

class by the character of immigration in this time, nor the American by adoption, who is content to be governed if only he be allowed to make more money than European conditions render possible, is help to be expected. There are some signs that a partial awakening is at hand; but this, alas, is merely because one or the other or both of these classes is to be pinched in his pocket-book. Therefore we offer a hecatomb to Moloch in Chicago, and the offering at that altar is the offering of the nation.

But is there less a God in Israel?

Have all our boasts of material possessions, our colonies denied self-government and representation, our voting masses debauched by huge campaign funds and threats of personal loss, our general substitution of quantity for quality, made greed for filthy lucre any less a crime? Have we permitted Moloch and Mammon to usurp the seat of the Most High? Are the heavens obscured because we choose to look at them through opaque plates of gold? Must these women and children perish in vain? And was their slaughter a denial of a moral order in the universe?

A thousand pities it is that such a calamity should be one of God's instruments for awakening human hearts. But greed of filthy lucre is at the root of their destruction, and their deaths are simply a concentrated example of what has been going on for years. In our sweatshops, our factories, our railway service, our ships on the high seas, in our efforts to reduce wages and withhold better conditions from the laboring classes, in our growing love for manifest power, for war, for territory, for fashion and aristocracy, extending even to distinctions of birth based upon ancestral services in the War of Independence, we have a disregard for human lives and for that humanly catholic sympathy that makes such disregard possible by which scores are made to perish every year for one who was lost in the Iroquois theater in open disaster, and hundreds, chiefly women and children, are doomed thereby to a fate compared with which death by fire is humane.

And which of us is guiltless when

we search our hearts? Who is there that does not say, "This law was made for others and not for me," "This is the deed of my neighbor and not of myself"? Not those who are living on investments, whose one anxiety is for the size of their dividends at whatever cost secured. Not those whose chief interest it is to obtain higher wages, regardless of the means taken to obtain them. Class and mass we have forgotten; and Kipling's "Recessional" is good only to be read—in England.

Our literature is rotten with self-seeking. The church is silent. Not hymnology, but secular poetry alone preserves the spirit of humanity—and poetry is not read. But God has not forgotten, nor need man despair. "For," as Thomas Hardy sings:

For, in unwonted purlieus, far and  
nigh,

At whiles or short or long,

May be discerned a wrong

Dying as of self-slaughter; whereat I

Do raise my voice in song.

This much is certain: Whether wholesale death brings us reform or leaves us torpid, all that "aeschrocerdia" implies is death to the individual, to the community, to the nation.

WALLACE RICE.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

London, England, Dec. 29.—All the reactionary tendencies which you denounce in America are rampant at the present time in Great Britain. But I am firmly convinced that the return swing of the pendulum will take us far in the other direction. Beneath the surface the democratic social philosophy is steadily gaining converts. It is molding the thought even of those who would indignantly repudiate being influenced by it.

As it seems to me, the possession of India has been and is still the main factor in hindering the advance of Great Britain along the path of true progress, civilization and peace. True it is, and ever will remain, that "free nations cannot govern subject provinces." Their own freedom, or a substantial part thereof, is the price they must pay if they attempt to do so. This, indeed, is the Nemesis of history, is the lesson which all history teaches, and which the history of Great Britain sufficiently verifies. For the sake of the future of the world, and more especially of your great country, it is to be hoped that Americans will learn to appreciate its truth before it is too late. They may do so if only some few of your public men remain true to the high

traditions they have inherited from the past.

The mission of the Anglo-Saxon race may be to teach the people of the world how to govern themselves; but this can only be achieved if they themselves remain true to their ideals, and base their foreign as well as their domestic policy on the glorious democratic principles they have as yet accepted in the abstract only, blindly and stupidly disregarding their teachings when they appear to conflict with what they regard as their immediate advantage.

Recent events in South Africa also corroborate this lesson. They certainly seem to have perverted the judgment and deadened the conscience of this nation. The gold of South Africa, which was, of course, the immediate cause of the late war—or rather, perhaps, the prospect of huge accession of wealth without having to work for it—has not only corrupted and debauched large numbers of the upper and middle classes, but has thrown its glamour even over those who have no reasonable prospect of ever receiving any share of it. Hence it is that what is called Imperialism is, as I have said, just now rampant in this country. The big drum of Empire, which always arouses a ready response amongst the ignorant, is being pounded by interested parties for all that it is worth.

It was in the name of Empire, of Imperialism, that the nation was induced to go to war to conquer the Boers. It is in the name of Empire, of Imperialism, that the same men are to-day endeavoring to induce the people to forge chains for their own enslavement and impoverishment. Of course, if they are successful, there will be, as there was in South Africa, lots of plunder for some. But not for those to whom they are appealing, not for those whose labors will have to provide the plunder. They and their children after them will have to pay the price of Imperialism; they and their children after them will have to pay the price of their ignorance.

Needless to add that we are doing what we can to stem the tide. Since July last the Scottish and the English Leagues for the Taxation of Land Values have managed to sell over 26,000 copies of Henry George's classical work, "Protection or Free Trade;" and if only we can secure the necessary financial assistance, we shall sell another 50,000 or 100,000 before another twelve months have elapsed. To my mind this is the best work we can do; for the political education of the masses is, as I take it, the only work to which single taxpayers can profitably devote themselves for the next few generations. Moreover, this book is not only, as we advertise it, "The cure for fiscalitis;" it is also a cure for the more deep-seated and dangerous disease of Imperialism, containing as it does a lesson in the fundamental principles of democracy. The strain upon our very limited financial

resources has been and still is almost more than we can stand. But, as we can tell from our correspondence, as well as from the increased demand for other literature it has created, the book is doing its work.

We shall pull through somehow. This optimism seems to me warranted by impartial and philosophic inquiry. Though in times of depression one is inclined to think that it is our desires and inclinations, rather than the evidence of existing facts, that impel us to accept it as true, yet all past history teaches us that in the eternal struggle between the social and the predatory instincts of man, the former must eventually gain the victory. To promote this end, however, is the highest duty, as well as the most satisfactory and elevating work to which any of us can devote our lives.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Jan. 14.

Between Russia and Japan (p. 630) the issue of peace or war still hangs in the balance. Diplomatic notes appear to be passing between the two governments, and ominous naval movements are in progress; but nothing at once definite and authentic is as yet reported.

In British politics another landmark has been made, by the disruption of the Liberal-Unionist party. This party was formed in 1886 under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain, who had been a leader in the Liberal party under Gladstone. In his last administration save one, Mr. Gladstone introduced in parliament a measure of home rule for Ireland, whereupon the anti-Irish, or imperial Liberals, followed Chamberlain's lead in the formation of the Liberal-Unionist party, which entered into a coalition with the Conservative party. At the ensuing elections, those of the Summer of 1886, this coalition drove Gladstone from power and formed a coalition ministry, with Salisbury as premier. The coalition held office until 1892, when the Liberals, under Gladstone, were returned to power for a brief season. They were again defeated, however, in 1895, and the coalition secured possession of the government to hold it ever since, their latest triumph at a general parliamentary election having occurred in 1900 (vol. iii, p. 441). Mr.

Chamberlain himself did not become a member of the coalition cabinet until 1895, notwithstanding the earlier temporary victory of the coalition of which he was the master spirit. In the Summer of 1902 Salisbury withdrew from the ministry (vol. v, p. 295), Balfour taking his place as premier; and in September, 1903, Chamberlain resigned from the ministry (vol. vi, p. 391) for the purpose of relieving the premier of embarrassment in connection with the Chamberlain protection policy. Since then Chamberlain has actively promoted this policy in a political campaign made with reference especially to the next general elections. At the by-elections (pp. 598, 629) thus far this policy has not been endorsed by the voters. The latest of these by-elections was in the middle division of Devonshire on the 8th, when the Liberal candidate was elected over the coalitionist by an increased majority of 100 per cent. Immediately afterward a correspondence disclosing the disruption of the Liberal-Unionist party, noted above, was given out for publication.

The letters had been written from October 23 last to January 4, and were between the Duke of Devonshire, president of the party organization, and Mr. Chamberlain. As reported by cable—

the Duke states that Chamberlain, in forcing his protection policy as a paramount issue in the next general election, places the Liberal-Unionist organization in a position of great embarrassment, since the organization disburses funds to local associations and assists candidates in their campaigns. The Duke points out that the party is irreconcilably divided on the protection issue and that he does not see how the Central Liberal-Unionist organization can usefully continue its existence or equitably distribute the funds among candidates who are antagonistic on the present question before the country.

Mr. Chamberlain, replying—advocates a conference with representatives of the Liberal-Unionist associations of London to vote on how to continue the central body, the minority to retire, and, if they wish, to start a separate organization.

To this the Duke responds:

The Liberal-Unionist association, which has done its work in averting home rule, and which has maintained the Unionist party in power for the greater part of seventeen years, should

recognize that under present conditions its existence is no longer necessary and should be dissolved with as little bitterness as possible.

Mr. Chamberlain thereupon declares that in his judgment a continuation of the association is possible, and announces his purpose—

on his own responsibility, to call a general meeting at as early a date as possible to decide upon the course to be taken. If the meeting resolves to continue as an association he does not feel that the resignations of some of its members would deprive it of its representative character.

Elections were held December 16, for the Commonwealth parliament of Australia; but only meager reports have as yet been published in this country. The best information thus far available shows a Labor party land-slide. The Labor party gains 9 seats in the Senate and 13 in the House, while the party in power in the last parliament (vol. v, p. 503) loses 6 seats in the Senate and 5 in the House. The result reported by Reuter to the London papers, December 18, is as follows:

Senate: Ministerialists (protection), 6; Opposition (free trade), 13; Labor party, 17.

House of Representatives: Ministerialists, 27; Opposition, 26; Labor party, 29.

On this result the Melbourne representative of Reuter comments:

As regards the fiscal question, the Laborites are, speaking generally, strongly protectionist, but parliamentary history in Australia shows that they have been willing to reinforce either side provided they have been able to secure their own legislative ends. There is no likelihood of the fiscal issue being raised, inasmuch as, in addition to staunch protectionists, who form the working majority in the house of representatives, a good many theoretical free traders declare for fiscal peace. The attitude of the Labor party towards preferential trade will still be to increase the tariff wall against the foreigner without making any reduction in favor of England.

In this connection, however, it must be remembered that the Ministerialists were defeated in the House last September by the adoption of a railway employes' amendment to the Ministerial labor arbitration bill. Having opposed this amendment the Ministry dropped the whole bill when the amendment carried, thereby incensing the Labor members