Rhodes is quoted as saying, "have balked the policy for which" he "had struggled all" his "life—to make South Africa an integral part of the British empire."

There you have an explanation at once of the motive for the Jameson raid and of the origin and cause of the British war in South Africa. Both were for the extension of British empire over all South Africa. The raid failed. But the same satanic influence, the same ambition for British conquest, that had instigated the raid kept on working, like yeast in the dough tray, until the Boers were driven, as the British blue books amply testify, either to submit to absorption into the British empire or to fight for their national existence.

The policy of the British government in all this matter has been a reflection of the policy of Cecil Rhodes, and it was his policy to fly the British flag over all South Africa. If the British cabinet was not in fact in collusion with him, it has nevertheless disclosed its sympathy with his imperial ambitions, and its conduct has been in accord, step by step, with his imperial plans. But for his imperialism, vitalized by the greed of "a combination of millionaires" and fostered by the government's hearty sym-

thy and active even if discreet cooperation, there would have been no Jameson raid and no war. The South African farmer republics would have gone on working out their own ideals and destiny in independence and peace.

## NEWS

At the municipal election in Chicago on the 1st, though in all other respects the election was of local interest only, there was one outcome which is so significant of political progress in certain directions as to challenge general attention. This was the result of the advisory referendum vote, which (pp. 690, 777, 803) we have heretofore explained. The law under which the vote was taken was enacted by the Illinois legislature one year ago. It provides for an advisory vote in municipalities on any question, upon the petition of 25 per cent. of the registered voters. The high percentage is almost prohibitory, but under the energetic management of Daniel Cruice, a young Chicago lawyer and radical democrat, who was cordially and effectively aided by the Chicago American, a petition with 109,000 signatures—some 30,000 more coming in after the expiration of the time limit—was secured. This petition called for a vote on the following propositions:

**Ownership by the city of Chicago of all street railroads within the corporate limits of said city.**

**Ownership by the city of Chicago of the gas and electric lighting plants. Said plants to furnish all heat and power for public and private use.**

**The nomination of all candidates for city offices by direct vote of the voters at primary elections to be held for that purpose.**

Since 104,000 was the number of signatures required by law as the condition of submitting the propositions to a vote, and as the margin beyond that number was only 5,000—but 109,000 of the 140,000 having signed in time—an attempt was made to discredit enough signatures to reduce the total below the legal requirement. A sharp and somewhat prolonged legal fight ensued, but the adversaries of the petition were unable to make a case. The propositions were consequently submitted in due course to the voters of Chicago, who have responded with a full vote and overwhelming majorities for all the propositions.

By full vote is meant a large proportion of the total vote cast for candidates at the election. The total vote for candidates, not yet officially reported, was about 207,926, and the total vote for these amendments was approximately 150,000, or about 72 per cent. The total vote on the propositions was distributed as follows:

For municipal ownership of street railways, 124,594, or nearly 60 per cent. of votes for candidates; against, 25,987, or less than 13 per cent; affirmative majority, 98,607.

For municipal ownership of lighting plants, 124,190, or nearly 60 per cent. of total vote for candidates; against, 19,447, or about 9 per cent; affirmative majority, 104,743.

For nominations for city officers by direct vote of the people at primary elections, 125,082; against, 15,861; affirmative majority, 109,221.

A comparison of this vote with that for abolishing the old township system in the city indicates the relative interest of the voters in all the referendum questions. The total vote on the township question was only 69,281. No legal effect is directly produced by the vote on the advisory referendum described above. As the result is only suggestive, the object of the law being merely to provide for definite expressions of public opinion, the effect can be only political. Advocates of the measures regard the expression of opinion as having been so emphatic in this instance that hostile councilmen and legislators will hereafter be more cautious, while friendly ones will be encouraged to become more bold and uncompromising.

The effect of the Chicago election upon the politics of the city council is not noteworthy. The Democrats elected 17 members and the Republicans 19. The political complexion of the new council will be 39 Republican to 30 Democratic, with 1 independent. Some of the men who were most earnestly opposed by independent voters were reelected. The total number of reelections was 23. Permanent side-party votes were larger than usual, though small, the aggregate of the councilmanic votes for the different wards being reported as follows:

Socialist, 6,031, or 3 per cent. of total.  
Prohibition, 2,866, or 1½ per cent. of total.

Single tax (local party), 1,816, or 4-5 of 1 per cent. of total.

Votes of these parties since the presidential election of November, 1900, have been as follows, as reported

at the times respectively, in the daily press;

	Nov., 1900.	Apr., 1901.	Apr., 1902.
Socialist . . . . .	6,009	7,195	6,031
Prohibition . . . . .	4,751	2,804	2,866
Single tax . . . . .	465	950	1,816

Other candidates independent of the two principal parties received at the election of the 1st an aggregate of 7,000 votes.

An exciting mayoralty election came off in Milwaukee, also on the 1st, resulting in the reelection of David S. Rose, Democrat, as mayor, by a plurality of 7,000. A large Socialist vote and defections of Republicans who are opposed to the Payne domination in the Republican party of the State are referred to as accounting for this result. But other influences may have been at work. This is not Mayor Rose's first election. He went into office four years ago by 7,000 plurality and two years ago by 2,401.

Previous to these municipal elections the results of the Democratic primaries held in Arkansas on the 29th had been reported with sufficient fullness to show that Senator James K. Jones, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has been defeated for reelection as United States Senator. He will be succeeded by ex-Gov. James P. Clarke, who is reported to have from 74 to 84 supporters who will be elected to the legislature. Only 67 are necessary to elect. Mr. Jones's defeat is a triumph for the wing of the party which is led by Jefferson Davis, who will be reelected as Governor. The contest between Jones and Clarke was a hot one, though entirely within party lines, as are all the political contests in Arkansas, the election being only a formal confirmation of the action of the Democratic primaries.

Another Southern State, Alabama, is registering voters for election purposes under the new constitution. As predicted, this constitution is being used to disfranchise Negroes, nominally for educational but really for race reasons. A press dispatch of the 27th from Montgomery states that the registration is nearly finished in all the big towns and that less than 1 per cent. of the voters registered are Negroes. Citizens of that race are reported as having been so persistently "turned down" by the registrars, arbitrarily, that in large numbers they have ceased to apply for registration. The constitution under

which this is done was adopted last year. It requires that the legislature shall provide for the permanent registration of voters after the year 1902, and that meantime they may be registered temporarily by county boards appointed by the governor and two other state officers acting as a board of appointment. The persons entitled to temporary registration by the county boards prior to December 29, 1900, are—

(1) males, (2) citizens, or foreign residents who have applied for naturalization, (3) 21 years of age, (4) having honorable military service, or being lawfully descended from persons with honorable military records, or having a good education and being able to understand the duties and obligations of citizenship under a republican form of government, (5) provided, however, that idiots, insane persons, convicts and vagrants are not entitled to registry.

After January 1, 1903, only the following can be registered:

(1) Those who can read and write any article of the constitution of the United States in the English language (unless physically disabled), and who are either physically unfit to work or have worked for the greater part of the year prior to their application for registry; (2) owners in their own right or in that of their wives of 40 acres of land in the state in which they reside, or of Alabama real estate or personalty assessed for taxation at \$300 or more, provided the taxes have been paid.

Nearly nine-tenths of the convention adopting this constitution were Democrats, and the constitutional convention had been called under the influence of the Democratic party of the state. The meaning and purpose of the suffrage clauses quoted above may therefore be regarded as having been authoritatively expounded when the Democratic State Campaign Committee, appointed for the purpose of conducting the ratification campaign, explained the instrument to the voters. The following quotations are from that explanation:

So long as it is necessary to maintain white supremacy in the counties having Negro majorities, and to prevent the inflicting upon any of our people of Negro domination, there has been a disposition in other parts of the State to condone the methods necessary to suppress the Negro vote. But to do that involves the doing of things which the white men in these counties have never desired to do, and which, if done at all, were done only because of what they regarded as a necessity for their own protection and government. . . . The reason for

adopting two plans—one temporary and the other permanent—is best shown by the difficulties which the convention had to meet. The Fifteenth amendment to the Federal constitution was the principal barrier, but there was another condition which good faith required the Democratic members to observe as fully as possible. . . . The party platform pledged that white men should not be disfranchised. To frame a provision that would observe this pledge and eliminate the mass of vicious Negro votes, and yet be constitutional, was no light task; but to it Democratic members of the convention addressed themselves. . . . And we unqualifiedly renew our party's pledge that under the operation of the registration feature of the new constitution no white man who can now vote will be disfranchised. . . . Under the temporary plan the Negroes cannot register. . . . When a man applies for registration he will not be asked to specify under which class he is entitled to register. The list will not show under what clause he is registered. When the party pledge not to disfranchise any white man is remembered, it is easy to see that the above plan will effectuate it. There is a general presumption that white men are of good character and understand the duties and obligations of good citizenship; the history of the race attests this. It is safe to say that the registrars will observe this presumption. This plan will not disfranchise all Negroes. It is well known that there are men of that race who are entirely competent to vote intelligently, and these will have no difficulty in registering. . . . White men insist upon their rights and will not submit to disfranchisement by any registrars, but if necessary will prove their right to register before a jury of their neighbors. The registrars will know this and will not refuse to register them except for good cause. . . . This is a white man's government and it will continue to be so. . . . The failure of the present movement for the new constitution . . . will be almost tantamount to an indorsement of the methods heretofore used, whether honest or dishonest, to control elections. . . .

The only other political news of the week of general interest is the calling of the Republican convention of Illinois to meet at Springfield on the 8th of May; of the Democratic convention of the same state to meet at Springfield on the 17th of June; the nomination on the 2d of the Republican State ticket of Oregon, headed by W. J. Furnish as candidate for governor, to be voted on in June; and the assembling of the first convention of a new national party, the

Allied party, at Louisville on the 2d. The Illinois conventions are of national importance because two factions of the Republican party in this state are so bitterly at war among themselves that the Democrats are confident of carrying the state next fall and securing a senatorship. The Allied party is another attempt to secure an organic union of the various "reform forces" of the country. The attendance of delegates on the 2d is reported as 75 from eight states. Col. J. S. Felter, of Springfield, Mo., was elected temporary chairman.

In Congress the Republican majority of the House of Representatives has agreed upon a bill regulating the tariff between this country and Cuba (see p. 673), by a general reduction of 20 per cent. on the Dingley law schedules. The measure was agreed to by the committee on ways and means of the lower house by 12 to 5. The majority included 3 Democrats and the minority 2 Republicans. The bill was thereupon, on the 31st, reported favorably to the House. Some Republican opposition to the reduction is looked for, but Republicans who are dissatisfied with the smallness of the reduction are expected to support the bill.

As the United States prepares to adjust its relations with the new republic, Cuba, a more amicable attitude is assumed by Colombia, with reference to the Isthmian canal, than what seemed probable at the time of our last report (p. 760) on that subject. She has submitted to this country for consideration a protocol, disclosed on the 31st,—

1. Embracing an entirely new concession to the United States, irrespective of the old concession to the Panama Canal company of France.
2. Consenting to and legalizing in every way the sale of the Panama company's property to the United States, and removing all question as to the validity of the title.
3. Proposing to grant the United States control, through perpetual lease, of a strip of territory amply wide for canal purposes.
4. Agreeing that all questions of police and sanitary control shall be satisfactorily adjusted.
5. Taking full cognizance of the existing treaty between the United States and Colombia, which binds the United States to preserve the freedom of transit through the Isthmus of Panama.

It is understood that the price asked for the concession is an annual sti-

pend of \$1,000,000; but as great secrecy is maintained on this point nothing about the price is really known.

Passing over to France, we find the French Chamber of Deputies adjourned for a new election which is to take place on the 27th, when a new chamber is to be chosen for four years. It will assemble on the 1st of June. The Senate, the members of which are elected for nine years (the terms of one-third of the body expiring every three years) has adjourned to June 3.

Russia has at last entered into arrangements for relinquishing, nominally at least, her self-assumed protectorate (p. 711) over Manchuria. The announcement is made by the Peking correspondent of the London Times, whose dispatch, published on the 29th, states that the Russian minister to China and the president of the Chinese foreign office have agreed upon the principal conditions of a treaty for the Russian evacuation of three provinces, to be carried out at three successive intervals of six months each, dating from the signing of the treaty. After the Russian evacuation, China is to be allowed to maintain in Manchuria whatever military force she thinks necessary.

Meanwhile another rebellion has been raging for several weeks in southern China, in and about Kwangse province. Early last month it was reported that it had become so extensive as to threaten Nanking. About the same time Mr. Conger, the American minister at Peking, was quoted as having notified the Chinese government that the United States expects China speedily to suppress this rebellion and protect foreigners. In response to his request of a few days previously for information as to the outbreak, the Chinese government informed him that 10,000 soldiers had rebelled and that they were being rapidly reinforced by other rebels. It requested him to have the foreign missionaries deposit their valuables with officials and accept an escort to the coast. On the 18th a Hongkong dispatch reported the rebellion as spreading, and told of a battle at Fangcheng which lasted two days and resulted in a defeat of the government troops under Gen. Ma; and on the 19th Gen. Ma confessed his inability to cope with the rebels without reinforcements. Three days later the

rebels had captured Kamchau in the Province of Kwangtung, of which Canton is the capital, and had seized the granaries and the arsenal. The rebel leader's name is Fungming.

These threatening disturbances in China are reported from London as having had a tendency to give the British government great concern, since the rebellion is in the region of the British "sphere of influence" in China, and Great Britain still has the South African war on her hands. Although high expectations of peace in South Africa have been raised by the journey of acting President Schalkburger, of the South African Republic, to meet President Steyn, of the Orange Free State (p. 808), no actual indications of a settlement are at hand. Schalkburger had passed through the British lines at the time of our last week's report, and was on his way, under British escort, from Pretoria to Kroonstad; but he had not yet met Steyn. It is now known that he reached Kroonstad on the 23d, and that on the 24th one of his staff was escorted, blindfolded and under flag of truce, through the British lines, to bring the Transvaal party into communication with Steyn, who was understood to be with De Wet. On the 29th a message from Pretoria stated that Steyn's whereabouts had not yet been discovered though he and De Wet had been traced to Paris, about 30 miles northwest of Heilbron road, in the Orange Free State; but on the 30th it was announced that he had been found with Delarey and that the interview between him and Schalkburger would be arranged without further delay.

This episode has not prevented the continuance of fighting. Some of the details of Delarey's escape from Lord Kitchener's cordon (p. 808) came out on the 28th. Kitchener captured 179 prisoners, but 1,500 broke through his lines and got away. Official news of a Boer victory, on the 24th, not before reported reached London on the 30th in the shape of a casualty report. A British force had lost 7 killed, 8 wounded and 29 captured near Sutherland, in Cape Colony. The prisoners were afterward released in accordance with the Boer practice. A British surprise attack on a Boer company on the 31st was repulsed, after a severe engagement, but Lord Kitchener's report of the event gives no details. To strengthen her force in the field Great Britain has

notified Canada of her acceptance of 2,000 troops offered by the Dominion for service in South Africa; and on the 1st orders were issued in London for the embarkation for South Africa of more troops on the 15th. Kitchener is believed to have again surrounded De Wet, but there is nothing authentic about the rumors.

American sympathy with the Boers was expressed on behalf of the Democrats in Congress on the 31st by the introduction into the lower House, by Congressman Sulzer, of New York, of the following resolution:

That we sympathize with the heroic Boers in their struggle to maintain their liberty and independence, and protest in the name of humanity and civilization against the continuation of a war which outrages the feelings of all liberty-loving people; and that, the Congress of the United States, being committed to the principle of arbitration for the settlement of international disputes, the President is hereby respectfully requested to urge upon the government of Great Britain the wisdom of adopting this policy for the purpose of stopping the awful atrocities now going on in South Africa; and that the President is hereby directed to maintain a strict neutrality between the contending forces, and prevent the shipment of contraband goods from ports in the United States to aid the British soldiers in South Africa, and respectfully inform the British government that, if the war in South Africa is continued, it must be conducted in accordance with the rules of civilized warfare and the provisions agreed to and adopted by the Geneva convention and The Hague peace convention.

The question of American neutrality, mentioned in the resolution, appears to have been brought to a sharp issue by the Governor of Louisiana, in which state the breach of neutrality is claimed to be in progress. Gov. Heard, of that state, officially and formally questioned the American State department on the 2d upon the subject. He writes the department that in his opinion the British government is maintaining a military camp within the territory of the United States; that the camp in question is located in his state, a few miles below New Orleans; that it is for the transshipment of horses and mules to South Africa, there to be used by British soldiers as munitions of war in the war against the Boers; that this camp is, therefore, in his opinion, a British army post, and its operations in his state a violation

## AN OPEN LETTER TO GEN. FUNSTON.

For The Public.

Exalted and Heroic Dear Sir: It is due you that some recognition be accorded your vigilance at this hour of the nation's peril. All true patriots applaud your timely utterances against treason. While our beloved country is in danger of an invasion by the savages of the Philippine islands we cannot afford to allow malcontents to give these Malay oppressors any sort of comfort. It must be of the greatest satisfaction to you to know that every member of the Marquette club of Chicago, agrees with you that all are traitors who either resist invasion or condone such resistance. In this hour of danger civilians should learn to curb their own opinions, and rely altogether on expert warriors. We all know that our country would have been invaded, and all of us made subjects of the Filipino republic long ago, had it not been for your peerless intrepidity in depriving that power of its head by the timely capture of Aguinaldo. That was a noble action which will make you live in history as the most fortunate of your kind. And your modesty, as well as your gallantry, challenges the admiration of your countrymen. Few heroes, given the opportunities for public utterance that you have encountered, could have resisted reciting the details of this dramatic incident. You resisted the natural tendency to particularize. Yet where, in all the pages of military valor, shall we find the equal of your matchless enterprise? Realizing that you were animated by a regard for the safety of your country from a threatened invasion, you did not hesitate, as lesser men might have done, to appeal to your enemy for food and shelter, and under the cover of his hospitality to make him captive. Our revolutionary fathers pledged their lives, their possessions and their sacred honor in the cause of their country, but none of them rose to the exalted height of violating sacred honor that we might be free from foreign invasion. It must have cost you some discomfort, after having been received with kindness by your host, to turn upon him, but your resolute mastery of your personal feelings in the interests of your cause, proclaims you the grandest hero of all ages. Never before in all history was that kind of military service so well rewarded, which goes to show how much you are beloved by the citizens of our country, and therefore whatever you may say

defining treachery will be accepted as authoritative.

In time of war prepare for peace, is a new reading of an old maxim. In time of war we should unhesitatingly yield to our military superiors, so that when peace comes about we may enjoy the sort of peace our heroes will have prepared for us. While it may be true, as contended by some silly civilians, that the representatives of the people, in congress assembled, have declared no war, the fact remains that we are at war, and facts are more important than theories. No patriot will cavil at any military measure instituted by the enlightened officers of our army at such a time, and he is indeed a traitor who will criticise any action of our martial superiors. I agree with you, therefore, that we should promptly hang any person who so transgresses loyalty as to condemn, or even appear to condemn, the noble work of benevolence which our war department is now promoting in our Pacific (if not pacific) possessions. Whether we pay duty on Manila hemp, or admit it free of duty, its best use will be in the manufacture of rope for the hanging of all such traitors. I congratulate you on the noble support in your timely contention which the Marquette club is affording you. All of us patriots must stand together.

Free speech and free press may be all right in times of peace, subject to certain prudent restrictions. Doubtless you, like myself, are in favor of free speech so long as the speaker exercises his freedom to speak only the things we like to hear. One would be foolish, whether in peace or war, to favor freedom of speech of any other kind. None of us have ever regarded the constitution as being worthy of serious acceptance in such matters. In short, we want freedom of speech, but we will not tolerate abuse of that freedom—and all is abuse that does not conform to the requirements of the military situation. That you may soon rise to be at the very head of the army, is the earnest wish of your ardent admirer,

HERMAN KUEHN.

## SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM—THE TREND OF THE CENTURIES.

An extract from a private letter commenting upon a plan for more fully socializing society.

All men will probably agree that the world has not yet arrived at the state of perfection anywhere; that there will be continuous change, and, judging from the past, slow but continuous progress; that organizations and aggregations of mankind are intended

for the welfare and happiness of all if possible, certainly for the welfare of the great multitude, and not of the few. It is probable that most men to-day will also agree that the organization known as the United States began with a much more level equality among its citizens than now exists, and that there has been a separation of a few from the masses, and that this separation is becoming more rapid and more marked. I think there will be no dispute that this distinction rests fundamentally upon money or wealth, and we have reached a condition where we have an aristocracy based upon wealth, or, as is the fashion to term it, a plutocracy. My opinion is that most men who are attacking this as an evil are not doing so because of envy, but because they know that the history of every republic the world has ever seen has been a degeneration into an oligarchy, and that these oligarchies rested upon money or property; for example, Rome, Florence, Venice, and the Greek Democracies. They know from the study of history that power has always rested where the wealth or property rested; and this is true whether it be landed property under the feudal system in England, or personal property as in the case of the senators of Rome and senators of the United States. It follows therefore that these men who believe this from their studies or by their blind instincts, believe also that if they would save the liberties of the people, they must in some way procure a more equal distribution of wealth, and must prevent its concentration in the hands of a few. I say again that I believe the motive of the radicals of to-day is not envy or hatred of the rich, but it is fear for the safety of the republic and human liberty. The danger we are in and the evil which is upon us, both to the historical student and to the unread and the unlearned, are so apparent that many "isms" are arising; but each believes his remedy the true one.

The one united party is the Republican, which is the party of this concentrated wealth and power, which necessarily will always be united upon the question of the protection of these property interests. I think it is pretty generally believed among the adherents of these different "isms" that the cause of this concentrated wealth and power in the hands of the few is that the few are reaping the labors of the many, not as a direct tax, as might have been imposed by Louis XV. of France, but indirectly through certain channels. For example: Protection,

which is only a payment to the protected manufacturer of a heavy subsidy from the pockets of the masses of people who are consumers of the manufactured articles; subsidies, as in the beet sugar subsidy and the proposed ship subsidy, which are direct payments out of the people's treasury to the subsidized beneficiary. Second, franchises, such as the monopoly of the streets for railway and other purposes, a monopoly of the highways and the right of eminent domain for railway purposes, etc. And, third, the private ownership in land is deemed a privilege on the theory that the earth itself is limited, and its desirable portion still more limited, and its concentrated wealth deposits, such as coal and iron, still more limited; and it is not thought right by many that any person should hold land by the old feudal paper title and fence it off from those who would be glad to use it, while he himself puts it to no use whatever. This becomes more apparent in city property. The owner by paper title takes to himself the benefit arising from improvements and increased values given by the whole mass of citizens. It is also apparent when it secures practically entire control of any material of limited amount, as say, anthracite coal or petroleum.

These ideas being obvious, many of the followers of the different "isms" take one or the other of two roads. One is socialism, leading to the government ownership or control of all industries—everything is monopolized by government; and the other philosophical anarchism, which seeks to bring about absolute personal liberty, in which law, order, government, or whatever you choose to term it, shall be evolved wholly from the voluntary association of individuals, and not by any compulsory idea, as statute law or other law enforced upon a minority of peaceful citizens by a majority of peaceful citizens.

I think most people would be inclined to admit that as an ideal, philosophical anarchy is the most attractive, because it rests upon a theory, which as a theory, at least, is the most to be desired, and is the most beautiful, namely, the right of every one to do as seems best to him, so long as he does not invade the rights of his fellow men; and the right of every one freely to associate himself with those of his own way of thinking and to live as they voluntarily elect to live as free beings, so long as they do not invade the rights of any other associate or community or individual. Socialism, on the other hand, for its perfect

operation requires the surrender of the liberty of every individual in the state to the state. To insure success each one must be absolutely under the control of the government. It is said that the government will be of the people themselves; that is what is said now, and that is the theory of our present government; but it is not true. This is not a government of the people. It is not even a government of the majority. It is the government of a few politicians who arrange matters at primaries and conventions which they control, and use the majority as the instruments to declare their power. The House of Representatives is not a House of Representatives. It is not a Chamber of debate. The minority has no right to be heard, and argument is a waste of time. The majority, even, are only puppets to be counted, and the real control is in the speaker and one or two party leaders. If you have more government with greater powers, I believe the same selfish desires and political practices which have put a few men in power and in control of the "welfare" of the country under our present system, will put just such men in control of the still more highly-organized machinery of socialistic government. This plan has never worked, even in the small socialistic communities which have experimented with it among themselves; even if it has worked among them, it is so small an experiment that I could not accept it as an argument.

I am in favor of philosophical anarchism, or personal liberty as an idea; and I am opposed to the socialistic or governmental idea. Your plan seems to me to be one of the many which have for a foundation the socialistic or governmental idea; and beside, it strikes me as exceedingly intricate and dependent in its last solution upon an arbitrary and forcible carrying out of the decrees of the government, and I am not clear from your plan but what that government might be the mere majority just as it is today. In other words, you seek more laws to compel more just conditions, as you think. I believe in less laws, or, if practically possible, no law, so that men may be free to work out their own salvation, unrestrained except when they attack or invade others. I know of no thoughtful man who expects, and certainly I do not expect, ever to abolish poverty, to abolish crime, and to produce an absolutely dead level of equality among men. I hope for a higher moral standard, I hope for greater equality of prosperity, but I certainly never expect to

see the natural inequality among men destroyed; nor do I think it would be desirable if possible. And I believe the ideal condition, if it ever shall be obtained in the distant future, will be that which allows the nearest approach to absolute freedom in the well behaving individual; which leaves each one free to use such gifts, talents, and energies as have been vouchsafed him. Toward that goal I think our present steps should tend. It will, in my opinion, be centuries before it is approached. The world as a whole is not ready for it, and if instituted to-morrow it would produce chaos. But I believe the true line of development is toward greater freedom, not greater government; and I think the intermediate stages will be sooner reached the sooner we begin the discussion, and model our reforms upon the idea of less law instead of more law.

I have probably bored you with these views, but I have intended it in the sense of a compliment, because I believe it desirable that men who discuss these matters should come as nearly together as possible. The theorist does much, but he is always ahead of his generation. There is always a present and practical issue. So I think the Democratic party, or some new party, ought clearly and unequivocally to advocate free trade, and let it be understood that absolute free trade is meant just as soon as it is feasible. I do not mean a tariff for revenue with incidental protection; and I do not mean a tariff for revenue only, which is an open door for protection; but I mean the abolishment of all tariff, leaving the trade of this country with the rest of the world absolutely free. This will set all industry upon an open and natural competition. It will also necessarily compel the raising of revenue from other sources; and I think the seed is already planted which will eventually flower in the taxation of raw land at its proper rental value, or something to this effect. If that be so, many of the benefits which you yourself are striving for will be reached, because no man could then afford to hold land out of use for speculation only; to make his land holdings profitable, he must put them to profitable use.

A necessary incident will be change in our written constitutions, Federal and State, but certainly they cannot be expected to remain any more fixed in the future than they have in the past. Have you read Herbert Spencer's "Plea for Liberty"?

Yours very truly,

C. E. S. WOOD.

Chicago, Mar. 13, 1902.

### ANARCHISM AMONG PRIMITIVE PEOPLES.

Anarchism is as old and indeed older than human civilization. Primitive man was so weak that he could not face the surrounding dangers of life alone, and so he had to apply for mutual help to his fellowmen. Thus an association of all the members of the tribe became a necessity; but property was communistic, because it belonged to everybody and to every one alike. The anarchic state of mankind lasted for a long time, and underwent a change only when the institution of private ownership of property was established.

There are, however, still a number of peoples living to-day whose social conditions are anarchic in the true sense of the word.

A few extracts from the writings of prominent ethnologists will prove the truth of this contention.

Schoolcraft says of the Chippewayans:

Though they have no regular government, as every man is lord of his own family, they are influenced more or less by certain principles which conduce to their general benefit.

Of the unorganized Soshones, Bancroft writes:

Every man does as he likes. Private revenge, of course, occasionally overtakes the murderer, or, if the sympathies of the tribe be with the murdered man, he may possibly be publicly executed, but there are no fixed laws for such cases.

From the Nagas of India we learn that they acknowledge no king among themselves, and deride the idea of such a personage among others; their "villages are continually at feud." . . . "Every man being his own master, his passions and inclinations are ruled by his share of brute force." And then we read that "petty disputes and disagreements about property are settled by a council of elders, the litigants voluntarily submitting to their arbitration. But correctly speaking, there is not the shadow of a constituted authority in the Naga community, and, wonderful as it may seem, this want of government does not lead to any marked degree of anarchy." That is to say, anarchy is well at hand, but not in the form of a state of disorder.

The Greenland Eskimos too are entirely without political control; having nothing which represents it more clearly than the deference paid to the opinion of some old man skilled in seal-catching and the signs of the weather. But an Eskimo who is offended by another has his remedy in what is called a singing-combat. He composes a satirical poem and challenges his an-

tagonist to a satirical duel in face of the tribe: "He who has the last word wins the trial." Indeed, a very simple and harmless way to settle quarrels!

Of one of the tribes of the northwest coast we read that "the Salish can hardly be said to have any regular form of government," a fact that has been confirmed by Prof. Boas, of New York.—Charles L. Henning, in the *Open Court* for November.

### "THE SALVATION OF BARBADOS."

A private letter from the West Indies says that "the salvation of the Barbados" described in the extract from Stark's "History and Guide to Barbados" given below, "shows itself in the greatest possible abjectness of the Negroes. They indeed have to work, carrying their products on foot six or eight miles to market."

The salvation of Barbados in the past has been the fact that the Negro had to work or starve; there was no land to squat on, as every foot was devoted to the cultivation of sugar cane. Under Negro rule it would soon be otherwise; under a "popular form of government" laws would be made on the principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number," the "single tax" theory would receive universal support, and every Negro, as soon as he understood the scheme, would become a disciple of Henry George. The whole tax-levy would fall upon real estate; and the irresponsible voter, having nothing to lose but everything to gain, would not be slow in running the island into debt. The result would be that the owners of real estate would be taxed out of existence, the estates would be sold for unpaid taxes and bought in by the municipality. Then the inhabitants could obtain all the land they wanted to squat on and raise all they desired with little work. No more sugar would be exported from Barbados, and the Negro would be truly free; he would have everything his own way, and in a short time have the island to himself. No Europeans would remain to be ruled under a black representative system, nor would they take part in it when they would be so overwhelmingly outvoted; they would sooner forfeit all they had in the world and go away.

### BOOK NOTICES.

The ideal method of popular government is the town meeting system, which is so closely identified with the history of New England. Under this system all the voters congregate in mass meeting and not only elect officers, but in a general way regulate the public affairs of their community. But only small communities can be governed in that way, although in Swit-

erland the system has been retained in its primitive form even where thousands attend the meetings. In a different form, however, the same principle is in vogue in Switzerland, and to some extent this form has been adopted in other countries, including our own. For, what is called the initiative and referendum is neither more nor less than an adaptation of the old town meeting system to modern conditions and large communities. On this subject there is already a very considerable literature, to which Gen. Herman Lieb, of Chicago, in "The Initiative and Referendum" (Chicago: H. Lieb, Jr., & Co.) has made an additional and excellent contribution. Gen. Lieb is not a novice in serious authorship. His "Abuses of Protective Tariffs," "Life of Emperor William," and "Foes of the French Revolution of 1789," suggest by their very titles that he comes well equipped to the task of writing on such a subject as the initiative and referendum, the development of which is one of the services that his native Switzerland has rendered to the cause of popular government. But his book on this subject needs no collateral recommendation. Its table of contents alone is a sufficient invitation to read it, and no disappointment will follow the reading. The book tells the story of the development of the initiative and referendum from its earliest uses in Switzerland to the present time, with especial reference to its applications to and development in the United States. The work of an American by choice and not by accident of birth, Gen. Lieb's book is alive with democratic spirit, which, however, is held in poise by a literary style at once reserved and pleasing.

### PERIODICALS.

—The *Pilgrim* for April (Battle Creek) makes a specialty of the Federation of Woman's Clubs. On another subject, its Altgeld editorial is valuable both for its tribute to Altgeld's memory and for its contribution to the accumulating testimony in his favor with reference to the railroad strike of 1894.

—The only articles of special value in the *Review of Reviews* for April are an explanation, by T. Iyenaga, of the Anglo-Japanese alliance from the Japanese point of view (to which is appended a copy of the treaty), and a translation from the *Nuova Antologia* for February 1, of part of Prof. Chiappelli's comments on recent transformations in the socialist and radical parties of Italy.

—The *Rural Californian* for March leads with a fine practical paper on the building up of California, written by William E. Smyth, the editor of an important department in "Out West." Though this article is local in purpose and treatment, it touches upon and illustrates principles of universal application. The land question of southern California, as of all arid regions, is a water question; and Mr. Smyth deals with it from the point of view of a land nationalizer.

—Although the idea of John A. Ryan, of the Catholic University of America at Washington, that speculation as a mode of insurance against trade fluctuations is of doubtful utility, seems hardly to be borne out by his argument upon "The Ethics of Speculation" in the *International Journal of Ethics* for April (Philadelphia), his presentation of the facts and theories of the subject make the article one of the most valuable of short discussions on business morality.

—An article on "Education in the Philippines" in the *April Arena*, by Antonio R. Jurado, ex-commissioner of education at Manila, will be a revelation to most Americans who imagine that the American educational system in the archipelago is carrying knowledge to a benighted race. This race is shown to be well educated in the elementary branches, though in Spanish instead of English, and our system is exposed as either a pretense or an attempt to force a new language upon the people. Incidentally the Philippine question is explained. In the same *Arena* Samuel A. Hamilton contributes an interesting paper on the so-called "cracker" class of the Southern states under the title of "The New Race Question in the South."