

high road to anarchism, if not already contaminated by the heresy.

1. Do you agree with Macaulay that "the evils of liberty are to be remedied only by more liberty?"

2. Do you believe that the earth was made for all mankind?

3. Do you believe that a child born into this world who is doomed to pay rent for the privilege of using and occupying what he needs of the earth's surface has been unjustly disinherited?

4. Do you agree with Thomas Jefferson that "that is the best government that governs least?"

5. Do you agree with Eugene V. Debs that "while there is misery at the bottom there will be no security at the top?"

6. Do you believe that it is possible for a workingman to entertain any intelligent opinion on any subject that he does not get from his master or his landlord?

7. Do you believe any of the stuff attributed to Jesus of Nazareth in Matthew v. and vi.?

Of course I realize that your method of applying the physical test is more scientific, and the learned men who will seek for the marks of anarchism can scarcely be deceived in view of the many ascertained stigmata that science has discovered. Nevertheless my suggestion may be of some value in sifting out those who are in the incipient stages, whose stigmata are therefore not sufficiently developed to attract the notice of the savants employed by the government.

Assuring you of my sympathy for your noble endeavors to keep out all who entertain opinions that may prove dangerous to our class,

Yours admirably,

HERMAN KUEHN.

70 Dearborn St., Chicago, Dec. 16, 1901.

GUERRILLA WAR.

Portions of a letter written by Sir William Harcourt to the London Times, reprinted here from the Times Weekly Edition Supplement of November 15.

What has been the fatal feature of this unhappy war from the beginning to the present moment is the invincible ignorance of those responsible for it, both at home and in South Africa, of the conditions they had to deal with, both physical and moral. Of their acquaintance with the physical conditions of the war they were about to wage the preparations they made for it are sufficient indication. But the most inexcusable of all the blunders which have brought us to the present situation has been the moral and intellectual obliquity of vision which has

blinded those who have brought about and conducted the war to the real character and spirit of their opponents. . . The government ignored the terrible nature of the enterprise which is undertaken by those who set about to subjugate a brave and a free people. And yet the lesson is written large in the pages of history from the days of the Persian king, of Philip of Spain with the Indies, of Napoleon at the head of countless legions. It is one which it is incredible that a British government should not have learned, especially as under evil counsellors, 120 years ago, the same thing was attempted on our own race. It is still more deplorable that the British government should seem to have forgotten the issues of that ill-omened contest, which for many years was as enthusiastically applauded as that in which we are now engaged. But at least those who profess to call themselves liberals cherish with pride the memorable protest against that ruinous policy which found a voice in the thunder of Chatham's "mother tongue," in the fervor of Fox, and the wisdom of Burke. They, too, in their day were assailed by ministerial slander and popular clamor as pro-Americans, as traitors, as enemies of their country, and friends of its foes. But they knew the truth, they spoke it, and their record remains for the instruction and imitation of those who come after them. . . .

Of course Mr. Chamberlain is for more and more violence—as Dr. Watts says, "it is his nature to." Like many penitents, he confesses only his virtues. He candidly admits that he has weaknesses; they are—too much courtesy to his opponents at home and too great leniency to his foes abroad. These foibles he promises to correct. . . .

No! We shall not, with Mr. Chamberlain, take refuge in the precedents of Poland or of Hungary. I trust we shall take counsel of our record and the example of, I fear we must say, better men and better times. When it is proposed to deal out "greater severities" to what are called "guerrilla bands," I will show that the English government and their noble military chief, the duke of Wellington, insisted that these guerrillas were entitled to exactly the same treatment as the combatants in the organized battalions of the great military powers. The Partidas of Spain in the Peninsular war were the exact counterparts of the Boer guerrillas to-day. The history of the guerrilla warfare in the Peninsula and their valiant chiefs is portrayed with graphic eloquence by

Southey in his history of the Peninsular War and the way in which they "held the fort" from 1809 to 1812 against all the marshals of France. Southey relates that he derived his information from a personal acquaintance with Mina, the Botha or the De Wet of that famous drama. The story is well worth reading to-day. Let me record what were the opinions of the duke of Wellington on guerrilla warfare. On August 9, 1809, he writes:

The guerrillas should be employed on the enemies' communications. The plan of operations I should recommend for the Spanish nation is one generally of defense. They should avoid general actions, but should take advantage of the strong posts in their country to defend themselves and harass the enemy.

Later on, after the defeat of the Spanish armies and in contemplation of his own retirement to Portugal, the duke writes, December 21, 1810: "We cannot beat the French army out of the peninsula; we must give occupation to as large a part of it as we can, and leave the war in Spain to the guerrillas." The war was accordingly left in the main to the guerrillas, and it was owing to their maintenance of the contest during 1810 and 1811 that the later operations of Wellington in his advance became possible. . . .

I do not believe that at this moment what the nation desires is the announcement of fresh severities. It wishes to hear a spirit of conciliation and a real attempt at peace. Peace will never come through the channels in which the conduct of the war has up to this time run. The temper and the tongue of Mr. Chamberlain are admirable instruments for the promotion and exasperation of war. They are employed without remorse for inflaming passion and aggravating prejudice at a general election. He has the happy knack of irritating for no purpose by bitter taunts each and all the nations of Europe; he insults and maligns his opponents at home; and by futile menace and actual severities he stiffens the resistance of the enemy in the field. This is not the statesmanship that makes for peace. A declaration from him that what he intends is equal rights for the British and the Boers gains no credit, but is regarded by them as a cruel mockery. They look to the bullying tone in which British ascendancy and Dutch subjection predominates the colonial office and the Cape; and they believe that the performance of the promises thus held out will practically rest in the hands of the authors of the Raid, who are the dominant factors in South African policy.

We have the confession of Lord Milner that as it has been and is now con-

ducted "in a formal sense this war may never cease." Those who desire that by a spirit of conciliation on reasonable terms it may cease now and forever must look for that end in other paths and by other men.

ROOSEVELT ON VESTED WRONG.

Roosevelt got off a lot of good things in his message that were never appreciated.

"Now he's going to be satirical," said Mrs. Dillingham. "He never says anything nice about the republicans but that he follows it with something that he thinks is real smart. If you say anything mean about the president I shall never speak to you again."

However, I wasn't going to say anything nasty about Roosevelt. I admire him. He does things. He is not ashamed to be a tory. If he was he wouldn't be a tory. He is a positive sort of a man.

"Go on," said Mrs. Dillingham, with warning. "Be just as mean as you please."

His message had a lot of good things that were not appreciated, and I am going to be absolutely respectful. Cross my heart and hope to die.

"If you think it is so clever," she said, "it would be a pity not to let you say it."

He said in one place that a fellow couldn't make a fortune in legitimate business without conferring on society vastly greater benefits than what he reaped for himself.

He's right. He's dead right. I agree with him exactly. No better test of the justice of social arrangement could be devised than that. If a man heaps up a fortune without benefiting society, he didn't get it in legitimate business.

For example, there is a man who never did a tap of work. His father never did a tap of work. His grandfather the same. His great-grandfather left a fortune of \$1,000,000, some of which was earned and some was stolen, but so long as it was stolen honestly that doesn't matter. This man confers no benefit on society, nor his father before him nor his grandfather before him. Yet he has \$100,000,000.

One million dollars was left to his grandfather. The other \$99,000,000 was not got by any legitimate business.

Thrift? He wastes more every year than his grandfather had in all. They have always spent more than the income of what the old man left them.

A gift? Of course it is a gift. It is

given them by the people who earn what they enjoy.

It was never got in legitimate business.

"He means the Astors," she said. "He is always harping on the Astors."

Mrs. Dillingham has a few of my hobbies definitely located.

By the same token when I get started on one of my hobbies I am not easily dismounted.

Roosevelt says further that in the arid states the only right to water is the right to use, the only right that should be recognized.

According to that if a man claims to own the water by which alone the next man's farm may be made fruitful, the claim doesn't count. It doesn't matter how many deeds he has nor how many dead-and-forgotten men gave him title to the water. His claim to it need not be recognized. The only right is the right to use it.

One of these days, Roosevelt says, people will recognize that the community has no more right to give away water privileges than to give away municipal franchises for public utilities.

Some of the states already recognize, he says, that the state must have perpetual ownership of water rights. Claims to the contrary, he says, must give way to the paramount claims of the whole people.

The doctrine of private ownership of water, he says, cannot prevail without working enduring wrong.

He's right. He's dead right. So long as you allow private ownership of water in arid regions, no man can keep his own.

"I'll take half your crop, if you please—or if you don't please—it's all one."

"What for?" says the other fellow, "I raised it, I planted it, I tended it, I harvested it. What for must I give you half of it?"

"I furnished the water—give me half your crop."

"You—why, the water fell from heaven. You never touched it."

Roosevelt says such an absurd claim need not be recognized. If it is not to be recognized, it may be ignored. That is to say, if anybody claims such a right, we take it away from him.

That's in regard to water. The reason he holds that is because the man who controls the water owns the land. The man who owns the land owns the man who lives on it. He must pay blackmail to the owner of the water before he can get his living.

He's right. He's dead right. The same thing exactly is true of the ownership of land. The man who owns the land can make the other fellow pay him tribute before he gets himself a living. He has to pay the landlord half his crop for the privilege of living on his land.

According to Roosevelt's reasoning, nothing but perpetual state ownership is tolerable. We are not to recognize any right but the right to use.

The railroads control a man's earnings as much as irrigation ditches do. The man who owns the railroad can take all but a bare living and let the farmer have what's left. Some railroads have done this.

According to Roosevelt the community has not the right to give that power to any private citizen. Perpetual state ownership of the railroad monopoly is the only tolerable arrangement.

No claims to private rights over another man's earnings need be recognized. Men can't establish homes, he says, when such rights of exacting tribute are held over them.

He's right. He's dead right.

No fortune is legitimately earned, he says, unless the fellow gives society more than he takes from society. Private ownership of the means of subsistence, he says is intolerable and its claims need not be recognized.

Now have I said anything mean?

"No more than usual," she graciously admitted.

Well, I could. I could insist that Roosevelt should try to apply some of these truths he has uttered. Of course, that wouldn't be fair.

It would break up the republican party.—John Stone Pardee, in *The Argus*, of Red Wing, Minn.

AMERICAN IDEALS.

Portions of a speech delivered by Hon. John P. Altgeld before the Good Government club of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, December 14, 1901.

A century and a quarter ago there was established on this continent, not simply a new government, not simply an independent government, not simply a government free from the political control of foreign powers, but there was established a new theory of government. A new principle. The principle of the equality of men before the law. The principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It was a government based upon liberty, based upon foundations of freedom. It was a recognition of the idea