

tabulated and as the women of Utah would incline the balance the other way, the numbers, making deductions for Utah, should exactly correspond.

A few months ago the Rochester Herald took the annual report of the New York state board of charities, where it is stated that the inmates and other beneficiaries of state institutions number more than 2,500,000, and said that "two and a half million people in a population of 7,000,000 receiving charity may well create a surprise in the foremost state in the union." Indeed it may, but it is not nearly so surprising as the Rochester Herald's failure to see how such figures are obtained. Obviously there are a number of individuals who figure more than once.

That very curious conclusions can be made to follow from statistics may be illustrated in those which deal with pauperism. England has the greatest number of paupers in the world (28 in each 1,000), and Italy very nearly the lowest (ten in each 1,000). This ought to prove to your devotee at the feet of the statistical Buddha that Italy is more prosperous than England! All it does prove is that organized poor relief in England is more systematic and thorough. In the United States paupers will not number more than two or three in each thousand, but this would not be a measure of our prosperity over England, for we certainly are not four times as prosperous as England. Sig. Lombroso not long ago stated that "wealth leads to crime," and this is the way he proved it: Rhode Island, the richest state in the union (with an estimated wealth of \$200 to each inhabitant), shows a high percentage of crime, while Dakota and Alabama (the first having \$30, the second \$20 to each inhabitant), show the very lowest percentage of criminality!

Another wonderful fact which the statistician has discovered is that so few great men have great sons, and this, in common understanding at least, has been established as one of the laws of heredity. But look at it. If great men had great sons there would soon be an overplus of great men, or, to have great men at all, the level of greatness would have to be raised much higher. If a large proportion of the sons of great men were idiots, that would be an important fact, but as most of them are, like most of the rest of us, men neither greatly above the average in ability, nor greatly below it, the equilibrium which nature strives to preserve is not seriously imperiled. If we consider the proportion of great

men to the rest of us, the number of those who have had offspring greatly endowed is not small.

It used to be thought that the sons of clergymen were apt to be worthless "ne'er-do-weels," and there were statistics for that. But De Candale, the distinguished French savant, says that the sons of ministers have contributed to science more eminent men than has any other class. He might have added, too, that they have also swelled the ranks of the poets, theologians, and not a few of the military heroes of the past.

On statistical absurdities such as these great reputations are built. Belief in them is a world-wide superstition; Germany is probably most profoundly deluded by them, but England and America are not far behind. I do not say that statistics have not their use; the contention I advance is that everywhere they are made to supply the place of pure reasoning, and that to multitudes of minds they stand for conclusions almost always irrational, and not infrequently immoral.—Joseph Dana Miller, in Philadelphia Saturday Evening Post.

#### RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Extract from a leaflet with the above title, by F. C. Selous, the South African explorer; issued as No. 17 of the publications of the South Africa conciliation committee, Talbot house, Arundel street, Strand, London.

The whole of the Dutch population of South Africa looks upon the war now being waged in that country as the result of an unjust and iniquitous conspiracy to subvert the independence of the Transvaal, and should it be carried on until the vast resources of the British empire have worn down the resistance of the Boers, and the two republics lie at England's mercy, there will, in my opinion, be no permanent peace in South Africa, should their independence be taken away from them; for there will still be 400,000 Dutch Afrianders in South Africa—the majority of the total white population of the country—who will have lost all faith in the justice of England and England's rulers. This disaffected population, dour and stubborn as the lowland Scotch, rooted to the land, ever increasing in numbers, and constantly brooding in their lonely farmsteads over what they consider injustice and bitter wrong, will have to be kept in subjection by an enormous army of occupation, which will be a considerable drain on the resources of this country. On the other hand, if when the Boers have been driven back

into their own territories—a point in the campaign which will not be reached until further terrible bloodshed has taken place, but which, having been reached, would make it plain that Great Britain was capable of wearing down any further opposition that might be offered—I believe that it would be not only just but politic to give the republics the chance of making peace on terms which would allow them to retain their independence and their flags in return for the granting of reforms which would secure good government and fair treatment for all foreigners within their borders. . . .

Should it, however, be determined to erase the Boer republics from the map of Africa, and to carry on the war to the point of practically exterminating the able-bodied male population of these two sparsely-peopled states, let it not be thought that the surviving women will bring up their children to become loyal British subjects. Let Englishmen remember that the men who prophesied that within a short time after the war was over the Boers would become reconciled to the British, whom they would then have learnt to respect, are the same people who also told us that the war would be a very short and simple campaign, as the Boers were a degenerate, cowardly race, who could no longer shoot at all well, and who would be sure to disperse to their homes after the first battle, if only a hundred of them were killed. These were the sort of predictions which were very commonly heard in this country a few months ago before the war commenced, and they were the utterances of men wholly ignorant of the Boer character. . . .

In 1848 Sir Harry Smith defeated at the battle of Boomplaats the full strength of the emigrant Boers who left the Cape Colony in 1836, with a force of 800 British soldiers and a regiment of Hottentots. Only 52 years have gone by since then, but to-day we find the descendants of these same emigrant Boers forming the main strength of an army which is holding at bay over 100,000 British troops. In view of this most significant piece of history, and the fact that the majority of her majesty's subjects in the Cape Colony are not British, but people of the same hardy and prolific race as the Boers of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, I cannot but believe that if in the settlement of South African affairs at the conclusion of the present unhappy war a policy should be pursued which, whilst despising Dutch Afriander sentiment, hopes to retain British paramountcy forever in South

Africa by the aid of British troops, such a policy must necessarily be predestined to failure.

#### A HINDU ON THE ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION OF THE REVENUES OF INDIA.

A letter written to the Manchester Guardian by Romish Dutt, dated at London, April 21.

India has waited for the report of the royal commission on Indian expenditure for five years, and the people of India, who have enough trouble and misery of their own, expect that in the matter of foreign wars and foreign complications England will at last deal justly and even generously by the people of India. Judging from the substance of the report which has already appeared in print, the recommendations made by the majority of the commissioners are full of the worst forebodings for India. Permit me to refer only to one or two heads. Under the head of "Apportionment of Charges" it is recommended that India should contribute one-half of the military charges of Aden, one-half of the cost of the Persian mission, £12,500 for the China establishment, £10,000 for the Zanzibar and Mauritius telegraph subsidy, and also the present Euphrates-Tigris subsidy. The amount under each of these heads is comparatively small; but is it just on principle to saddle India with any portion of the cost of maintaining British power and influence in different parts of Asia and Africa? Does England saddle Cape Colony or Natal with the cost of Ashanti or of any of the British establishments in West Africa?

Under the head of "Indian Troops Out of India" we are told that a part of the cost of employing Indian troops out of India should be borne by India if she has a distinct and special interest at stake. And then we are told that India has a "direct and substantial interest" in keeping open the Suez canal and in the maintenance of order in Egypt; a "modified interest" in Zanzibar and the African islands in the Indian ocean; a "direct and substantial interest" in Persia, the Persian gulf and the coast and islands of Arabia; a "direct and substantial interest" in Afghanistan and parts of Central Asia; a "direct and substantial interest" in Siam, and a "modified interest" in China and the Malay peninsula. Does this mean that the resources of India, which are scarcely enough for her civil and military administration, will continue to be drawn upon by England in her various complications in different parts of Asia and Africa? Does this

mean that the richest country in the world will continue to tax the poorest and most miserable peasantry on earth, not only for their own welfare, but also for the maintenance of England's influence and empire in portions of two continents? The principle that India is responsible for keeping the path from England to India clear is a principle which would be considered outrageous if it was applied to any of the colonies. The Australian colonies are as much interested in the Suez canal, the Arabian and Persian coasts, and in the Malay peninsula as India; has any royal commission or colonial secretary suggested that the Australian colonies should be saddled with the cost of maintaining British influence in these places? Sir Henry Fowler said at Wolverhampton: "Why am I standing here to defend the [Transvaal] war? Because it is a war not for the obtaining of the franchise, not for the rights, sound and strong as they were, of the outlanders, but because it is a war for nothing less than British supremacy in South Africa. That supremacy means our Indian empire." If the recommendations of the majority of the royal commission were accepted and followed out to their logical conclusion, would not the Indian empire be charged for this South African war, which is necessary, according to Sir Henry Fowler, for maintaining the Indian empire? Would not the Indian empire be charged for the maintenance of the British army and the British fleet and of the British power generally, because they are all necessary for maintaining the Indian empire? Where will you draw the line when you once depart from the old and equitable and sound maxim that India shall pay for troops maintained for her protection in India—not for troops and establishments and wars outside India? The army now maintained in India is not for her protection only, but for England's Asiatic and African possessions. Considering the large portion of the Indian army now employed in South Africa, the question was raised, not long ago, by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman whether the whole of the army now stationed in India should be paid for from the Indian revenues. I do not find that this question has been dealt with in the report of the majority of the royal commission. While the majority of the commissioners are anxious to define India's interests on the Nile and the Tigris, in Mozambique and the Malay peninsula, I do not find that they are anxious to define England's imperial interest in the army now stationed in India. I write this in

regret and in sorrow—a sorrow which will be universally felt by my countrymen when they read the substance of the report which has been published.

"God help the people of India!" said Mr. Donald Smeaton, a member of Lord Curzon's council, to Reuter's agent at Bombay the other day; "Great Britain and Ireland owe a debt to the Indian peasant, a debt of millions upon millions." We know that India annually remits to England a sum estimated between £20,000 and £30,000 for home charges, pensions, interest, and the like. We know that the people of India are virtually debarred from the higher posts in India, except a very small percentage, and that £15,000,000 are annually paid to European officials employed in India and sending all their savings to Europe. We know that our ancient industries like weaving and spinning and dyeing have been killed by European competition, and that the land is so heavily taxed in many provinces that the peasant cannot save in good years for years of bad harvest. We know that an army is kept in India, and paid for by India, sufficient for England's imperial requirements over the best part of Asia and Africa. We know that our finances are adjusted by executive councils in India and in England in which the people of India have no seat, and that in the taxation of India we have no voice. These are some of the burdens we bear in India, and these are some of the causes of the famines from which we periodically suffer. Will Englishmen add to them the burden of paying for British forts and armies, British establishments and wars in various parts of Africa and Asia—from the Suez canal to Mozambique, from the Tigris to the Malay peninsula? Will the English conscience reconcile itself to thus proceeding in a year when 90,000,000 of people are affected by the worst famine that India has ever known and 5,000,000 are actually attending relief centers? After the famine of 1770 and the desolating wars of Warren Hastings, the great Minister Pitt brought in his Indian bill in 1784 to give us a better government. Is there no statesman in England at the present day who will give us a new India bill, moderating land tax, reducing expenditure, opening up the higher services to the people of India, and giving them some control over their finances? Is there no Englishman of this generation who will stand up for justice to India?

The expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production.—Marx.