

of men between enlightenment and dependence. There are to-day thousands of individuals in all the humble pursuits of life who are by vote and speech supporting men and policies in which they do not in their innermost convictions believe, but in which they have persuaded themselves to believe. This persuasion has arisen from the burden of their necessities and from the force of environment. It is the penalty of their dependence.

In old times, when there was less spread of education and enlightenment, we can imagine that courtiers, retainers, dependents, serfs, and slaves had, as a rule, never a thought but that the rule of their lords was as the will of God. Their subserviency was at least sincere. In modern days it has become necessary to be insincere in subserviency. The trouble is that freedom of actual social conditions has not yet caught up with the spread of freedom of thought upon these conditions. The trouble is not so much intellectual, but lies rather in the will and character. The inherited forces of inequality, the vested rights of classes, the taint of dependent inertia, all tend to hold in abeyance the full and final freedom of will and character. Hence the lack of right action, and the false persuasion to a support of existing conditions, which is at bottom insincere.

These two forms of insincerity, of the orator and of the people, different as they may have seemed in this presentation, may be seen to meet together in the utterance and thought of the great modern dictum, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." The senator, fresh from securing a franchise for some monopoly, rolls it from his tongue with solemn vehemence. The people, who might and do know better, uphold the very measures and policies that belie the theory of equal rights which they applauded in the platform of the party and in the speeches of the politicians. One is the insincerity of charlatany; the other is the insincerity of impotence and slavishness. The orator hires himself to secure some monopoly for a corporation; the corporation clerk upholds the monopoly as a part of his own living. Each will profess

to believe in the general principle of "special privilege to none;" neither will apply it to the special case. The orator talks one way and acts another; the servant thinks one way, or would if he could, and persuades himself that the other way is right.

The fact seems to be that the tendency of modern conditions, coupled with modern intellectual progress, is to sear conscience and beget insincerity. Without offense to Shakespeare, it may be said that in modern life and in present social conditions it is not conscience, but the lack of conscience, that doth make cowards of us all.

J. H. DELLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Freiburg, Baden, Germany, May 25.—Revolution is spreading in Russia. The organization of the movement is being perfected. But what is more important, the broad masses of the people are in a state of eager excitement. Hunger and misery have played their part and the indistinct glimmer of the intellectual and political development of western Europe, contrasted with the unspeakable wretchedness of their own condition, is moving that vast unleavened mass, the Russian folk, with a might, almost irresistible, that is akin to rage. To convert this force into action is the desire of the people and into this work they throw themselves with the courage of those who have nothing to lose. The revolutionary agitation to them is welcome. They go out to meet it. In many quarters a repetition of the peasant revolt of last year is expected and this in spite of the knowledge of the terrible punishments meted out to those simple farmers who had only taken from the landlords that which they considered their own. The government sees this and their question is how to break the gathering storm.

The salvation of the government is at stake. What must they do? With the revolutionists they have fought for years with all weapons conceivable and inconceivable: Siberia, exile and death—but all in vain. The simplest method at hand seems to be to turn the attention of the people into a channel harmless to the powers that exist at St. Petersburg. It is not hard to deceive and lead a people that have been kept in such thorough ignorance as the Russian peasantry and the scape goat is always at hand—the

Jew. This idea is especially pleasing to the government because, of all the socialistic organizations at present in existence that of the Jews is the oldest and most important. With it there has been many a bitter fight. To weaken this society and at the same time to bring it into disfavor with the Russians is particularly desirable. Every use is made of the natural distrust that an undeveloped folk always feels for strangers with different and unusual customs. This is blown by the bitter propaganda of the anti-Semitic press, the Conservative party, and especially the Orthodox church into a national hate. As was the general case in the middle ages the Jews in Russia are subject to special legislative restrictions. This opens them to contempt from even the lowest of the low. Despised as well as hated, the ground is prepared for such tragedies as have just taken place in Kishineff.

Kishineff is a town of about a hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants, situated not far from the boundary of Roumania. It has large iron industries and machine works principally engaged in the manufacture of farming implements. The people are not true Slavs, but a mixture, the eastern element predominating. Formerly there was no open ill-feeling between the numerous Jewish population and the Russians and Mahomedans. Five years ago an anti-Semitic newspaper was founded—Bessarabetz. It was the only one in the entire district. Any attempt to found a rival was met by the refusal of the authorities. The sheet was sold at a very cheap rate, which enabled it to be read by large masses of the people.

A short time ago in the neighborhood a boy was murdered. The "Bessarabetz" brought forward the old medieval slander that at Easter the Jews are bound by their ritual to offer a sacrifice of Christian blood. The story is as old as the days of Hugh of Lincoln and is found repeated in many curious forms all through the early history of England and France. There was an investigation, and in spite of the fact that an official report was given out that the child had been killed by his own relatives in order to obtain his share of an inheritance, the Bessarabetz continued to publish the same stories as formerly.

For months before Easter it was an open secret in Kishineff that on the feast of the Resurrection the Jews would be punished. All knew the story and many of the police spoke about it openly. Deputations of the promi-

ment Jews called on the military governor and the chief of police begging that some steps of prevention or at least protection be taken before it was too late. The officials received them and promised to do so.

In Holy Week crowds of ruffians and idlers, the sweepings of middle Russia, were brought into the city. Pamphlets were distributed among them stating that all the prevailing misery and hard times were caused by the evil machinations of the Jews and that it was the will of the Czar, their Father, that these people be killed and plundered. To all who should take part in this crusade the fullest immunity from punishment was promised. Here it should be remarked that in Russia it is practically impossible that papers of this kind should be printed and circulated by private persons without the knowledge of the police. Under the present regulations it is an offense punishable with banishment to Siberia to have in one's possession without permission a hectograph or any other device for copying or reduplicating printed or written matter. Even the well organized and enthusiastic revolutionary committee only manages to secure the publication and circulation of its tracts with the greatest difficulty and danger. In fact, in regard to the inflammatory leaflets at Kishineff, it has since come to light that several officials, a student, and a few large property owners were paid for their work in this connection.

The rioting began on Easter morning after early mass in the churches. The rioters all dressed in red blouses and for the most part armed with pistols divided themselves into several bands and commenced their work in different quarters of the city at the same time. In the Jewish houses where no men were expected lads went and even women and children took part. Gentlemen rode ahead in carriages and pointed out where the Jews lived. That there was an organization and a guiding spirit cannot be doubted. No Christian house was disturbed and few of the Jewish were missed. First the shops and the dwellings were destroyed. The goods and the furniture were thrown out into the streets. What had any value for the rioters was stolen and in this they were partly assisted by the public that was looking on. What remained was scattered and broken. Then the mob cast itself upon the Jews themselves. These were not simply beaten and murdered, they were tortured. One had his tongue pulled out by the roots. They stuck

long pins up the nose of a little girl so that they came out through the head behind. A baby they tore in two. A pregnant mother they beat with sticks. Boys and girls were pitched from the upper stories of high buildings. Women old and young were outraged in the streets before the eyes of passive onlookers. Many of the smaller girls died from the brutality on the spot. To resist was to court the death of the martyr. When all was over in one street the mob moved on into another. Flags were made of Jewish garments colored with Jewish blood and every Jew that met this bloody trophy was killed. Jews were thrown from the tram cars. The synagogue was broken open and the holy writings defiled with blood. Early in the day the way was found to the wine cellars and the frenzy of drunkenness was added to the horrors of fanaticism. The non-rioting Christian population of the town did not interrupt their Easter promenading. They saw everything and then passed laughing on. The very few who sought to interfere were themselves attacked and their houses plundered.

But where were the police?—the Russian police, gendarmes, soldiers and cossacks who at every political demonstration seem to grow up out of the ground? Where were those who at Rostoff, Pichositz and Slatoust, where the strikes and political demonstrations recently took place, restored order so perfectly that scores of dead and wounded were left in the streets—and the awful vengeance afterwards, so many scourged, so many arrested and banished to Noroh and East Siberia?

The police were at their usual posts watching with satisfied eyes the destruction. Many showed the way to Jewish houses as yet untouched. The military governor and chief of police sat in their offices and answered to all appeals for assistance that as yet they had received no permission from St. Petersburg.

In this connection it should be stated that the Russian government, seeing the indignation that the massacre has aroused in western Europe, now claims that it sent word to the governor of Kishineff to prevent all disturbances, but not to use the soldiers owing to the uneasy feeling of the peasantry. This statement, however, is not believed even by the conservative minded Frankfurter Zeitung. Private persons were forbidden to send telegrams to the capital, and the telephone at the military governor's house was broken.

An excellent example of how eager the police were to assist in the interest of order: At one merchant's the mob worked for over ten hours in the effort to force his safe. During all this time the man went from one official to another begging help and everywhere was he laughed at and refused.

On the second day troops of soldiers paraded the streets laughing and plundering with the others. When all was finished in one place they would say, "Good, now let us go on further." Their duty appeared to be to prevent the Jews from forming for self protection or the rescue of their families, for as soon as a small group gathered together it was at once set upon and dispersed. In the cases, however, where the Jews had been rich and thoughtful enough to bribe the police, a guard was set at the door that prevented anyone from entering. The climax of official indifference, if not actual participation, was reached when several unfortunate creatures, who had escaped from the rioters over the roofs to the police station, were thrust from this protection back into the streets, there to be murdered by the mob which was waiting for them.

Would it have been difficult at any time to have quieted the disturbance? One policeman defended an entire house and an officer with a small corps rescued a whole street. But these were the only ones who tried or cared to interfere.

At last, on the third day, martial law was declared. The government had accomplished its purpose and it was time to begin to regard proprieties. To their great consternation large numbers of the rioters were arrested, but their punishment will not be so great. It will be as light and agreeable as that of the political prisoners is hard and cruel. Judge, state attorney and police who will try their cases are the same persons who instigated the riot. On the board of investigation is a member of the staff of the Bassarabetz, and other active organizers. Already relief committees are being formed to relieve the families of those who are in prison because of the riot. The military governor has also been removed and reprimanded on account of his share in the matter, but it is an open question if his influence at St. Petersburg, has been diminished.

In what condition are the Jews at present? In Kishineff for many days the streets and walls were stained with blood and scattered brains. One walked up to one's knees in a wreck of

broken mirrors, furniture, torn clothing, and down and feathers clotted with blood. Twenty-five thousand people are beggars, a few of whom were wealthy; but for the most part artisans and factory hands, not the rich bankers against whose tyranny an outraged people had risen, as the ambassador at Washington would have you believe. Many women and children have become crazy from the nervous strain, and as for the number of the dead and wounded no one can as yet tell with exactitude. In the first day fifty were murdered, three hundred dangerously and a thousand slightly wounded, and in the following dreadful two days when the mob had gained in ferocity and cruelty one can well picture how these figures were added to. The entire district thickly settled with Jews is in a state of panic, and, although smaller riots have taken place in several of the neighboring cities, notably the holy town of Kief, the railroads are not able to carry the numbers of terror-stricken people who desire to flee to any place except the vicinity of Kishineff.

The foregoing facts relating to the massacre at Kishineff are derived from dozens of eye witnesses through unimpeachable but necessarily confidential channels of information.

EDWARD RUMELY.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 11.

The Conservative party of Great Britain has barely escaped a ministerial crisis over the free trade issue (p. 134) which Secretary Chamberlain has raised. Following the parliamentary interpellation on the 28th (p. 135), the Commons entered into a debate upon the subject on the 9th, in the course of the consideration of the fiscal budget, the second reading of which was at that time moved by Charles T. Ritchie, the chancellor of the exchequer.

Just before the parliamentary session of the 9th a special meeting of the cabinet was held, upon the call of the Premier, to consider the new situation which had probably so divided the Conservatives as to place the ministry at the mercy of the Liberal and Irish members. All the ministers, except Gerald Balfour, president of the board of trade (who was ill), attended this cabinet meeting; and it

was rumored that a split in the ministry itself had there developed. This split was understood to have been immediately caused by the publication two days before of a letter from Mr. Chamberlain to a workingman, in which Mr. Chamberlain committed himself to the policy of protection. The workingman whom he addressed had called his attention to denunciations of his proposals by trade union leaders, and in his reply Mr. Chamberlain said:

I do not attach excessive importance to the opinion of the trades union leaders, because they are, almost without exception, strong radical partisans. Their opinions are not necessarily shared by working people generally, nor even by trades unionists, who appoint officers independently of political considerations. For instance, I may mention that in Birmingham the members of the trades council almost to a man opposed me politically, notwithstanding which my majority at the election, in a purely working class district, was 4,500. I feel confident that in the matter of preferential tariffs and commercial fair play the workingmen will think for themselves and will not be dictated to by even the most trusted trades unionist leaders. . . . It will be impossible to secure preferential treatment from the colonies without some duty on wheat as well as on other articles of food, because these are the chief articles of colonial produce. Whether this will raise the cost of living is a matter of opinion. There is no doubt that in many cases duty of this kind is paid by the exporter and really depends on the extent of competition among the exporting countries. For instance, I think it is established that the shilling duty recently imposed was met by a reduction in price and freight in the United States, and the tax did not, therefore, fall in any way on the consumer here. But even if the price of food is raised, the rate of wages certainly will be raised in greater proportion. This has been the case both in the United States and Germany. In the former country the available balance left to the workingman, after he has paid for necessities, is much larger than it is here. These facts we have to bring to the notice of workingmen generally. Another side of the question requires discussion. At present we enter into negotiations with foreign countries empty handed. We have nothing to give and have to take what they are good enough to leave for us. If we were able to bargain on equal terms I believe the duties now imposed on our produce would be generally reduced. There would be competition among foreign nations for our markets which would bring us nearer to real free trade than we ever have been. As regards old age

pensions, I would not look at the matter unless I felt able to promise that a large sum for the provision of such pensions to all who have been thrifty and well conducted would be assured by the revision of our system of import duties. The grain and other food already supplied from the British possessions are important and are capable of rapid increase. Returns show that this has taken place in the past, even without preference, while our exports of finished goods to foreign countries have gradually given place to exports of raw materials, which are returned to us with the advantage to the foreigner of increased employment of labor and of trade profits on business thus secured. . . . You are told by opponents of all change that such reform as I contemplate would involve the country in ruin, bring starvation into the homes of the working people, and destroy our export trade. If these predictions have any foundation, how are we to account for the fact that the increase in exports and wages and general prosperity during the last 20 years in the United States and Germany has been greater than in the United Kingdom, which is the only civilized country in the world to enjoy the blessings of unrestricted free imports.

The rumor that this letter had brought discord into the ministry was confirmed on the 9th, when Chancellor Ritchie avowed himself to be an out-and-out free trader, and added that with his present knowledge he could not be a party to the Chamberlain policy, which he believed would be detrimental to the interests of both Great Britain and her colonies. That the ministerial split thus indicated ramifies the Conservative party, was plainly evident as soon as Chancellor Ritchie had formally moved the second reading of the budget bill, which contained a clause repealing the war duties on grain (p. 134); for Henry Chaplin, a Conservative member, who had been president of the local government board in the Salisbury ministry, immediately moved an amendment striking out that clause. He said that the ministry had made an irretrievable mistake in throwing away, by this repealing clause, a weapon which would have helped them to carry out the new fiscal policy to which Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain were committed. While admitting that Chancellor Ritchie had for the moment prevailed with the ministry over Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chaplin predicted that the triumph would be short lived; and he added significantly that it was an extraordinary position in which the fol-