

other refuses to take the matter up. Because the democratic party in Ohio has pledged itself to the people to bring about these reforms it does not follow that it is democratic politics to advocate it.

"Though it were I would take the stump and speak for it, for the cause is righteous. If I were called it would be my duty as a citizen to respond. Every man should take an interest in politics and something more than a passive interest."—Plain Dealer of October 17.

The local democratic campaign was launched in earnest last night. Mayor Johnson's famous circus tent, which has been through so many hard-fought struggles, was once more brought into requisition. Its canvas folds were spread on a vacant lot on St. Clair street, near Willson avenue, and in spite of the worst conceivable weather conditions, a crowd of between 400 and 500 men gathered to hear the mayor and the candidates on the local democratic ticket.

When Mayor Johnson was introduced the cheers were prolonged. Mr. Johnson addressed his audience as "republicans and democrats."

"That is," said the mayor, "I hope there are both republicans and democrats here, although I'm afraid that only democrats would come out in such weather as this.

"We are in dead earnest in our invitation to have the republican candidates come here and state their position. We want them to come to our meetings and we promise to treat them with all consideration, if they will only accept our invitation. Moreover, we pledge ourselves that we will accept any invitation they may see fit to give us to attend their meetings and state our principles there. It is well for voters to be afraid of men who are unwilling to come out and define their position on public questions when they are invited to do so. Such men are not good men in whose hands to place a public trust. . . . We are playing this campaign with open hands. It is the men who are playing politics with open hands who are the men for the people to elect. The people know where we stand, and they know that we are working for their interests.

"Last spring I made some promises. I promised that tax inequalities should be remedied, and on this platform to-night are two members of the city board of equalization which added \$20,000,000 of the property of corpora-

tions to the tax duplicate. These men are now candidates for the state legislature, and they will continue their great work if they are elected to that body. This board did pretty good work just for a starter, when they raised Mark Hanna from \$600,000 to \$6,000,000. Hanna hasn't explained this yet. Perhaps he will explain it when he gets started on his state campaign from the rear end of a private car. If Hanna wasn't a United States senator he would have been in this tax fight clear up to his neck. Hanna's a good fighter and a good fellow, and I admire him for the fight that's in him. He has licked me a good many times and I admire him for it."—Plain Dealer of October 18.

#### THE CONCENTRATION CAMPS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

From an editorial in the Manchester (England) Guardian of October 3.

If the general idea underlying our recent operations is unsound, no amount of ability or hard work can make it succeed. The whole scheme will have to be revised. We do not believe that any processes of attrition can yield satisfactory results when conducted simultaneously over such enormous distances as those of South Africa. The first condition of success is to reduce the area of hostilities; and to achieve that end enormously superior forces must be concentrated in given districts in succession. The tendency of the present military theory is constantly to enlarge the area of war and destruction; the military process needed is gradual reduction of the area, with a constant process of reconstruction, so that each pacified district should serve as the base for the pacification of the next. The great obstacle is the enormous distance between the principal towns, which swallows up considerably more than half the fighting force in mere passive defense of communications. Unless certain parts of the communications hitherto considered vital are to be given up, we see no way of reverting to sound military methods except by a considerable increase in the military forces; and then we are faced by the difficulty of feeding our fresh forces. The only way out of that, it seems to us, is by breaking up the concentration camps and moving them down to the coast. In that way we might hope to be able to maintain a larger fighting force in the two new colonies, and perhaps to concentrate in overwhelming military strength at the desired point, which we are seldom able to do at present.

The only objection to this plan was stated in a very remarkable article in the Times a couple of days ago. In discussing the additional burdens which the maintenance of these camps had thrown on the army, this correspondent pointed out that there were certain compensating advantages hitherto unsuspected. There have, he says, been very many cases in which the existence of these camps has helped to maintain the lines of communication intact, because the Boers have hesitated to interfere with trains carrying supplies to them. According to the Times correspondent, certain sections of the line have, in fact, been kept open by an arrangement with the train-wrecking commandos. The inference is that if these camps were transferred to the south, there would be more train-wrecking and greater difficulty in feeding our own army. These extraordinary statements, if correct, dispel a swarm of popular delusions. They show that the Boers are doing what they can to assist us in providing for their wives and families, and that they are indisposed to take any advantage of the military drawbacks which the upkeep of these camps entails. They dispose, once more, of the theory that the establishment of these camps is an act of unrequited generosity on our part. Further, if we are not only losers but gainers by our seizure of all these women and children, does not the fact impose on us an even more stringent obligation to secure the welfare of the people within these camps?

We cannot allow it to be said that the "marauding bands" and the "dastardly train-wreckers" exercise consideration for the inmates of the concentration camps and that the British government leaves anything undone that could relieve their lot. Our duty to women and children is not changed by the fact that they are other men's wives and children. The train-wrecker apparently does not require a certificate that his own wife or child is in a certain camp before he allows a train carrying supplies to proceed. His forbearance, according to this Times correspondent, is extended to all women and children, without distinction, and our duty—or, if anybody prefers the word, our charity—must be equally catholic. We have a lesson to learn from these train-wreckers. Admit everything urged by the apologists of the camps; can anyone reconcile himself to a death-rate that rose from 109 per thousand in June to 183 in

July and 213 in August? Dr. Haldane has told us what the figures mean. The deaths among the women in the camps per month should under normal conditions be 96; the actual number is 606, an excess of 510 due to insanitary surroundings. The deaths among children during August were 3,245; under normal conditions they should only have been 272. In other words, the maintenance of these camps means that seven times as many women and 12 times as many children are dying as would have died if there had been no burning of homes, no concentration policy, no wholesale destruction of food and live stock. We have just now seen the military consequence of the policy. The remedy for this terrible mortality and for our military difficulties is, we believe, one and the same. The camps should be removed and the military theory which led to their formation definitely abandoned.

#### ANARCHY AND GOVERNMENT.

An article by Erving Winslow, secretary of the New England Anti-Imperialist League; published in the San Francisco Star of September 28.

It may be difficult to obtain a hearing for a philosophic consideration of any event which is deeply stirring the emotions of the community. From one point of view it might seem best to await the sober second-thought of the people before making any comments upon the situation that might be interpreted as casting the least shadow of reproach upon honest sympathy and righteous indignation. Nevertheless, the hysterical sentiment is so increased and multiplied by the magnetism of personal influence, possessed by those whose hearts are better than their heads, and by the tremendous power of the sensational press and pulpit, that serious results may be brought about and embodied in popular action or hasty legislation before the expected time of second-thought is reached. The Virginia constitutional convention has already eliminated the guaranty of freedom of speech from the bill of rights. It may be well, therefore, to throw into the seething caldron some elements which may possibly contribute a little to a normal precipitation.

The confusion of the public mind has been singularly illustrated in the recent rejection in New York of a proposed candidate for office, suspected of socialism, because of the present antipathy for anarchism! This is very much as if we should proceed to boycott some well-known apostle of tem-

perance because a drunken man had committed a crime. Socialism is the logical opposite of anarchism, and it might be supposed that a socialist just now would be the most popular person in the country.

It is, of course, too much to expect, under the circumstances, that the difference between the philosophical and the violent anarchist should be recognized. In common speech "anarchy" is indeed generally recognized as a synonym for disorder and destruction. The ordinary person who was told, for example, that a schoolroom was in a state of anarchy, would conceive the idea of a scene of uproar and confusion, desks overturned, books thrown about and a general tumult, requiring at once the strong hand of authority. A schoolroom in a state of true anarchy would exhibit, on the contrary, a collection of pupils fulfilling their appointed tasks in the absence of the teacher, with zeal and concentration, assisting each other, if necessary, by the exchange of a pen or a pencil, and happily cooperating in perfect goodwill to produce the most harmonious result in the most peaceful way.

Not many years ago the doctrine was generally accepted that government should be limited to the narrowest range of functions consistent with the preservation of order, and it was felt that with the natural progress of education and enlightenment, as time went on its functions might be safely still more limited in number and scope; in fact, that with the elevation of mankind, approach would be made to the millennial idea which, in a way, may be called philosophic anarchism. It is the doctrine of scripture that in the fullness of time, "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

Is this idea no longer conceivable? It might almost be believed that such is the case when so many of those who are technically apostles of the Christian religion appear to have lost it and are most conspicuous among those who see in a single act of insane violence only a provocation for greater violence and for the employment of force against force, and when high functionaries of government also openly advocate lynching. As it is the first duty of the Christian man, outraged in feeling or in person, to look at home and to seek a cause of provocation rather than to wreak hasty revenge, it certainly becomes the body politic to act and judge dispassionately in the presence of an outrage committed by

a single wretched and degenerate member of it. The horrible crime which has been lately committed is probably altogether an isolated one; but as so many attempts are being made to throw the responsibility of it upon every outspoken opposition to what may chance to be individual or party policy, it is certainly well to open our minds to more sober counsels. A well-known ecclesiastic has even vehemently denounced any severe criticism of republican functionaries in obedience to the precept that their power is "ordained by God"—the sanction claimed by royalty—oblivious of the fact that impeachment, which would be treason under monarchical governments, is among us a constitutional right which may become a duty.

Efforts to control legitimate criticism, to strengthen the visible power of governments and to increase the prestige of mere authority, will increasingly challenge in the future dislike, hatred and the possibility of violence from the poor, the discontented and the unfortunate—the proletariat, as it is contemptuously called. Poland, unhappy Poland, where freedom fell with Kosciusko, has been the parent of anarchism in the past, as Finland and other countries now being deprived of freedom, may be in the future—not the America of constitutional liberty.

With the enormous progress of individualism, through the influence of the press and modern education, anything like thorough and effectual suppression of criticism and discussion is impossible. The czar cannot compass it; the kaiser, with the pains and penalties of lese majeste, cannot effect it. How futile would be the effort in America! The claims of imperialism, of authority based upon conquest, of usurped or hereditary prerogative, will constantly meet with increasing danger. Shining marks which stand for force will inevitably excite prejudice and aversion. It would seem, indeed, as time goes on, as if the only function which could be exercised with safety would be that of the recognized public servant; that simplicity in manners, absence of show and pretension, and especially disassociation from military conditions, would be the only prudent characteristics of officialdom. The executive of the United States will be certainly most effectually respected when professing and pursuing absolute obedience to the constitution, the rule of order established by those who have selected him for their service, having no responsibility and no accountability beyond it.

A suggestion has been made that