

ber of farms less than 10 acres during the last decade of 118,252, that the number of farms of less than 10 acres with a product of less than \$100 was 114,043. It appears also that the number of farms of this size with a product of less than \$250 was 214,326. Very few of these could have been reported according to the requirements of the census of 1890, for very few could have required the services of one able-bodied workman. The increase in the number of farms over 10 and under 20 acres was 141,462, and the number with a product of less than \$100 was 106,146. The number reporting a product of less than \$250 was 288,719. Of farms over 20 and under 50 acres we find the ten years' increase to have been 355,008, and the number with a product less than \$100, 147,784. The number with a product of less than \$250 was 602,688.

Considering that from this product must come not only the farmer's recompense for his labor, but also the return for investment, it appears that few farms with a product of less than \$250 could have met the requirements of the census schedules of 1890. Taking farms in the South Atlantic and South Central divisions with products of less than \$100, and those North Atlantic, North Central and Western divisions reporting a product of less than \$250, and we have a total number of farms under 50 acres of 650,659, which number exceeds the increase in the number of farms of less than 50 acres by 35,937.

To arrive at a correct conclusion as to the actual increase in the number of farms during the last decade, we must also consider, besides the foregoing facts, that the census enumeration of 1890 was notoriously deficient and unreliable. This was unquestionably due in large measure to the fact that the census office had been made a part of the political machine and that appointments of census enumerators were made with little regard to fitness. Another reason, and perhaps the most important one, was that stated by Congressman Hopkins, of Illinois, in introducing the bill for the present census. He is reported in the Congressional Record, vol. 32, p. 1,510, as saying:

"The only trouble was that such a mass of information was required from the enumerators that their returns were not accurate and in many cases had to be taken again. . . . Under such circumstances it will readily be seen that accurate and desirable information, such as should be embodied in a report of this character, could not be collected." In this debate Congressman Johnson, of Indiana, said: "Mr. Carroll D. Wright, who succeeded Mr. Porter in his office, declared positively, and I think that we all have reason to know his statement to be true, that the last census was an exceedingly unreliable one and was also a very expensive piece of work."

That there exists a "possibility" that all the farms of the nation were not enumerated in 1890 is admitted by Statistician Powers who, as supporting such conclusion, on p. lxxi, Part I, Agricultural Census, presents a table in which the number of farms as reported on the agricultural schedules in 1890 is compared with the number of farm families as shown in the report on Farms and Homes of that census. According to this comparative table the number of farm homes, as shown by the latter report, is 4,767,179, which is greater by 202,538 than the number of farms as given in the agricultural reports.

It is noticeable that while Mr. Powers quotes the figures of the report on Farms and Homes as having been compiled from the population schedules, he makes no mention of the fact that the statistics of occupation, also compiled from the population schedules, show the number of persons engaged in operating farms in 1890 as 5,354,158, which is more than three-quarters of a million greater than the number of farms reported on the agricultural schedules, and more than half a million greater than the number of farm homes as given in the report on farms and homes. It is evident that the farms most likely to be omitted by census enumerators would be the small and not the large ones.

Considering these facts, it appears that the great increase in small farms, like the great increase in farm acreage indicated by the census for the last decade, is fictitious.

HENRY L. BLISS.

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

### KANSAS.

Topeka, Kan., May 2.—Ever since the dismissal of Prof. James H. Canfield as professor of political economy in the University of Kansas by a Republican board of regents, some twenty years ago, because he taught political economy in a scientific and fearless manner, that study has been practically barred in that institution. In its stead is taught something called sociology. But everything relating to taxation, land tenure, tariffs, currency systems, public utilities, corporations, trusts, etc., is looked upon as dangerous and improper. Any student daring to ask a question upon these topics is silenced by an icy stare and an ominous shrug of the shoulders.

The students' time is employed in an aimless study of unrelated details of personal and family life, habits of tramps, routines of life and labor by different classes of workers, and life in asylums, jails, poorhouses, etc. As a sample of what the professor of political economy calls excellent original research by an advanced student I copy the following from the student's study of farm life:

The house is of stone, on a south hillside, near the center of the farm and contains fourteen rooms. Some of the rooms have carpets on the floors and in one is a bookcase, two rockers and several straight-backed wooden chairs. The sleeping rooms are upstairs and the dining-room, laundry and kitchen downstairs. The eight horses are of Perchon, Clydesdale, Hambletonian or mixed breeds. The cattle are Shorthorn, Hereford, Jersey and Galway breeds—about fifty in number. The hogs are Jersey Duroc breed, the poultry Plymouth Rocks, and the dog shepherd.

He does not give the cat's pedigree, but it was probably mixed.

And people are taxed to pay the professor \$2,500 a year. Moreover, he actually threatens to write a book on political economy and sociology for use in schools and colleges! Government by injunction might do some good in his case.

Not long ago I talked with a recent graduate of this department of our State university and found him profoundly ignorant of even the rudiments of the science. In place of any knowledge of economic principles or authors he had a mass of utterly useless details, totally unrelated. That satraps of plutocracy are very distrustful of this study is natural, but it is rare that one is so frank as one of our Kansas Congressmen when he said to me: "I don't believe there is really anything in this stuff they call political economy, but what some feller has got up in his own head to try to hurt the Republican party."

W. H. T. WAKEFIELD.

### AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, April 1.—The Federal parliament has now been

sitting for about a month, but practically nothing has been done yet.

During the recess Mr. Deakin, prime minister, invited Mr. Chamberlain to visit Australia to try to induce us to accept England's "offer" with regard to preferential trade. Mr. Chamberlain declined. He is probably too busy trying to get Great Britain to accept the "offer" made by the colonies. Preferential trade was mentioned in the Governor General's speech at the opening of parliament, but the question is really dead in Australia.

The arbitration and conciliation bill has again been introduced. It was on an amendment to this bill that the Barton ministry was defeated last year. The Deakin ministry will probably get beaten in the same way, which may mean a change of government.

Mr. Irvine, the State premier of Victoria, has retired on account of ill health, and has been succeeded by Mr. T. Bent. Irvine was by far the strongest man in the local ministry. Most of the reforms he set out to carry have been obtained: Economy, reduction of members of both houses of parliament, and reduction of the property qualification for electors of the upper house.

The elections under the new constitution will soon be held. The Opposition party has put forward taxation of land values, which is supported also by the Labor party, as one of the principal planks of their platform.

The See ministry in New South Wales was returned at the last election, in 1901, pledged to reduce the numbers of the State parliament. Nothing was done in that direction until at the end of last year, when a referendum was held on Federal election day to let the people vote on the reduction of State members. The choice was limited to 125 (the present number), 100, and 90. By a large majority 90 was carried, and the local ministry at once prepared a bill and mapped out new electorates; so it seems probable that the next election in New South Wales will be held under the new act.

The proposal to work the Rand mines with Chinese labor has opened many people's eyes to the underlying cause of the Boer war. Public meetings have been held to protest against it, and a motion condemning it was carried in both Federal Houses. Mr. Deakin sent a letter of protest, as did Mr. Seddon, of New Zealand, a thorough imperialist, and worshiper of Chamberlain. Deakin and Seddon were politely told by the home authorities to mind their own business.

ERNEST BRAY.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 5.

What appears to have been a bloody and important battle in the

Russo-Japanese war (p. 55) has been fought on the western or Manchurian side of the Yalu river. The fighting occurred in connection with a Japanese movement in force across the Yalu from Suku, on the Korean side, to Chintiencheng, on the Manchurian side. The Russians describe it officially as the battle of Turenchen. Gen. Kuroki commanded the Japanese troops; Gen. Zassalitch commanded the Russians. The battle was fought on the 1st. Apparently the Japanese outnumbered the Russians about three to one, but this disparity is supposed to have been equalized by the fact that the Japanese were the assailants in the open, while the Russians fought behind entrenchments. The Japanese are conceded to have been victorious, the Russians having retired from Chintiencheng and Antung, to the south of it, back to Fenghuancheng, which lies to the west of both places and slightly north. Japanese official reports estimate the Japanese loss at 798 killed and wounded; Russian official reports estimate the Russian loss in killed at from 2,000 to 3,000. The Russians suffered heavily also in their loss of field artillery.

Following the authentic reports of the Japanese victory at Chintiencheng, came rumors of their capture of Newchwang, the point on the Russian railway at the head of the Gulf of Liaotung, which commands rail communication southward and menaces Port Arthur from the north. This rumor came from Chefoo, China, in a dispatch of the 4th to the London Chronicle as follows: "The Japanese landed troops at Yinkow on the 1st, under cover of the guns of a squadron of Japanese cruisers, and attacked and captured Newchwang on the 2d, after a fierce battle, the Russians falling back to protect the railway." This rumor is not verified and is probably false. It appears to be certain, however, from dispatches of the 4th from Tokio that the Japanese have succeeded completely in blocking the entrance to Port Arthur and thereby bottling up the Russian fleet at that point.

Colonial warfare by the Dutch against natives in Java and Sumatra has furnished an occa-

sional item of news during the past month or so. For 250 years Holland has maintained a profitable colonial system in these islands and on a greater part of the Malay archipelago. One of the features of this system is an institution resembling peonage, under which the natives are held in a species of slavery, they and their descendants, for the working out of debts. In more recent years a paternal despotism has somewhat modified the rigors of peonage; but the natives have never become reconciled to their foreign masters, and a continuous though desultory warfare has been the result. Lately this warfare has been carried on with the Atcheenese, of the extreme north of Sumatra, against whom the Dutch declared war in 1873. They are pure Malays and the most civilized of all the native tribes. This war is still in progress, and it is to its prosecution that the recent news reports refer. On the 2d of April an Amsterdam report told of a dispatch of that day from Kota Raja, Island of Sumatra, announcing that a column of Dutch troops operating in Atcheen province had engaged a strong intrenched body of Atcheenese in the Gajocloes district, with the result that 541 Atcheenese were killed, although the Dutch lost only 3 men killed and 25 wounded. The latest report from the seat of this colonial war, also from Amsterdam, is dated May 3, and tells of a dispatch from Batavia, Java, saying that a Dutch column had captured the Atcheenese position at Tjan-tee after a desperate fight, in which 190 Atcheenese were killed, the Dutch casualties being only 7 killed and 43 wounded. These fights appear to mark a new outbreak, for a series of campaigns, begun in 1898 and ending last August, was supposed to have subdued the Atcheenese.

Germany's colonial war in German Southwest Africa (p. 25) is not encouraging to the home authorities. Although an official dispatch of April 16 told of a repulse on the 13th of a superior force of Herreros who were moving upon Oxumbo, Berlin reports of the 28th tell a different story. The commandant of the Grootfontein district had cabled that the Germans there had suffered severe