

"But you have no right at all to anything we produce."

"I am holding it only as a trustee," said the leading citizen, "and I have founded a library with my gains."—Bolton Hall, in *Life*.

ISSUES AT STAKE IN LEGISLATING AGAINST ANARCHISM.

Extract from editorial with the above title by Prof. Graham Taylor, in *Chicago Commons* for October.

To conserve the people's hard-earned, long-awaited liberty of thought and freedom of speech in the face of the too passionate, panic-stricken demand for the most drastic legislation against anarchism, will tax the vigilance and power of the really conservative element in every legislative body and in the constituency of every legislator. Any special class legislation is dangerous enough to the community, in its liability to be applied at random to general interests after the specific needs that call it into existence have been met. The very freedom of the English working classes was imperiled for half a century by such a perversion of the "conspiracy" laws to apply to the "restraint of trade." There is graver danger that the impending legislation, aimed to silence the incendiary utterance of the infinitesimally small faction of fanatics among the American people, may constitute a precedent, if it does not itself ever prove applicable, for the abridgment of that "right of private judgment" and that freedom of speech upon which more than upon anything else our religious and civil liberties and social progress depend.

VEGETARIANISM IN LINE WITH HIGHER DEVELOPMENT.

Vegetarianism is tendering its specific with the rest for the regeneration of the world. Nothing is less likely than a sudden change in the general diet of man. Yet there are influences on the side of vegetarianism which appear to promise it a future. As the world fills up, space will become more valuable, and more vegetable food, as a rule, can be produced on a given tract of land. Taste, as it becomes more refined, will be apt to incline to the vegetable side. The associations of the harvest and the vintage please, while those of the shambles disgust. Even the meat-eaters have, as civilization advanced, used more bread and vegetables with their meats. Heroes in Homer devour enormous quantities of beef and pork, with little cereal food, and no

other vegetables. Is animal food absolutely essential to any function of man, bodily or mental? A scientific meeting to which the writer once put the question, answered in the negative. A harder day's work a man could scarcely do than was done by the British farm laborer, who only once a week smelt bacon. The great schoolman, Thomas Aquinas, may stand for the maximum of brain work, however obsolete that work may now be, and he was forbidden meat by the rule of his order. Shelley was a vegetarian, and he may stand for the maximum of imagination.—Prof. Goldwin Smith, in *Toronto Weekly Sun*.

MURDER IN SOUTH AFRICA.

An extract from a speech on "Martial Law," delivered by Frederic Harrison, in London, October 13, as cabled to the *Chicago Record-Herald*.

As a lawyer of 30 years' experience in the courts of the empire, I was amazed to read in the newspapers last week telegrams from South Africa stating that certain men not soldiers had been tried in courts-martial and sentenced to penal servitude, banishment and even death.

If these things have really taken place our soldiers have violently outraged the British constitution and are liable to prosecution in the courts of London.

Martial law, which means no law, is absolutely without recognition in the British system. Under no circumstances whatever can it be applied to a British subject who is not a soldier. No civil offense, such as treason, conspiracy, arson or murder, can be legally tried by courts-martial. Any general, governor or other commander or official who sanctions or participates in any such proceeding is guilty of criminal usurpation, which is a crime punishable under the civil law.

Rebels and foreign enemies may be slaughtered without restraint in the course of actual warfare, but after the fighting is over the military authorities have no right to try or punish civilians who may have fallen into their hands. Such prisoners must be surrendered to the civil authorities for trial according to the principles of English law. All our great lawyers are at one on this point. Both common law and statute law emphatically exempt civilians from the jurisdiction of courts-martial. We have had many cases illustrating this principle. All were decided against the military usurpers.

Furthermore, no order from the war office or commander in chief places the officers subjecting civilians to the operations of courts-martial beyond the reach of civil penalties. Every party to the illegal process is individually responsible. I would warn our "khaki" judges and executioners in South Africa that during comparatively recent times, years after he committed the offense, a British governor of a West African colony was tried in London for having sanctioned the judgment of a court-martial which decreed the whipping of a civilian, which proved fatal. I would warn them also that this governor was hanged in England for his subversion of English constitutional law.

The declaration of martial law at Cape Town, miles distant from any actual hostilities, is utterly illegal and monstrous and deserves the odium of the empire. If soldiers may become absolutists at Cape Town, why may they not also become absolutists at Dublin, Glasgow or London?

IS THE RICH MAN GOD'S STEWARD?

An extract from a sermon delivered at the Vine street Congregational church in Cincinnati, October 6, by the pastor, Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow.

In my college days I read, or thought I read, books like "Progress and Poverty." I considered their authors "medicinal men," whose extravagant schemes might delude untrained minds, but not a mind like mine which had mastered the subject of political economy.

I considered a knowledge of social conditions a necessary part of a preacher's equipment. Therefore, while in the theological seminary, I became a friendly visitor for an associated charity organization. The poverty I found was appalling. Yet I believed as I had been taught regarding the cause of this poverty. Therefore I patronized the poor. I went among them to instruct them out of my superior knowledge. I learned those beautiful phrases about giving the poor not my money but my life. And I really suffered some inconvenience in order to bestow upon them the privilege of knowing me. I thought all this was very generous in me, and fortunate for the poor; and I plumed myself on my self-sacrificing devotion to weak and erring humanity.

I became a member of a social settlement. I was convinced that it was the mission of the settlement to bridge the social chasm. So I helped to

get ladies from the hill-tops to come down to the bottoms, to play and sing, and show their good breeding to the daughters of drudgery. After a few months of that sort of thing I began to think of myself as an authority. I was called here and there to lecture on how to improve the poor, and the rich heard me gladly.

It was not because I was more sincere than others, but because I had certain facts constantly forced upon my attention, that a change began to take place in my mind touching all these things. I found a little girl in my Sunday school working for 22 cents a day. I could not help comparing her condition with that of a woman who owns a strip of land on Fifth street, 16 feet wide, for which she receives \$3,000 a year, and, according to the terms of the lease, the tenant pays the taxes, and at the end of 20 years is to give her the store building which he has erected on the property.

Then I came to see that the only thing of any consequence which the rich can do for the poor is, as Tolstoi says, to get off their backs.

With considerable misgiving I came to the conclusion, about which I do not now have the slightest doubt, that the world is suffering more from the lack of an aroused social conscience and a sound political economy, than from the lack of agencies to give aid and comfort to the victims of social wrongs; that there is more need to stop the cruel car, than to pick up the mangled bodies in its bloody train; that sense and conscience are wanted in the legislatures; that freedom of opportunity is the brand of charity that is needed.

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE NAVY.

There is a general impression that whatever is "official" is beyond question, and "official" reports of various kinds are quite commonly regarded with something like veneration and awe, notwithstanding that fallibility has been shown to be one of their attributes in common with most human work. But especially have we all felt constrained to accept without question official reports made by naval officers, and yet it is being shown by the court proceedings at Washington that even these may err. Not only may they err, but also it seems the men (and they are mere men, after all) that make them may know that they err. Commenting upon the matter, the New York Times aptly remarks:

"What does 'official' mean, anyhow? Hitherto a confiding public has ascribed to the word a significance lit-

tle less than that of 'authentic' or 'unquestionable,' but so ready have been the—well, the prosecuting attorneys in the Schley inquiry to admit both the incompleteness and the inaccuracy of the logs, charts, reports, etc., made by naval officers in the regular course of duty, that, for the moment at least, the civilian mind is filled with an amazed, not to say an angry, distrust of everything 'official.' The chart of maneuvers in a great battle, for instance, is coolly tossed aside as 'worthless' by the very men who made it, the position taken by them, apparently, being that though the chart is good enough to file away in the national archives for the amusement of the student and historian, it is not good enough to refute, or even to confuse, its makers when the difference between its testimony and theirs is called to their attention! The official chart, it seems, is merely a rough-and-ready compromise between widely varying guesses. To have sifted the evidence and to have reached and recorded the facts of the case would have taken too much time and been too much trouble. The navy department, we read, never had an opportunity to admit all this before, else would it gladly have done so! That may be true—it must be true, since it is the statement of men who, as an officer of high rank said the other day, have a regard so profound for honor and professional obligations that civilians simply cannot understand how absurd it is to apply to them the tests and restrictions imposed on ordinary humanity. There will be no present hesitation to confess this inability frankly and promptly. When a civilian makes a record or a map, if he is honest he does it with accuracy if he can, and if he cannot he says so. Naval officers, according to these latest revelations, are different, and their logs and charts, though 'official,' are 'worthless' as evidence in courts—of inquiry and others. 'Tis passing queer!"

Another queer thing was brought out by the testimony of one of the men who was in a responsible position in the engine-room of the Texas during the engagement off Santiago. He testified that for a time during the chase after the Spanish ships the engines of the Texas were reversed. Now we all know that the reversal of the engines of a naval vessel while going at full speed is significant of something, and that if an engine-room log is being kept, it may be fairly expected to show that such

a reversal took place in obedience to signals from the bridge. When the witness had his attention called to the fact that the log was silent on this point, he said not everything got into the log; but when it was further shown that the handling of ashes in the regular course of events was recorded in the same log, there was no explanation that seems at all satisfactory as to why the log maker recorded the utterly insignificant moving of ashes, but not the reversal of the engines, one of the most important things done in the engine-rooms.—Editorial in American Machinist of Oct. 3.

"WAR IS WAR."

"We went to Vrede next, and after a day's rest left that place in a shocking state. We killed thousands of sheep, and put them in every house. The stench in a week will be horrible. It is to prevent the Boers from returning."—Letter of Trooper Victor Smith, in the London Daily News of August 17.

This is how Trooper Victor Swift, of the Fifty-third company East Kent Yeomanry, describes war. In spite of the censor, many similar descriptions have been sent home to the ladies and gentlemen of England, who sit at home at ease, nor is there a workingman who has not read them. It has been observed that in this South African campaign, for the first time in the history of war, the British people have been able to look on, to watch the incidents, not as in former wars, long after, but while they were yet happening. It has occasionally happened that a battle has taken place under the eyes of non-combatants. The Bostonians thus looked on while Bunker Hill was fought. But in this campaign in South Africa, the whole course of events has unrolled itself before our eyes, and we, "like guilty creatures sitting at a play," have looked on at the deeds done with our approval—with our passionate applause. . . .

War is war. We used to think of it as we see it in the battle pictures—long lines of fighting men advancing against each other, a wild charge of cavalry, a gleam of sabers, a wavering streak of color, where the enemy's banners are swept down the tide of flight—a handsome young officer lying dead by his dead horse in the foreground, and over all the smoke of battle, hanging like a thick cloud, hiding every meaner detail of the slaughter. It was a grim but glorious spectacle. It was terrible, but not despicable—it was all on too large a scale, too loud, too bright; and when the battle was a British vic-