

tual Indians, mostly college graduates, have assembled in Congress and formulated their complaints in subservient and sycophantic language. A person needs only to read a few of the speeches to feel the deep underlying grudge the Indian harbors. Indeed, one of the ablest writers on India, Meredith Townsend, a man of 50 years' experience in the colony, and a radical thinker whose thoughts are highly prized by leading London periodicals, says that after over 100 years of rule there are not 10,000 natives who, uncoerced and unbribed, would lay down their lives for English sovereignty; that the English are hated most where they are best known in India; and that in the Sepoy mutiny of 1857 the favorite native regiments were the most dangerous and treacherous. "There is no province, no tribe, no native organization in India upon which, in the event of disaster, she [Great Britain] can rely for aid." The Indian empire may be said to be a corporation of less than 1,500 men, who are set to govern and who protect themselves in governing by finding pay for a minute white garrison of 65,000 men.

The Indian's criticism in a nutshell is that England rules India for English gain and not for her benefit. When, for instance, cotton manufacture sprang up in India like a mushroom in the night and increased eight and ten fold in a few years, the British imposed an excise tax thereon, of course in favor of Manchester (England) cotton mills. The Indians here are watching with much eagerness the outcome of Joe Chamberlain's somersault on the tariff issue. If Canada and Australia thereby secure for the purpose of imperial unity preferential treatment for their grain, is India to be treated as a stepchild and thus indirectly be legislated against? Is the poorest land in the world supporting a dense population by the most intense labor in irrigation to bear additional indirect taxation for the sake of British imperial unity? Are the millions of souls periodically required to be sacrificed on the altar of famine and pestilence for the good of India by the love and benevolence of Britania not enough? From 1880 to 1890 the occupancy rights to 1,963,364 acres were offered for sale by reason of default in the payment of taxes, and 1,174,143 acres were returned unsold for want of bidders and bid in by the government. Does this not prove an unbearable rate of taxation? The annual tribute India must pay for British love is \$100,000,000 annually paid in extravagant salaries and liberal pensions. Is it any wonder that this proud, domineering Briton, sapping the life blood of the poor colony, awaiting impatiently the expiration of his service in India for the enjoyment of his half-deserved pension at home, living in this black country only by the grace and assistance financially and physically of the black man, is secretly despised?

But the answer to all this is the "Pax Britannicus"—without British peace there would be anarchy and bloodshed. The Indian replies that the killing of a few hundred thousand in religious conflicts far outweighs in social and religious benefits the slow and blighting process of killing millions by starvation and famine. How did the European gain his civilization but by international, interracial, interreligious conflicts involving the death of many millions of people in the strife? Did it not require strife involving the sacrifice of millions of dollars of property and the blood of hundreds of thousands of men to maintain American unity? These Indians are not stupid people. They claim not only to be equal but even superior in intellect to the Briton and boast that they can pass any examination that the Briton can.

In regard to the judicial system much criticism is offered by the Indian. How can he secure justice when prosecutor and judge are one and the same official? How can native and English fare alike when with a few dozen Englishmen residing in a city (of the 300,000,000 people in India, excluding the white soldiers, there are but 65,000 English in all India), an Englishman is tried by a jury of his peers, Englishmen, and a native by a mixed jury. In the latter case, the wheels of justice hampered and checked at every point by British supervision, modification and nullification, the high offices, civil, military and judicial, all being filled by Englishmen. A bill is even now pending to throw the burden of proof upon the defendant, contrary to every maxim of civilized jurisprudence. In the Assam tea districts, where field labor is hired at \$1.65 per month on a three years' contract, natives are guarded by armed pickets posted on brick walls about the plantation. About two per cent. of such labor deserts with opportunity, when "Pax Britannicus" invokes the goddess of justice to arrest the deserter, contrary to the civilized legal principle that no man shall be imprisoned for debt.

As to education, the census shows that ten per cent. of the males are literate and .006 of the females. The native Congress is agitating general compulsory education, but whoever has watched the course of imperialism knows that it can never exist where education flourishes. The doctrine of imperialism tends toward special privileges, special opportunities, special education, special power, and a corresponding debasement of the privileges and powers of the masses.

The policy of the English government in India, as must necessarily be that of every alien governmental authority, can be foretold upon every measure and at all times accordingly as it tends towards equality or inequality, democracy or aristocracy. In proportion as such legislation encourages the equality or op-

portunity it hastens and deepens the pitfall of its very existence.

One of the means of centralizing the English power is the land tenure system. I do not know what proportion—for statistics concerning English rule are very difficult to obtain—of the land is owned by the government; but I am credibly informed that fully one-half is so owned and leased on terms of 30 years or less at a fixed rental. This enables the government to reward the faithful and punish the unfaithful. It is an approach to the Henry George idea, though not carried out in his spirit. That would be too equitable and destroy the weapon. The present inequitable method of leasing land at a rental depending upon the dyspepsia or gout of the land commissioner, permits the English government to tax the people off the land, thereby minimizing their interest and patriotism in India.

Since the mutiny in 1857 the English do not hesitate to show their distrust of the natives. No natives are permitted inside of any of the numerous forts in the heart of the large cities; natives are employed on guard duty during the day, but at night all must vacate the premises and Englishmen stand guard. There are no batteries of native artillery of any importance. The British troops, before the mutiny one-sixth of the native, are now about one-half. No firearms of any kind are permitted to be purchased or sold by a native without a special license. The English may be successful temporarily in governing 300,000,000 natives, but their policy does not create content nor is it benevolent assimilation.

India enjoys the "Pax Britannicus," but who, being unbiased and unprejudiced, will not concede that it is a blighting, withering, debilitating, degenerating decay? Is the "Pax Britannicus" the explanation of the fact that with the exception of France and Ireland India's population has increased less in percentage than any other civilized or semi-civilized country?

JOHN A. ZANGERLE.

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., June 3.—As prophesied in my letter of April 22 (p. 118), Mr. Deakin, then the ministerial leader in the Federal House of Representatives, has resigned, and the Labor leader, Mr. Watson, has formed a new ministry.

When this had been done the House adjourned and Mr. Reid, the free trade or Opposition leader, and Mr. Deakin, the leader of the deposed protection or Conservative party, met to try to arrange a coalition. After negotiating for several days, they agreed personally upon a programme, but made no arrangement as to leadership. This tentative programme left the fiscal tariff question in abeyance during the life of the present parliament.

Mr. Reid's followers in the House decided unanimously to support him in connection with the proposed coalition programme; but the extreme protectionist wing of Deakin's party (led by Sir William Lyne), opposed any coalition whatever with the free traders. The majority of the old ministerial party would probably nevertheless have agreed, but Deakin, although he urged his followers to join the coalition, stated he would not take office in a coalition government. After a good deal of discussion the Deakin party refused to join that of Reid.

The Labor party also offered to form a coalition with the Deakinites, but that too was refused; so there are still three parties in the house, as before.

The Watson (Labor) ministry has put before the House a very mild programme for the present. It has dropped the clause to include all public servants in the arbitration bill, upon which it defeated the Deakin ministry, but it will probably try to include all railway employees.

The Victoria State elections were held on June 1st, with this result.

Ministerialists	38
Opposition	11
Labor	19

The Opposition and Labor parties both advocate land value taxation.

ERNEST BRAY.

ST. LOUIS.

St. Louis, Mo., July 6.—There is only one marked difference between the Republican convention recently held at Chicago, and the Democratic convention now in session here. The great corporations control here as they did there. The politicians for plunder are in the saddle here as they were there. The "band wagon" element is dominant here as it was there. But there was no protest there, save La Follette's, and that was promptly suppressed. All was harmony. The whole Republican convention surrendered to its plutocratic masters without so much as a whimper. But here there is a protest, a fight, an effort at least, however ineffective, to prove that not the whole Democratic party is owned by the corporations and bossed by hungry office seekers. Therein is the only important difference between the two conventions.

The atmosphere for days has been an office-hunting atmosphere. It is amazing, the candor with which men, even men supposed to be men of principle and conviction, have brushed off all pretense of principle and boldly avowed either by word or deed, that their only object is to get office, or, as most of them put it, to "get into the band wagon." Here is an instance which is typical in spirit, though slightly unusual in expression. A delegate from Oklahoma was overheard "barking" for Park-

er to a group on the street. One of the group asked:

"What has Parker done to make him a good candidate?"

"It makes no difference what he done," was the response; "it's what he do."

"Well, what will he do?"

"He'll make me marshal of Oklahoma for \$4,000 a year; that what he do," came the answer.

"But what are his principles?"

"Oh, to hell with principle; what I want is the loaves and fishes."

This was an actual occurrence and, its spirit, I repeat, was typical. Precisely the same idea was expressed by William T. McMahan, an old-fashioned Democrat down Cincinnati way, who declared at the caucus of the Ohio delegation that he wanted a candidate who "not only can carry the country, but will take care of you young fellows when he gets in." Mr. McMahan made no other requirement.

Yet he it was who at the same caucus defeated Tom L. Johnson, 26 to 20, for Ohio member of the committee on resolutions. He was McLean's candidate, and this contest between him and Johnson was the first test of strength in the Ohio delegation.

Had the field been clear for a fight in Ohio when the primaries were approaching last Spring, Johnson could have defeated McLean, although it would have required a strenuous primary fight all over the State to do it, for spoils and boodle are alluring bait. But at that time the meretricious Hearst campaign invaded Ohio, and Johnson was forced either to support Hearst, which was simply out of the question (as all self-respecting Hearst men ought by this time to understand), or else to precipitate a conflict between radical Democrats, and so make even greater demoralization. He wisely decided to do neither. Before primaries are on again in Ohio, the air will be pretty well cleared and Johnson's friends will be glad that he reserved his strength for a fight worth making.

The "band wagon" campaigning which has turned over the convention here to professional politicians is bad enough in itself. But in itself it is not the worst of the situation. For behind these spoils-men are the same corporate influences that were behind those of the Republican convention, and that means fat campaign funds. Spoils if successful, and campaign funds anyhow, are a great power in politics.

With the railroads, the Standard Oil company, and the influences of Wall street as represented by August Belmont—with these distinctive powers in the ascendent, well served by "band-waggoners," the convention assembled at noon to-day. Though the attendance was large, there were many empty seats in the galleries. Shuffling noises were so general throughout the day's proceedings that the speaking could be

heard only a few feet from the rostrum. This was partly because it was not very good speaking. The voice of John Sharp Williams is thin and without carrying power; and, although his gestures are impressive and graceful, his presence is not of the kind that commands attention from great audiences. His long drawn-out speech soon became wearisome to an audience which had to strain attention to catch here and there a word.

Unfortunately Mr. Williams's manner of speaking was no worse than the matter of his speech. His speech was the poorest apology for a keynote speech that the enemy could possibly desire. Of the mere stump speech grade, it was defensive in character, evasive as to principle, disgusting in the indecency of its expression of race animosity, and altogether lacking in the qualities that arouse the higher instincts and inspire noble enthusiasms. Mr. Williams has distinctly deteriorated. It is not long since he exhibited signs of statesmanship; but his keynote speech reduces him to the level of the "band wagon" politician.

This is not to say that Mr. Williams's speech was without merit in every detail. He said some good things in a strong way—not many, but some. One of these was his demand that we shall "not make of the army and navy of the United States a constabulary for the collection of European debts from the governments or peoples of South and Central America." But brave words like these can count for little in the speech of a man who, knowing what free trade is and believing in it, as Mr. Williams has heretofore indicated that he does, turns off the tariff issue with a few vague generalities. Much can be excused in Mr. Williams with reference to his views on the race question. His home environment is such that allowances must in fairness be made. But he should realize that whatever his own views on that subject may be, it behooves him not to revive the old sectional and race questions as national issues. His projection into national politics of the "white man's government" proposition with its principle of legalizing status, is intolerable; and his objection to the adjustment of national representation on the basis of suffrage is indefensible. This attitude of his is unfortunate, and so was a certain pervading sentiment in the convention of which he was the spokesman. Not only did Mr. Williams repeat the ante-bellum doctrines of unequal rights which the Democratic party of Toombs represented, but the audience galvanized that old party, when after listening without much emotion to the "Star Spangled Banner," it burst into enthusiastic applause at the strains of "Dixie." This is a little matter in itself, but it is unhappily significant of a great matter. Under all the circumstances it signifies a disposition, and this is confirmed by Mr. Williams's speech, to undo the re-