

The Public

Complete

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1902.

Number 210.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Commandant Kritzinger, the captured Boer officer whom the British have been trying for his life before one of their court-martials, as a few weeks before they tried Scheepers, was fortunate in having been tried after the Boers had captured and released Gen. Methuen. For the charges against Kritzinger have now been dropped. To have shot him in cold blood, after the Methuen episode, as Scheepers was shot before it, would have left a pretty bad taste in the mouth. It was Scheeper's misfortune to have been "tried" before his executioners had been taught a wholesome moral lesson by Gen. Delarey the Boer.

Several months have elapsed since President Roosevelt's attention was directly called to the British army supply-station at New Orleans, which has been there for nearly three years in flagrant breach of American neutrality. But he refused even to investigate the matter until the governor of Louisiana put a question to him last week which foreclosed all possibility of evasion. Declaring that a British army supply-station had in fact been established in his state, the Governor asked whether the state could expel it without impinging upon Federal prerogatives. Mr. Roosevelt was in no hurry even then—certainly not in a strenuous hurry. He first deliberately called for a legal opinion from the attorney general. This opinion, when it came, was to the effect that the law in the matter depends upon the facts. So Mr. Roosevelt set about ascertaining the facts which he ought to have ascertained fully five months before. Nor

does he appear to be extraordinarily strenuous even now; for the military officer sent down to investigate arrived ahead of his instructions. Meanwhile, a week after the governor of Louisiana compelled the Federal authorities to "get a move on" in the matter, a British transport clears for Cape Town with a cargo of munitions of war in the shape of mules and horses for military use on the veldts of South Africa. That "understanding between statesmen" appears to be as potent at the White House now as it was before Mr. Roosevelt's accession.

Much ado is made about the complexity of the neutrality question. But what is there complex about it? The treaty of Washington, between the United States and Great Britain, expressly declares that—

a neutral government is bound . . . not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters . . . for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies.

There is nothing complex about that part of the question. The law is clear enough. This government is bound to prevent the use by Great Britain of American ports or waters for the renewal or augmentation of military supplies. The other part of the question is nothing but a question of fact. Is Great Britain so using our ports or waters? That question is so simple that President Roosevelt's long delay in investigating it, and his manifest indifference and dilatoriness now that the governor of Louisiana has left him no loophole for further evasion, would seem to be less significant of a complex problem in international law than of British influence with a complacent state department at Washington.

In the enactment of the oleomargarine bill, now almost assured, Fed-

eral legislation enters boldly, and with no more pretense than is supposed to be necessary to guard against interference by the Supreme Court, upon the centralizing policy of regulating local trade. Foreign boundaries and state lines are to be no longer considered. In the form of tax laws, yet with an unconcealed purpose in no sense fiscal, private businesses are to be promoted or suppressed as the central authority may dictate. It is true that heretofore Congress has stamped out private businesses by a fraudulent exercise of its taxing power. A 10 per cent. tax on state bank notes, for instance, has created and fostered the national banking system and destroyed the currency-making function of local banks. In that instance, however, unjustifiable as it was and vicious as the precedent has been, there was the excuse of a supposed necessity for bringing the whole money-issuing function within the control of the general government. Not even that excuse pleads for the oleomargarine bill. This bill is a measure designed for no public purpose whatever. It has no other object than to drive a certain food product of American manufacture out of the American market in the interest of the American producers of a competing product.

Oleomargarine is a substitute for butter which on the one hand is pronounced wholesome and on the other deleterious. But that dispute makes no difference with reference to this congressional bill, for Congress has no authority to legislate generally with reference to the wholesomeness of foods. Such legislation is a police function of the individual states. On the one hand, also, it is claimed that in coloring oleomargarine yellow the manufacturers are no more guilty of fraud than are butter makers when

they treat white butter in the same way; while, on the other it is contended that the custom of artificially coloring white butter yellow has been so long followed that the use of the same color for oleomargarine has the effect of defrauding butter buyers by imposing oleomargarine upon them for butter. But that dispute, also, is out of the case with reference to this congressional bill. Congress has no authority to legislate for the suppression of fraudulent practices; that function, too, belonging to the states. The congressional problem, therefore, is to serve the butter making class at the expense of oleomargarine makers, by preventing the coloring of oleomargarine without expressly prohibiting it. And this is to be done in the guise of a revenue measure. Uncolored oleomargarine is to be taxed one cent a pound; but if colored, the tax is to be 10 cents. Neither tax is expected to raise revenue. The lower one is intended to obstruct the sale of oleomargarine, while the higher is intended to make the yellow product so dear as to drive it out of the market. The motive, of course, is to shield butter makers from competition. Inasmuch as the law is not in fact a revenue law, but is so only in form, it is plainly a fraudulent use by Congress of its revenue powers for the purpose of invading the reserved rights of the states and making or unmaking private businesses at will. In principle it is in line with the protective tariff legislation of the past quarter of a century, but with the additional characteristic that it breaks down state lines and opens the way for future legislation that may bring even the most minute private and local concerns within the jurisdiction of the Federal legislature and courts.

Another event of the week directs attention to this rush into centralization, with even greater emphasis. It is the decision of two Federal judges overruling the Supreme Court of Illinois on a question of local taxation, something that has always been con-

sidered as clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal government. The decision is extraordinary. Under the Illinois tax laws property must be assessed for taxation at full value. Assessors, however, have fallen into the habit of assessing at all sorts of valuations, 60 per cent. of the value having come to be regarded as a legitimate custom. That custom was made to yield to the law by the State Supreme Court, in proceedings instituted against Chicago street car corporations; and these corporations thereupon went to the Federal court with the contention that as other taxpayers are assessed at only 60 per cent. this full assessment against them was a denial, contrary to the XIVth amendment, of "the equal protection of the laws." It did not seem to occur to the Federal judges, as it did to Judge Tuley in the Chicago case commented upon last week (vol. iv., p. 817), that the proper mode of escape from such inequality is not to seek a reduction of assessments from full value in the cases in which the law is observed, but to secure equality by insisting upon full legal assessments in the cases in which it is defied. They decided in favor of the complaining corporations, setting aside the state laws; putting a lawless custom in its place; and overriding the state Supreme Court. And they actually proceeded to act as a state board of assessors, by fixing the amount of state taxes which the complaining corporations should pay. Should this procedure take root, local government by the Federal judiciary will be a thing established, and states will have little more power over their local affairs than counties have now. When they lose control of the taxing power, they lose control of themselves.

Some arrests were made on the occasion of the Altgeld memorial meeting in New York last week, the prisoners being charged with selling anarchistic literature. When they came before the magistrate it appeared that they had been selling a pamphlet en-

titled "Roosevelt, Czolgosz and Anarchy" with an addendum on "Communism," a tract in advocacy of anarchistic communism and in criticism of President Roosevelt's message on anarchy. Since this arrest we have examined the pamphlet in question. So far as the criticism of Roosevelt is concerned, it is written in much better temper than are most political editorials and the gravamen of the charge is fully sustained. As to the anarchistic communism which is advocated, while we do not accept it but distinctly and we believe intelligently reject it, we are at a loss to know why anybody should be arrested or prosecuted or be in anywise personally condemned for writing or publishing it. Yet the police magistrate before whom the sellers of this pamphlet were haled, was so indignant that he refused to be satisfied with the charge that the prisoners had sold the pamphlets without having a license, and remanded them until he could discover if possible some law under which they might be prosecuted for inciting "anarchy." Whoever will read the pamphlet will, while running no greater risk than that of getting a wider horizon for his world of thought, be apt to conclude that the solicitous New York magistrate is probably a good deal of a demagogue. Demagogues do not ply their trade, however, unless there are masses of people willing to be fooled. Is it not time, then, for the people to put these anarchy baiters out of business? Why should the masses of the people any longer raise a hue and cry against free speech whenever demagogues label it "anarchy," and so furnish a convenient noise to conceal the operations of the truly dangerous anarchists—those who live in palaces instead of tenements, and go to the Senate instead of the jail? These anarchists were justly held up to public execration at a ministers' meeting in Cleveland this week by the pastor of John D. Rockefeller's church, the Rev. Dr. Charles A. Eaton. "Anarchy," he said, "is rampant everywhere. The anarchists are

not all poor men. . . . The man who gets rich at the expense of the people is an anarchist of the worst kind." It would be better to get seriously to work pulling down this kind of anarchy, than to chase poor men into jail for publishing wholesome criticisms of the President's message and legitimate essays on the foundation principles of government.

CONAN DOYLE ON THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE BOER WAR.

Much ado is made by British partisans just now over A. Conan Doyle's plea for the British government in connection with the war in South Africa. * It is a remarkable fact that pro-British apologists, who exploit this pamphlet with an ingenuous confidence quite pathetic, should be wholly ignorant of or indifferent to A. M. S. Methuen's "Peace or War in South Africa." ** Mr. Methuen, head of the Methuen publishing house of London, had approved the ministerial policy until he made a careful personal study, from original documents, of the origin of the war, of which study his book is an outcome. He was therefore as unbiased as possible. He certainly was not a Boer partisan to begin with. And the whole spirit of his book is judicial. Had Methuen come to a pro-British conclusion, it is easy to imagine the enthusiasm with which British "patriots" would have promoted its circulation and sworn by its covers.

But Methuen's book has no charm for them. This is certainly not because it is an unworthy product. In literary quality it is by no means inferior to Doyle's book, while it greatly excels Doyle's in its fullness and fairness of historical statement, in its documentary citations and in its non-partisan spirit. The reason why Methuen's book has no charms for British imperialists must be because the

* If not elsewhere procurable it may be had of George N. Morang & Co., Limited, of Toronto, for ten cents.

** Methuen & Co., 36 Essex street, W. C., London. American readers may procure it of the American Transvaal League, room 14, 88 La Salle street, Chicago.

author fails to support his country's cause, right or wrong.

That mistake has been avoided by Dr. Doyle. A war partisan, he has approached the task of defending the British government in the spirit of a partisan, and his conclusions are partisan conclusions. His plea is highly acceptable, therefore, to British "patriots," who seem to be more concerned to have their cause justified than to try it upon its merits.

The Doyle pamphlet begins with a chapter on the Boer people, which is followed by one on the cause of the quarrel and another on the negotiations preceding the Boer ultimatum. After that there are chapters on the peace negotiations, on farm burning, reconcentrado camps, British soldiers, etc. The only parts of the pamphlet, however, that can be considered without raising contested issues of fact, are those which relate to the moral responsibility for the war and rest upon record evidence. So long as the British continue censoring dispatches from South Africa, so long must their own indorsements of certificates to their own good behavior there be suspected. It is to be observed, also, that as no questions of British barbarity would have arisen but for the war, the moral responsibility for that is after all the turning point in the whole controversy.

We shall accordingly confine our review of Dr. Doyle's pamphlet to that one crucial point. Are the Boers morally responsible for the war, or is it the British government?

I.

For the discussion of that question Dr. Doyle thinks it proper, and we fully agree with him, to go back to the establishment of the Transvaal republic as a sovereign nation.

That was in 1852, when, as Dr. Doyle correctly states—

the British government guaranteed to the Boer farmers the right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves by their own laws without any interference upon the part of the British.

As there was no change in this condition until 1877 the Transvaal was for twenty-five years a sovereign state, with all the rights, under internation-

al law, that pertain to the mightiest power on earth.

But in 1877, while the Boers were resisting an invasion by native tribes—

Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the British commissioner, after an inquiry of three months, solved all questions by the formal annexation of the country.

So says Dr. Doyle, who adds:

The fact that he took possession of it with a force of some 25 men, showed the honesty of his belief that no armed resistance was to be feared.

If the force was in fact so small, it doubtless did show precisely that. But Dr. Doyle neglects to explain why Shepstone entertained the honest belief that he need fear no armed resistance. The reason was that the burghers were out on the frontiers resisting the threatened invasion of their homes by savages. Shepstone had gauged the time well for what Doyle euphemistically calls "formal annexation." And Doyle exposes the flimsiness of the shop-worn excuse for Shepstone, that his object was to save the Boers from destruction by their savage enemies, for a force of 25 British troops would hardly have been adequate to assist in opposing a native invasion, however sufficient it may have proved to be to revive dominion over a little republic while its fighting men were battling with savages on the frontier.

Dr. Doyle refers to this Shepstone exploit as constituting "a complete reversal" of the treaty whereby Great Britain had acknowledged Transvaal independence. In other words, Shepstone broke the treaty; and, his government confirming the act, this bad faith and bold violation of international law, became "the opening," to quote from Dr. Doyle, "of a new chapter in the history of South Africa."

It is to be noted as an indication of Dr. Doyle's light and airy way of dealing with his subject that not only does he call this conquest a "formal annexation"—as if one should speak of pocket picking as a "formal appropriation"—but he declares that—

there did not appear to be any strong feeling at the time against the annexation—

although in the same paragraph in

which he states that conclusion he nullifies it with the admission that—a memorial against the measure received the signatures of a majority of the Boer inhabitants—

an admission which he hastens with the speed of a "swift" witness to modify by the remark that—

there was a fair minority who took the other view.

Dr. Doyle follows up this revolutionary episode in South African history with a deplorably weak defense of the "annexation." But the facts he concedes are infinitely more important than his eccentric reasoning. They uncover the clew to the moral responsibility for the present war.

Here was an independent nation. Whether it was a big nation or a little one is immaterial; little or big, it is all the same so far as natural rights and moral principles go. This nation was "formally annexed" by a British armed force, in violation of a British treaty, and against the formal protest of a majority of the inhabitants. There is reason to believe, also, that bribery played a part in the business. It has been charged, and Dr. Doyle confirms the charge by saying that Burghers, the president, after formally objecting to the "annexation"—

took up his abode in Cape Colony, where he had a pension from the British government.

But bribery or no bribery, the sovereignty over the country was not restored to Great Britain by treaty or other solemn act of recession. It was therefore taken back by conquest; for there are only two ways in which a sovereign nation can lose its sovereignty, one being conquest and the other voluntary cession. As there was no voluntary cession in this case the acquisition must have been by conquest.

Upon conquest, then, and not upon any more honest or honorable basis, all the subsequent claims of Great Britain in the Transvaal rest. Is it claimed that the Transvaal is not a sovereign state, and therefore cannot be a party to international arbitration? Then it is because she was divested of her sovereignty by British conquest. Is it claimed that her internal affairs were subject to British regulation? Then it is because Great Britain acquired that authority by conquest. Let the responsibility for the war and all the horrors that have followed be put to any test, the ques-

tion still harks back to this conquest of 1877.

II.

Proceeding with Dr. Doyle's narrative, we read of the Boer rising in 1880 to reverse the Shepstone conquest and reestablish independence. After the British defeat at Majuba hill, a compromise treaty was made, in 1881, which turned the Transvaal into what Dr. Doyle aptly describes "as a curious hybrid thing, such as the world has never seen." This treaty was replaced in 1884 by another; and it is out of these two treaties that the quarrel directly arises.

Great Britain claimed authority under the treaties to interfere in the internal affairs of the Transvaal. On this point the word "suzerainty," used in the preamble of the treaty of 1880 but omitted altogether from the treaty of 1884, played a part; and Dr. Doyle says of it:

This suzerainty was declared in the preamble of the first treaty and no mention of it was made in the second. Was it thereby abrogated or was it not? The British contention is that only the articles were changed, and that the preamble continued to hold good for both treaties. They point out that not only the suzerainty, but also the independence, of the Transvaal is proclaimed in that preamble, and that if one lapses the other must do so also. On the other hand, the Boers point to the fact that there is actually a preamble to the second convention, which would seem therefore to take the place of the first. As a matter of fact the discussion is a barren one, since both parties agree that Great Britain retained certain rights over the making of treaties by the Republic, which rights place her in a different position to an entirely independent state. Whether this difference amounts to a suzerainty or not is a subject for the academic discussion of international jurists. What is of importance is the fact, not the word.

While the fact, and not the word, "suzerainty," is indeed the important consideration, there is nothing in the treaties except the word to create the fact—nothing with reference to internal affairs.

Dr. Doyle implies that the rights reserved by the British "over the making of treaties by the Republic," comprehend the rights which Great Britain has asserted. But nothing could be farther from the truth. Great Britain has asserted rights of interference, as "suzerain," over the internal affairs of the Republic, rights

which could by no possibility be involved in her reserved powers over treaty-making.

This is easily demonstrated.

In the treaty of 1884 are many clauses. They describe the boundaries of the republic, change its name from Transvaal to Southern African Republic, provide for a British consulate at Pretoria, regulate a variety of details having no bearing on the present question, and cover the subject of commercial relations in substantially the same manner as is common to commercial treaties between independent nations. In none of these clauses was any authority over the internal affairs of the Republic reserved. If, then, such authority is to be inferred from the reservations as to treaty-making, as Dr. Doyle implies, we must find it in the following clause, which is a full quotation of all the treaty specifies on that subject:

The South African Republic will conclude no treaty or engagement with any state or nation, other than the Orange Free State, nor with any native tribe to the eastward or westward of the Republic, until the same has been approved by her majesty, the queen. Such approval shall be considered to have been granted if her majesty's government shall not, within six months after receiving a copy of such treaty (which shall be delivered to them immediately upon its completion) have notified that the conclusion of such a treaty is in conflict with the interests of Great Britain or of any of her majesty's possessions in South Africa.

That this reservation prevented the South African Republic from being an "entirely independent" state, no one disputes. But to infer, as Dr. Doyle does, that it has the effect of a reservation of power over any of the internal affairs of the Republic—which is the real point at issue, for there has been no quarrel over any treaty-making question—is very much like pettifogging.

As to the British claim of suzerainty, as Dr. Doyle formulates it, the argument for that is pettifogging pure and simple. To requote him:

The British contention is that only the articles were changed, and that the preamble continued to hold good for both treaties. They point out that not only the suzerainty, but also the independence, of the Transvaal is proclaimed in that preamble, and that if one lapses, the other must do so also.

There is richness indeed. One country having made a conquest of

another is soon afterward forced to relinquish the conquest. It is able to reserve, however, certain of the fruits of conquest, which it does in two treaties. One of these treaties acknowledges anew the independence of the conquered country, but with a "suzerain" reservation. The country so recognized becomes in fact, save for that reservation, as independent as it was before the conquest. After so existing for three years it enters into the second treaty with the suzerain power. This treaty is declared to be a substitute for the other; and the "suzerain" clause—which happens also to be the restoration-of-independence clause—is omitted.

The manifest object of the second treaty is not to degrade but to exalt, not to narrow the independence but to extend it. And it does extend it so far as to authorize the republic to make treaties—a right reserved in the former treaty to the diplomatic agencies of Great Britain—which treaties shall stand unless vetoed within six months, and with one nation shall be exempt even from this veto clause.

The statesman who would seriously argue that under those circumstances the omission from the second treaty of the clause containing recognition of independence subject to suzerainty, operates to abrogate the independence if it abrogates the suzerainty, isn't fit to sit as a justice of the peace in the trial of a horse case.

The facts are that the treaty of 1881, the first of the two, accorded to the Transvaal—

complete self-government, subject to the suzerainty of her majesty, her heirs and successors;

and that the treaty of 1884, the second of the two, declared that—
the following article of a new convention, signed on behalf of her majesty by . . . and in behalf of the Transvaal State (which shall hereafter be called the South African Republic) . . . shall . . . be substituted for the articles embodied in the convention of 3d August, 1881.

This substitution wiped out the treaty of 1881 entirely. That is the function of a substitute. It would be absurd, therefore, to say that any "suzerain" reservation in the former treaty was carried over into the latter without being re-declared.

We have said that the principle of this pro-British contention would be unworthy a justice of the peace in a horse case, and we repeat it.

Suppose John Doe had sold a

horse to Richard Roe, and, having afterward stolen it, had compromised with Roe by an agreement that Roe was thereafter to own the horse subject to the "suzerainty"—a right, for instance, to regulate the manner of driving the horse—which was reserved to Doe. Suppose that this suzerainty annoyed Roe, and he negotiated for and secured a new agreement, expressly declared to be a substitute for the other, which new agreement reserved the right to Doe to regulate the driving of the horse only in foreign countries, and said nothing whatever about either ownership or "suzerainty." Then, when they have gone to law over Doe's attempt to regulate the driving of the horse not only abroad but at home, suppose that Doe sets up the old "suzerainty" clause in his defense. Suppose he should say that this clause remained in force by implication as a modification of the new agreement; suppose Roe should answer that the new agreement was a substitute for the other, and as it said nothing of suzerainty it therefore abrogated that clause; suppose Doe should reply that if this were true, then the ownership clause also was abrogated because the new agreement said no more about the ownership than about the "suzerainty." What would a competent justice of the peace say to that reply? Would he not say in effect: "Ownership of a horse once established cannot be presumed to have been abrogated by any subsequent agreement, made with the owner as owner, in consequence of the mere omission to re-declare it in express terms in the new agreement; but liens or conditions qualifying an established ownership are abrogated by omission to declare them in new agreements which are unmistakably substitutes. That is what a justice of the peace competent to try a horse case would say.

But if Mr. Joseph Chamberlain happened to be the justice of the peace in such a case, and were dull enough or corrupt enough to apply the same principles that he asks to have applied to the Boer treaties, he would decide otherwise. He would hold either (1) that the clause of ownership with the qualification was by implication part of the substitute; or (2) that if the qualification of ownership had been abrogated by failure to re-declare it in the substitute, then the ownership itself was abrogated for failure to re-declare it; and accordingly he would give judgment restoring the horse to the man who original-

ly stole it. It would not be safe, if Chamberlain were the only justice of the peace in a community, to make compromise agreements in that community with horse thieves.

The justice and common sense of the principle that self-government once established has all presumptions in its favor, while suzerainty has all presumptions against it, are almost too plain for elucidation. Like some propositions in mathematics and others in morals, this is self-evident. Though the suzerainty by treaty of one nation over another must be expressed in some form or it does not exist, and having been expressed ceases to exist if the expression of it is omitted from substitute treaties, the reverse is true of independence. Once recognized and exercised, the independence of a nation continues until in some form it is expressly abrogated. Abrogation of independence can neither be presumed nor implied.

To mention for illustration a case which American readers will appreciate, it is inconceivable that any treaty between this country and England, agreed upon as a substitute for the treaty of Paris of 1783, could by any possibility, by the mere omission from the new treaty of the independence clause of the old one, operate to restore the American states to their former status as British colonies. Yet every right reserved to Great Britain in the treaty of Paris would be abrogated by merely omitting it from a substitute treaty.

The British contention that the suzerainty clause in the Boer treaty of 1881 is by implication part of the substitute treaty of 1884 derives its only plausibility from the fact, alluded to by Dr. Doyle, that this clause appears in the preamble of the former treaty, and that the latter treaty is a substitute not in respect to the preamble but only to the articles which it introduces; in other words that in 1884 the contracting powers repealed the articles of the treaty of 1881, but not the preamble.

Unfortunately for that view, the treaty of 1884 has a preamble of its own. Nor does there appear to have been any such crying need for two preambles as to warrant the inference that it was intended to preserve the old one.

Moreover, as matter of fact, the old one was not preserved; but on the contrary, as may be seen by reference to British "blue book C."—9507.

pp. 26-27, it was marked for omission, by the British colonial secretary, Lord Derby, in the course of the negotiations for the new treaty.

There is no room for honest doubt that the suzerainty preamble was carefully struck out and left out, with the deliberate purpose of advancing the South African Republic from a province to a nation, and of investing it with all the attributes and powers of independence, save only the right to make treaties contrary to the South African interests of Great Britain. Whatever legal rights of interference Great Britain may have since had in respect to the foreign affairs of the Transvaal she has had none in respect to its domestic affairs.

III.

That was the state of the republic when the present war was begun by the Jameson raid—1895-96. Having considered that raid last week (vol. iv., p. 819) as the true beginning of the war, and especially with reference to Dr. Doyle's book, we need say but a few words about it here.

The British ministry disclaims responsibility for the raid. But Dr. Doyle allows the responsibility to rest upon Cecil Rhodes.

As Cecil Rhodes was then premier of the British government of Cape Colony; as he was director of the politico-commercial government of the Chartered company which Great Britain had empowered to exploit the land to the west and north of the South African Republic; as the raiders whom he permitted to attack this peaceful neighbor were officered by British army officers and carried the British flag; as nobody was seriously punished, and Rhodes himself was not even proceeded against or in any other manner held to account; as the raid, had it been successful, would doubtless have been adopted by the British government just as the equally unauthorized Shepstone raid had been 19 years before; and as all the diplomatic warfare which Great Britain waged with the Republic between the defeat of the Jameson expedition in 1877 and the waging of bloody warfare in 1899, was in furtherance of the same purposes as that expedition,—as these were the facts, the Boers had good reason for believing that the British government instigated the raid, and for fearing that it would follow it up with further aggression. Whether that government was technically responsible for the raid or not is of minor

importance. And it now transpires that the Boers' fears at least were justified. The object of Mr. Rhodes, as stated by himself, was—

to make South Africa an integral part of the British empire.

This statement was published after his death.

IV.

The negotiations that followed the Jameson raid are described by Dr. Doyle. His narration of the domestic conditions in the Republic with reference to the alien population of the mining towns is of no interest, except as the testimony of a partisan upon questions of fact which are both contested and confronted with countervailing allegations. Nor is it important to the main question. Even if the complaints recited by Dr. Doyle were true, Great Britain had no more right to dictate to the Transvaal a basis of suffrage for aliens as a remedy than China would have to dictate to the United States a basis of suffrage for Chinamen to remedy the abuses they suffer here, which are almost identical in kind and worse in degree than those complained of by the Transvaal aliens. On the undisputed and indisputable record facts, Great Britain had no more right to dictate the domestic policy of the South African Republic than she would have to dictate that of Russia, Germany or the United States. She had only the right of might.

Yet that is what the British government undertook to do, when the disaster to the Jameson-Rhodes raid had prevented a repetition of the Shepstone episode through the *ex post facto* adoption by the government of the fruits of an "unauthorized" conquest.

The question selected for the negotiations, says Dr. Doyle—

was that of the franchise for the uitlanders [aliens], for it was evident that if they obtained, not a fair share—such a request was never made—but any appreciable share in the government of the country, they would in time be able to relieve their own grievances, and so spare the British government the heavy task of acting as their champions.

That is, by means of the ballot, to be placed in the hands of great bodies of the more or less transient aliens of the mining towns and camps, this part of South Africa was to become, as Shepstone had made it by one "unau-

thorized" raid and as Rhodes had hoped to make it by another, an "integral part of the British empire."

The aliens were not to abjure their original allegiance. Such as were British subjects were to remain British subjects, but with Boer voting rights. Express objection was made by the British to laws requiring applicants for naturalization to take oaths abjuring original allegiance. It was argued that the act of becoming naturalized terminates previous obligations of allegiance without an oath. But if that argument was made in good faith, why object to the oath of abjuration? The United States requires it; why not the Transvaal? There is but one explanation. It might have stood in the way of making all South Africa "an integral part of the British Empire."

That this distinctively domestic policy of citizenship qualifications and voting rights which Great Britain undertook to dictate, was the issue between the two countries, is clearly revealed by Dr. Doyle in describing the negotiations:

Milner [the British representative] contended for a five years' retroactive franchise, with provisions to secure adequate representation for the mining districts. Kruger offered a seven-years' franchise, coupled with numerous conditions which whittled down its value very much.

After weeks of negotiation the Boers thus came to British terms on this domestic question; but they demanded in return that the pretense of "suzerainty"—the unfounded character of which we have already seen—should be abandoned. Here is Doyle's way of telling about that:

The proposal was made that the Boer government should accede to the franchise proposals of Sir Alfred Milner, on condition that the British government withdrew or dropped her claim to a suzerainty, agreed to arbitration by a British and South African tribunal, and promised never again to interfere in the internal affairs of the Republic.

This fair and pacific offer was refused by the British government. Mr. Chamberlain has since pettegged over the government's answer, professing that it was intended as an acceptance; and Dr. Doyle, taking Chamberlain's cue, speaks gingerly of the answer as indicating that— for a moment there seemed now to be a fair prospect of peace. There was

no very great gap between the two parties.

But there was a very great gap, indeed, as Dr. Doyle's own statement of the fact shows; for what Chamberlain answered was, as Doyle summarizes it, that Great Britain—

would agree to such arbitration; that she hoped never again to have occasion to interfere for the protection of her own subjects, but that with the grant of the franchise all occasion for such interference would pass away; and finally that she would never consent to abandon her position as suzerain power.

That question of suzerainty, raised by Chamberlain in bad faith and without even technical justification, for the evident purpose of enabling Great Britain to supervise the domestic affairs of the Transvaal, and in time by one means and another to make it and all the rest of South Africa "an integral part of the British Empire," was the vital point in dispute. It was to secure immunity from further domestic interference on this pretense of suzerainty that the Boers had been willing to compromise by complying with the unwarranted demand of Great Britain as to voting rights for aliens. Consequently, when Mr. Chamberlain declined to accept that condition as part of the compromise, he declined the whole offer and imperiously asserted the overlordship of Great Britain as to all Transvaal affairs—both foreign and domestic.

Naturally, therefore, to continue quoting Doyle, the Boers—
withdrew their offer of the franchise. They reasserted the nonexistence of the suzerainty. The negotiations were at a deadlock.

That was September 2, 1899. Six days later, says Dr. Doyle, the British ministry—

held a cabinet council—one of the most important in recent years. The military situation was pressing. The handful of troops in Africa could not be left at the mercy of the large and formidable force which the Boers could at any time hurl against them.

At the same time the British government gave warning to the Boers, proceeds Dr. Doyle—

repudiating emphatically the claims of the Transvaal to be a sovereign international state in the same sense in which the Orange Free State is . . .

This was a subterfuge intended to justify the British claim of suzerainty as to domestic affairs, on the absurd basis of the British right

to veto foreign treaties. The government also suggested unconditional compliance with the British demand as to voting rights. This warning closed with the intimation, says Dr. Doyle, that if the reply should be negative or inconclusive, the British government—

must reserve to themselves the right to reconsider the situation de novo and to formulate their own proposals for a final settlement.

If that was not a threat to compel submission, by force of arms if need be, no such threat was ever put in diplomatic phrase. The Jameson raid was evidently now reorganizing, again with British army officers and under the British flag, but this time with the authority and in the name of the British government.

Since their national existence was at stake, the Boers declined in their answer to surrender it; and on the 22d of September, 1899, the British government gave notice, accordingly (again quoting Dr. Doyle), that—

now, in accordance with their promise, they would shortly put forward their own plans for a settlement.

"This message," comments Dr. Doyle, naively, "was not an ultimatum, but it foreshadowed an ultimatum in the future."

Precisely. "It foreshadowed an ultimatum in the future." And pray what is the difference, so far as moral responsibility for forcing a war is concerned, between an ultimatum and an irreducible demand "foreshadowing an ultimatum"?

By Dr. Doyle, then, this much vaunted apologist for British oppression in South Africa, we are thus assured of what intelligent observers already knew, that the ultimatum of the Boers of October 9, 1899, on the basis of which they have been charged with forcing an unnecessary war, was only a reply to the British demand of September 22, 1899, a fortnight before, "foreshadowing an ultimatum." That is, the Boer is culpable, in pro-British estimation, because he got his ultimatum out before the British had formulated the one of which they had given advance notice.

This "foreshadow" of a British ultimatum was followed by the calling together of the British parliament, the calling out of the British reserves, the rushing of troops to South Africa, and in general by all the indications of an intention to formulate

demands to be handed to the Boer government on the point of a bayonet. Yet Dr. Doyle, after reciting these facts, and presumably thinking them over, has buried them so far out of sight in the depths of his partisan rhetoric, that he can innocently comment upon the situation on the eve of the Boer ultimatum in this irresponsible fashion:

It has been stated that it was the action of the British in calling out the reserves [Oct. 7] which caused the ultimatum from the Boers and so precipitated the war. Such a contention is absurd, for it puts the cart before the horse. The Transvaal commandos had mobilized upon September 27 and those of the Free State on October 2.

While these dates would go to show that it was not the calling out of the British reserves on the 7th of October that caused the mobilization of the Boer troops on the 27th of September and the 2d of October, how can Dr. Doyle avoid the reasonable inference that the Boer mobilization was caused by the British "foreshadow" of a British ultimatum which darkened the South African sky on the 22d of September? And inasmuch as the Boer troops were not sent over the border until October 11, after the British had given out their "foreshadow" ultimatum, had called parliament together to vote war supplies, and had scorned the Boer ultimatum of the 9th—which, by the way, was part of a pacific offer to arbitrate all differences,—in view of this succession of events, how can he hold the Boers morally responsible for beginning the war, even along his own line of argument, without setting up for Great Britain the moral right to formulate irreducible demands to be enforced by the sword, and investing that imperial nation with privileges of immunity from responsibility for violence if the other fellow meets its threatening demands with a blow?

Here was an offer to arbitrate, even after Great Britain had foreshadowed an ultimatum to be enforced by war if necessary. How can the nation that offers to arbitrate be held responsible for bloodshed if the other nation, refusing to arbitrate, leaves no way open to peace save by conceding its demands?

Dr. Doyle says that Great Britain could not arbitrate the issue of suzerainty, because the very submission of that issue to arbitration would have amounted to a relinquish-

ment of her claim. That begs the question—which is the moral responsibility for the war. It is a proposition, therefore, which, technically sound or not, need not be discussed. Enough to say that if the issue of treaty interpretation which the British assertion of suzerainty involved had been submitted to an arbitration tribunal, and that tribunal had refused to construe the treaties, but had decided against Great Britain on the ground that merely by submitting the issue to peaceful adjudication instead of putting it to the test of the sword she had relinquished the claim on which she asked judgment, and held that the Transvaal had not thereby relinquished its opposing claim—it is sufficient to remark that if this had been the outcome it would have reflected sadly on the good faith or the intelligence of the arbitration tribunal. Probably only two characters could evolve such an impotent conclusion from such hopeful circumstances. One is Sherlock Holmes. The other is Joseph Chamberlain.

V.

It must not be supposed that the Boers had been long preparing for war, because Dr. Doyle says so. He asserts that they had been quietly doing this "even before the Jameson" raid. But on that point Sir Hercules Robinson, British governor of Cape Colony at the time, wrote in March, 1896, to his superiors [British blue book C—8063, p. 17] officially replying to a question:

Transvaal Republic and Orange Free State burghers are making military preparations, and I learn that Boers residing on the borders of Cape Colony and Natal are also arming, but the movement, so far as I can gather, is defensive and not offensive. Boers generally believe that the recent raid was, if not instigated, at all events connived at by her majesty's government, and that an attack upon their independence will be renewed on the first favorable opportunity.

Far seeing Boers! What they feared came to pass as speedily as possible after the non-invasive Robinson had been displaced by Sir Alfred Milner, who, with Chamberlain, shared Rhodes's ambition to see all South Africa "an integral part of the British Empire."

Neither are we to infer, because Dr. Doyle is reticent about it, that the British were making no military preparations before that cabinet

council of September 8, 1899, of which Dr. Doyle writes as if it were the first step of the British in the direction of military preparations. He who will take the trouble to run over the files of the London Times for 1899 will be richly rewarded on this point.

As early as June 19, army officers in India were pressing for appointments to service in the Transvaal. In the midst of the negotiations, and early in July, a large force was being organized "to dispatch to South Africa in the event of the negotiations" then "in progress with the government of the Transvaal proving unsuccessful." About the same time the ministry thanked Queensland for an offer of troops for service in the Transvaal, hoping "occasion will not arise; but if it should," etc. Canada offered a regiment about the middle of July. A combined Australian contingent was suggested about the same time. Men and officers left England July 15 for special service in South Africa. On August 7, a regiment left Cape Town for Ladysmith and another regiment was ordered from Gibraltar to the Cape. During this month the recruiting of local forces at Cape Town was brisk, and British troops were being mobilized at Mafeking. At the same time another regiment left Gibraltar for the Cape.

All this before the cabinet council about which Doyle writes.

On the very day of the council, September 8, several regiments in India were warned to prepare for service in South Africa at the shortest notice, and the council decided to forward 10,000 more troops, bringing the force up to 23,000. On the 15th the wives and children of British soldiers were advised to leave Ladysmith before October 10; and on the 18th, the first installment of troops from England direct left Southampton, with patriotic cheers from the populace for the mission of conquest on which they were bound and about which there was no reserve. A few days later British troops sailed from Bombay for Cape Town.

These events all preceded the British irreducible demand for voting rights in the Transvaal for aliens, which, according to Dr. Doyle, "was not an ultimatum" but "foreshadowed an ultimatum in the future."

After that "foreshadow" had been projected, but still before the fighting began, before the Boer ultimatum of "arbitrate or fight," even before the calling out of the British reserves and the summons to parlia-

ment, the reinforcement of British South Africa went on apace. On the 22d of September imperial troops arrived at Kimberley. On the 25th and 26th aggressive military movements of the British were reported by the Times, which on the 27th told of the departure of troops from Birkenhead, with the cheers of 40,000 enthusiastic British patriots ringing in their ears. On the 28th other movements of troops were reported and again on the 2d of October. And so the British war of conquest gathered momentum for the enforcement of the "foreshadowed" British ultimatum, while the Boers waited to learn the terms of that ultimatum, which, as they had been formally admonished on the 22d, would be formulated by the British government.

In these circumstances it is pitiable to find men so blinded by partisanship as to venture upon charging the Boers with precipitating the fighting of 1899. Especially so, almost ludicrously so, is Doyle's effort to shift the responsibility from British shoulders when he quotes an illiterate letter from an obscure Boer, writing to a friend and saying:

The war are by us very much. How is it there by you? News is very scarce to write; but much to speak by ourselves.

This letter, written, says Dr. Doyle, "some fourteen weeks before the declaration of war, when the British were anxious for and confident of a peaceful solution," is actually printed as evidence, even if only a "small straw" showing the current, that while the diplomatic negotiations were most promising the Boers were preparing to make aggressive war.

But if that is a "small straw," what of the greater straws—the whole sheaves and hay-wagon loads of straw—which show the imperialist current at that time in England? Doyle's pitifully insignificant piece of evidence, the letter quoted from above, was written in South Africa June 25, 1899. As it was part of Dr. Doyle's loot, captured by him in a deserted Boer farmhouse—into the secrets of which he was prying for "some souvenir which should be of no value,"—Mr. Chamberlain could not have seen or heard of it as early as June 26, 1899. It could not, therefore, have been the exciting cause in him of the war spirit to which he gave expression at Birmingham on that day—the day after the date of Doyle's farmhouse "find"—when he said, as

reported in the London Times of June 27:

I agree that moral pressure should be exhausted before any man talks of anything else. I agree that patience is a virtue which becomes the strong, but there is, I imagine, no responsible person who will pretend that after successive governments have recognized the danger of the position and have made persistent requests, the position can be allowed to remain as it is at present. Every man of sense must see that there comes a time when patience can hardly be distinguished from weakness, and when moral pressure becomes a farce which cannot be continued without loss of self-respect.

Which is the more indicative of the war spirit, Dr. Doyle's illiterate letter from an obscure Boer to his equally obscure friend, or this speech of the colonial minister of Great Britain delivered to an applauding British audience? The obscure Boer says, on the 25th of June, that "the war are by us very much;" and on the other side of the globe, on the 26th of the same month, Mr. Chamberlain says, at a time when, according to Dr. Doyle, "the British were anxious for and confident in a peaceful solution," that there comes a time "when moral pressure becomes a farce."

In the light of the events succeeding this speech, can there be any reasonable doubt that it was inspired by the same aggressive motive by which Cecil Rhodes was confessedly actuated—ambition to make the South African Republic "an integral part of the British Empire?"

So the evidence furnished by Dr. Doyle, when analyzed, only confirms what all the other evidence indicates, that the moral responsibility for precipitating the South African war rests upon the Salisbury ministry of Great Britain.

NEWS

No further information regarding the consultation between Vice President Schalkburger, of the South African Republic, and President Steyn, of the Orange Free State (vol. iv., p. 823), has been received. It is only known that they have come together under circumstances which inspire hopes of an early peace.

There are reports, however, of two additional battles, in which the fighting was severe and the losses heavy. They occurred in the southwestern

extremity of the Transvaal on the 31st. A British force which had started out to capture a Boer convoy was met by a large force of Boers, and the fighting lasted all day, terminating in the withdrawal of the Boers and resulting in a British loss of 27 killed and 147 wounded. At night a British force attempted to surprise a Boer camp, but was itself surprised and compelled to retreat under fire. Its loss is reported as 20 killed and 53 wounded, of which number a Canadian regiment, which bore the brunt of the rear guard action, lost 9 killed and 44 wounded. The reports are not very clear, but it would seem that these two battles were between the same opposing forces.

Since Gov. Heard, of Louisiana, questioned the American administration as to the breach of neutrality at the port of New Orleans (vol. iv., p. 823), where the British army maintains a station for the purchase and shipment of army mules and horses to South Africa, President Roosevelt has taken steps in the matter. At the cabinet meeting of the 4th, which was almost entirely devoted to the letter of Gov. Heard, the President ordered an investigation into the law and the facts of the case. An opinion on the law was accordingly rendered by Attorney General Knox on the 5th, and on the 7th Col. E. H. Crowder, an American army officer, designated to inquire into the facts, arrived in New Orleans. Nothing has yet been reported regarding his procedure except that on the 8th he exchanged notes with Capt. Fenner, the ranking member among the British officers at New Orleans who are directing the loading at that port of horses and mules upon British transports.

In consequence also of Gov. Heard's action Representative Sulzer, of New York, introduced in the House on the 4th a resolution reciting the circumstances and requesting the secretary of state to transmit to the House the governor's report and accompanying documents, affidavits, etc. No action has yet been taken on the resolution.

Another British army supply post has been discovered in the United States. It is at Lathrop, Mo., and is under the command of Maj. More, Capt. Gray and Capt. Caldwell, all of the British army. All the employes at the place—which was recently inspected by Gen. Sir Richard Stewart, of the British army—are reported to

be in the pay of the British war department. The mules and horses are shipped by way of New Orleans direct to Cape Town on board British transports.

From the Philippines (see vol. iv., pp. 663, 680, 695, 745, and week by week preceding), authentic news is now at hand tending to confirm the charges of barbarity on the part of American army officers, which have heretofore been strenuously and sweepingly denied. This news comes in Associated Press dispatches reporting the court-martial trial of Maj. Waller, now in progress at Manila. This officer led an expedition last winter into the interior of the island of Samar. After being given up for dead he and his party returned to camp, January 28, delirious from privation (iv. 680). Maj. Waller was next heard of in this connection in a dispatch of March 6 from Manila. He had been subjected to court-martial proceedings, on charges of having, while on this ill-fated expedition, executed natives of the island of Samar without trial. One of the specifications alleged that in one instance the accused had caused a native to be tied to a tree and on one day to be shot in the thigh, on the next in the arms, on the third in the body and on the fourth to be killed. Friends of Maj. Waller attributed his horrible actions to delirium caused by privation; but Maj. Waller himself refused to make this defense, insisting that he had acted under superior authority.

When the Waller trial began, March 17, Maj. Waller pleaded not guilty to the charge of murder, but admitted that while on his expedition he had ordered 11 natives to be shot. The taking of testimony has been proceeding, with some interruptions, ever since; but the press reports of it are too brief and disconnected to warrant any attempt at a full summary. The defense is directed to showing that Waller acted under orders. One of the witnesses on the 22d, Capt. David D. Porter, testified that he was with the Waller expedition, that he was present when Gen. Smith gave Maj. Waller his orders, and that Waller had not exceeded them. Maj. Waller himself testified on the 31st. In the course of his testimony he said that he had exceeded Gen. Smith's orders only in calling on his party to avenge the slaughter of their comrades at Balangiga (iv., 410), having strictly obeyed them in all other

respects. He said that Smith had virtually given him power of life or death by admonishing him to take no prisoners. Gen. Smith testified on the 7th, explaining that by his order about taking no prisoners he had meant Waller to understand that he should disarm prisoners not charged with serious offenses, and let them go. It was in rebuttal of this testimony that Maj. Waller, testifying again on the 8th, disclosed the startling nature of Gen. Smith's orders as he had understood them. He swore that Gen. Smith had said:

I wish you to kill and burn. The more you kill the more you will please me. The interior of Samar must be made a howling wilderness. Kill every native over ten years old.

In this testimony Maj. Waller was immediately corroborated by Capt. Porter and Lieut. Halford. The latter said that Maj. Waller did not wholly agree with Gen. Smith's order, for he commanded Porter not to kill old men, women and children.

The Senate investigation into the Philippine question is proceeding at Washington without other incident than the protest of minority members of the committee that important facts are being suppressed by the secretary of war.

In politics the only significant or interesting event of the week is the local election in Cleveland, which came off on the 8th. School officers, justices of the peace, the city treasurer and half the city council were the only officers to be voted for; but the success of the Democratic candidates derives importance from the fact that they were selected under the advice of Mayor Johnson and were elected by large majorities in a Republican city at a time when the Republicans were generally successful at the local elections elsewhere in Ohio. The Democratic pluralities on the general ticket were 2,308 for H. D. Coffinberry for city treasurer and 4,011 for Starr Cadwallader for director of schools; while 6 of the 11 vacant seats in the city council were won by the Democrats, making that body Democratic for the first time in 14 years. Only one of the corrupt members of the expiring part of the previous council was reelected, one being defeated, and seven not being renominated. One of the 5 Republicans elected—Springborn—was a member of the previous council and was heartily supported by Mayor Johnson in

recognition of his straight record in that body on the street car question.

This question is now in the courts. As heretofore reported in these columns (vol. iv., p. 792), a 3-cent street car franchise had been granted by the city council to John B. Hoefgen, the only bidder on a call for bids. He has assigned to the People's Railway Co. The ordinance provides not only for 3-cent fares, but also for the early acquisition by the city of Cleveland of the road to be built, whenever the city shall have authority and shall decide to acquire it. Various obstructions were put in the way of this enterprise, to which Mayor Johnson was pledged by his election a year ago, the existing companies having combined to secure a renewal of their expiring privileges. Failing to prevent the granting of the franchise these combined organizations have prompted certain frontage owners along the route of the proposed road to resist its construction. They had evidently intended to take no open action until after the election, fearing the effect upon the popular vote; but Mr. Hoefgen began the construction of the new road on the 3d, and without waiting for the election the old road party thereupon immediately procured an injunction stopping his work. The injunction was granted without notice, last Sunday afternoon, by Judge Dissette; and April 14 is set for the argument to continue or dissolve it.

NEWS NOTES.

—On the 7th both houses of Congress passed a bill repealing the war revenue act.

—The legislature of Maryland has enacted a bill admitting women to the bar.

—Lord Kimberley, once a member of Gladstone's cabinet, died on the 8th, at the age of 76.

—The Russian treaty for the evacuation of Manchuria (vol. iv., p. 823) was signed at Peking on the 8th.

—The court of civil appeals of Texas decided on the 2d that the Texas anti-trust act is unconstitutional.

—The "Allied People's Party of the United States" (vol. iv., p. 822) completed its organization at Louisville on the 3d.

—A combination or trust of hardware jobbing interests, representing nearly every important trade center of the country, was announced on the 9th. The capitalization is to be \$120,000,000.

—By his will Cecil Rhodes devotes the bulk of his fortune to the establishment of scholarships at Oxford with a view to encouraging a brotherly feeling among the English-speaking peoples of the world.

—A memorial meeting in honor of the late John P. Altgeld was held in Cooper Union, New York, on the 3d. Henry George, Jr., was chairman, and Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago, the principal speaker.

—Dr. R. Heber Newton, the widely known rector of All Souls Protestant Episcopal church, of New York, has resigned, to accept the pastorate of the Leland Stanford, Jr., University church in California.

—A "Theocratic party" was organized at Zion City, Ill., on the 7th by the followers of Dowie, who have built that town. Its candidates for city officers were elected without opposition. The party is to be national in scope.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for March shows on hand March 31:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Gold reserve fund | \$150,000,000 00 |
| Available cash balance..... | 177,856,289 04 |
| Total | \$327,856,289 04 |
| On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901..... | 326,832,124 02 |
| Increase | \$1,023,165 02 |

—The candidate of organized labor for mayor of Hartford, Conn., Ignatius A. Sullivan, was elected on the 7th, his nomination by the Democratic party having been secured. The usual Republican majority of 3,000 was changed to a majority of 600 the other way. The new mayor is a clothing store clerk.

—On the 5th the grand jury at St. Louis made a report to the criminal court, presided over by Judge O'Neill Ryan, which denounces the city council as guilty of bribery and perjury. Four well known and wealthy citizens of the city have been indicted in connection with the corruption, which relates to street car franchises.

—The vote cast for side parties at the Chicago election of April 1, last, as found by the official count, is somewhat higher than that reported by the press (vol. iv., p. 821) the day after the election. The total vote cast was 213,857, of which the—

| | |
|---|-------|
| Socialist party received | 6,311 |
| Prohibition party received..... | 2,928 |
| Single tax party received..... | 1,904 |
| making a total of 11,143, or about 5% per cent. of the whole. | |

—At the request of Peter Van Vlis-singen, secretary of the Yates committee for the collection of relief funds in Illinois for the Boers in concentrated camps, President Roosevelt has forwarded \$5,000, collected by the committee, through the American consul at Cape Town, to the camps. Requests are now made that checks of one dollar, drawn to the order of Theodore Roosevelt, be sent to the

secretary of the committee, 88 La Salle St., room 14, Chicago.

—The official count of the Chicago vote at the municipal election of the 1st shows a larger vote upon and majority for the referendum (vol. iv., p. 821) than did the newspapers. The total vote cast at the election was 213,857, while that on the referendum was as follows:

| | For. | Against. | Majority For. |
|--|---------|----------|---------------|
| Municipal ownership of street railways | 142,826 | 27,998 | 114,828 |
| Municipal ownership of lighting plants | 139,999 | 21,369 | 118,630 |
| Nominations at primaries | 140,860 | 17,954 | 122,906 |

—The March treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1901, shows the following:

| Receipts: | | |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Tariff | \$190,181,892 30 | |
| Internal revenue | 208,895,911 82 | |
| Miscellaneous | 24,766,076 38 | |
| | | \$419,002,879 50 |
| Expense: | | |
| Civil and misc | \$85,546,971 31 | |
| War | 86,734,000 64 | |
| Navy | 51,322,584 82 | |
| Indians | 7,931,884 14 | |
| Pensions | 104,496,824 69 | |
| Interest | 21,752,866 47 | |
| | | \$367,844,901 97 |
| Surplus | | \$61,157,967 53 |

—A national committee, of which Senator Bucklin, of Colorado, is chairman, Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, being chairman of the executive committee, and Lawson Purdy and August Lewis, of New York, secretary and treasurer respectively, has been organized for the purpose of collecting funds to promote the agitation in Colorado in favor of the Australasian tax amendment to be voted on in that state next fall. The Illinois branch committee was organized this week, with Edward Osgood Brown, of Chicago, as chairman and treasurer, and U. A. H. Greene as secretary.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PHILIPPINES.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), April 9.—The testimony just brought out at the Waller court-martial in Manila is of the most startling nature. It came as a distinct shock to the American people when the charges of killing natives were first made against Maj. Waller and his companions. But now it must stagger the most enthusiastic expansionist to have the testimony of three officers to the effect that Maj. Waller was simply obeying the commands of his superiors. . . . The war department has a duty to perform in the premises.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), April 7.—The trouble in this whole business is that the sympathies of the American secretary of state have been all along with the British in their war for the conquest and subjugation of the South African republics.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), April 6.—There was a time in the history of this country when a revelation like that made by the governor of Louisiana would have stirred the people of every state in the Union and prompted a protest so vigorous and unmistakable that the politicians at

Washington would be compelled to heed the cry.

New Orleans Harlequin (Ind.), April 2.—The site where Jackson defeated the English in liberty's cause should not be the recruiting stamping-ground for those same English. Whatever the rest of the United States may think, this state should put itself on record by a unanimous concurrent resolution, calling upon the governor to put a stop to the traffic in horses from this port.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), April 7.—The people feel that it is bad enough to withhold all official expression of sympathy of the United States from the gallant handful who are holding the power of an empire at bay, without actually contributing aid for crushing them. This feeling is constantly growing and will assert itself.

New Orleans Times-Democrat (Dem.), April 4.—Gov. Heard, of Louisiana, has done not only this commonwealth, but also this nation, a notably high service. . . . It is now known of all men that Port Chalmette is, and has for months been, a British military camp, and that this camp is furnishing the British army in South Africa with the essential snaws of war. . . .

San Francisco Star (rad. Dem.), April 5.—If the state department will not act, Congress should. It is bad enough that the representatives of the Boer republics were denied recognition by our government, and that we have been forced by our own policy of criminal aggression to withhold the nation's "moral support" from them, but it is shameful that we should longer permit the use of American territory, in violation of the duties of a neutral nation, to further England's unholy cause.

OLEOMARGARINE.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), April 7.—There can be no question that the oleomargarine bill . . . is class legislation, and is designed to advance the consumers' price of one article of necessary food by increasing the cost of another and competing article by taxation. It rests on a vicious principle.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), April 4.—The bill is neither a revenue measure nor an anti-fraud measure. . . . But it is a waste of time and breath to continue argument against a measure begotten of politics and passed for political reasons only. Rational defense of it is impossible, and the sophistry invoked in its behalf has not deceived anybody.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), April 7.—The real object of the bill is to tax out one industry for the benefit of another. It is the result of a war between dairymen and the manufacturers of oleomargarine. . . . If this policy of taxing one food product for the benefit of another is continued, Congress might just as well tax one brand of sugar or flour, so as to give advantage to other favored brands. Oleomargarine has been found in the main to be as wholesome as butter. The proposition to tax it out of existence shows a growing tendency on the part of the national government to encroach upon the rights of local government.

SHIP SUBSIDY.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), April 4.—The probability is that the bill will be pigeonholed until after the congressional elections in November when its fate will depend on the way the elections go.

CHICAGO REFERENDUM.

Farmers Voice and National Rural (Agr.), Chicago, April 5.—The vote creates a working basis for future action; it determines the status of the questions involved so far as public sentiment is concerned, and gives to the leaders in advanced methods the strength and power of a well-organized, intelligent and determined public sentiment.

Cleveland Daily World (Rep.), April 7.—This fairly indicates what public opinion

is on these questions wherever it might have opportunity to find expression. Public ownership of public utilities is popular everywhere. It would no doubt prevail in Cleveland and in most other cities if opportunity were given the people to vote on it. The longer the experience with the system of private ownership the more general becomes the public discontent. This is not socialism, but business.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), April 3.—No greater victory for self-government and democratic institutions has been won since the era of corporation rule in municipalities began. It marks the advent of a time when cities will be conducted in the interest of the people and not for the enrichment of the syndicates which monopolize the streets of American cities. The result is bound to have a great educational effect upon the people of other cities, the governments of which are now in the grip of franchise monopolies. It is a ray in the darkness of boodle and corporation-owned municipalities.

COLORADO TAXATION.

Durango (Col.) Democrat (Dem.), April 2.—The Bucklin amendment is the trail that will lead to equitable taxation and it will be antagonized only by those who seek to dodge and evade a just share of taxation. The money changer and the land and lot speculator will be against the Bucklin amendment and against every other species of legislation that tends to honest government.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, Mar. 31-Apr. 5, 1902.

Senate.

When the Senate reassembled on the 21st, it resumed consideration of the oleomargarine bill. Mr. Patterson presented a hostile petition from the Cattle and Horse Growers' association of Colorado (p. 3677), and was followed by Mr. Simmons in an opposition speech (p. 3677). The other speakers of the day were Mr. Proctor (p. 3684), Mr. Mitchell (p. 3684), Mr. Dillingham (p. 3686), and Mr. McCumber (p. 3686). On the 1st Mr. Hetfield spoke against the bill (p. 3741), and Mr. Gallinger for it (p. 3745). Mr. Spooner was also one of the speakers (p. 3746). Mr. Bailey opposed the bill on the 2d (p. 3794), and was followed by Mr. Depew, who supported it (p. 3794). On the 3d Mr. Rawlins began the discussion (p. 3827), speaking against the measure, and being followed by Mr. Teller (3829), who was also against it, and by Mr. Foraker (p. 3830), who approved it. After Mr. Spooner (p. 3833) and Mr. Money (3833) had been heard, the bill came up for passage, pursuant to previous agreement, and being amended was passed (p. 3842) by a vote of 39 to 31. One of the Chinese exclusion bills (S. bill No. 2960) secured right of way as unfinished business on the 4th, when Mr. Mitchell (3881) opened the debate in favor of the bill; and at the conclusion of his speech several amendments were acted on (pp. 3896-3900). During the morning hour of the 5th the Indian appropriation bill was passed (p. 3834), and immediately afterward consideration of the Chinese exclusion bill was resumed. The principal speakers were Mr. Fairbanks (p. 3934), Mr. Lodge (p. 3938), Mr. Platt of Connecticut (p. 3941), and Mr. Gallinger (p. 3943). Upon the adjournment over Sunday this bill still held its place as unfinished business.

House.

Pursuant to a previous understanding, the consideration of the revenue cutter service bill was passed over on the 21st in favor of the sundry civil appropriations bill (p. 3683); and in the course of the debate over the latter, Mr. Hemenway spoke on the question of Chinese exclusion (p. 3683). Mr. Bell on the money question (3686), Mr. Spight on Negro suffrage in the South (p. 3702), Mr. Pou on the corrupt use of money in elections (p. 3706) and Mr. Williams of Mississippi on Chinese exclusion (p. 3706). The same bill being under con-

sideration on the 1st, Mr. Robinson spoke on the autocratic character of the House rules (p. 3748), and Mr. Grow on the election of senators by direct vote of the people, introducing a joint resolution of the Pennsylvania legislature approving this change (p. 3750). Mr. Sulzer offered an amendment appropriating \$50,000 or so much of that sum as necessary for the care of the lighting of the "Liberty Light" in New York harbor, to which he spoke (p. 3752), being opposed by Mr. Cannon (p. 3753); but his amendment was rejected, 67 to 61 (p. 3754). Following a desultory discussion on the 2d, and the adoption of several amendments, this bill was passed (p. 3812), and consideration of the revenue cutter service bill resumed and continued on the 3d, when it also was passed. After the urgent deficiency appropriation bill had been passed on the 4th (p. 3903), the House went into committee of the whole on the Chinese exclusion bill (H. bill No. 13031), in charge of Mr. Hitt, who opened the debate (p. 3904). Mr. Perkins (p. 3905), Mr. Clark (p. 3907), Mr. Adams (3913), Mr. Kahn (3913), Mr. Napfen (3913) and Mr. Palmer followed. Mr. Grosvenor discussed the bill on the 5th (p. 3947), as did Mr. Jett (p. 3948), Mr. Gillett (p. 3948), Mr. Otjen (p. 3949), Mr. Hooker (p. 3952), Mr. Brick (3956), and Mr. Lloyd (p. 3967); also (p. 3956) Mr. Kern, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Thayer and Mr. Green. The bill was still in committee of the whole when the House adjourned to the 7th.

Record Notes.—Speech of Senator Quarles on the oleomargarine bill, at p. 3661; and that of Senator Dillingham on the same subject at p. 3771; Senator Patterson on slavery in the Philippines at p. 3715; and Representative Adams on Chinese exclusion at p. 3921.

Text of Sulu treaty at p. 3716.

Receipt by Senate from Secretary of War of English translation of the proceedings of the Cuban constitutional convention, p. 3777.

Bills introduced: H. bill No. 13225 (p. 3820) to abolish slavery in the Philippines; H. bill No. 13327 (p. 3858) and No. 13363 (p. 2918) to fix the gold standard.

Report on bill to protect miners in the territories, quoted and passed in Senate (p. 3676).

MISCELLANY

THE PROPHETS.

For The Public.

'Twas a bright and beauteous planet,
Peopled by a race of slaves;
Godless fools, with hearts of granite,
Journeying on to shameful graves.

Braggart braves,
Graceless knaves,

Knowing not the truth that saves.

To this orb there came a Seer,
Teaching men as best he could,
Preaching truths men should revere—
Be ye brethren! God is Good!

Brotherhood!
God is Good!

Things we've never understood.

Ages passed. The age now passing,
Heedless yet of what he said,
Goes its way, its numbers massing—
Goes as did the ages dead.

Banners red,
Mercy fled!

Still with truth will not be fed.

Horde of selfish, warring nations,
Cheated, hindered by disputes;
Wearying God with invocations—
God, whose word their claims refutes.

Greedy brutes,
Hell's recruits,

Eating evil's bitter fruits.

But 'tis writ: A thousand ages
Are with God but as a day.
He will send us other sages,
Showing us the righteous way.

Cheering ray!

"Come!" we pray,

Aid them, brothers, as ye may.

STEPHEN BELL.

THE NEW CIVILIZATION IN THE SOUTH.

Col. Kirby, in his speech before the Progressive Union of New Orleans, is quoted as saying that "upon the Gulf of Mexico will be built up a civilization such as the world has never seen." Let us hope that when our great civilization shall come, the words "such as" will be found to refer to quality as well as to quantity.

Now that the South is entering upon an era of prosperity, is it not worth while to ask ourselves seriously whether we would not like to vary somewhat from the many civilizations of prosperity that the world has seen in its long day? There have been in the history of the world, in various countries, eras of great advance in prosperity, in wealth, in the refinements of luxury, in all the arts of cultivated life. Somehow none of these eras have had satisfactory results.

And why? Because the wealth and the culture were measured by the quantity of these concentrated in a class, and the civilization was thus narrow and exclusive, based in fact upon the servitude of the great masses of laborers.

And why could this be so? Because, by means of force or fraud, the natural sources of production, and various special privileges, were in the hands of a class, a well-named "privileged class."

If we want a civilization which shall rival the civilizations founded on this basis, we of the South stand now on the verge which leads thereto. Let us continue to grant special privileges and franchises without due return to the people; let us continue to tax labor and exempt monopoly; let us continue to elect to office men or their tools whose object it is to fleece the public under the catching watchword of "progress;" let us continue to do these things, and we shall reap just the civilization which the world has seen over and over.

The great need is that the men of head and heart among us should see a higher ideal of civilization—one in which prosperity shall not lead apart, which shall not separate man from man by a wider gulf, but shall be the prosperity of the wage-earner as well as of the capitalist.

We need to learn that all progress is not progress; that all prosperity is not prosperity. The prosperity that history tells of has invariably led to ruin.

It is clear that it must be so, as long as the principles of its distribution are unjust. For if THE PROGRESS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH IS INEQUITABLE, THEN IT MUST FOLLOW THAT THE GREATER THE WEALTH, THE GREATER WILL BE THE CLEAVAGE BETWEEN THOSE OF THE HOUSE OF HAVE AND THOSE OF THE HOUSE OF HAVE NOT. It is just this cleavage which has destroyed all the boasted civilizations of the past.—J. H. Dillard, in the Houston Weekly Times.

THE COMMONER'S SUBSIDY BILL.

Senate File No. 334,463,187.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR MUD-STREET MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN THE DEPOTS IN EVERY OLD VILLAGE AND THE POST OFFICE, TO PROMOTE DRAYAGE, AND TO ENCOURAGE ANY OLD THING THAT NEEDS IT, AND HAS GOT A PULL.

Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled.

TITLE.—Mail Conveying Vehicles.

Section 1. The postmaster general is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract for a term of not less than five years nor more than fifteen years, with American citizens possessed of any old kind of a vehicle drawn by any species of live stock, for the carrying of mails between the depots of all American railroads and the post offices of the government by the nearest route.

Section 2. That vehicles so employed in the mail service shall be owned by American citizens and drawn by live stock as follows, to-wit: First two years of such contract, by at least one mule and any other animal; during the next succeeding three years by at least two mules, and during the remainder of the time by at least one horse and one mule or two horses. Said animals shall be sound in wind and limb, with the exceptions that they may be afflicted with spavin, ringbone, glanders, stringhalt or blindness, but not more than three of said diseases at one and the same time. The vehicles shall have either wheels or runners as best suits the season, and in the case of unusually muddy roads they may be operated as scows.

It shall be stipulated in the contract that said vehicles may carry passengers with their baggage upon giving bond to pay fare and relieve the government from liability in case of wreck, runaway or failure to reach destination in time for dinner.

TITLE II.—General Subsidy.

Section 1. That from and after the 1st day of June, 1902, the secretary of

the treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this title out of any moneys not otherwise deemed the property of the syndicates and corporations, to the owner or owners of any dray, wheelbarrow, farm wagon or dump cart owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and being engaged at the time in hauling, transporting or carrying any old thing between points within the United States, one cent per hundred pounds for each one village or city block so hauled.

That compensation under this title shall not be allowed in respect of any of the following named vehicles:

A vehicle that is so badly greased that it squeaks.

A vehicle that has not been painted at least once during its whole existence.

A vehicle that has neither shafts nor tongue.

A vehicle that has been foreclosed under chattel mortgage.

A vehicle which is driven by any other person than a white man, black man, brown man, yellow man, sunburned man, a blonde man, or brunette man or a wife or daughter of said man in case the aforesaid man is too lazy to work for his own living.

That the blockage to be decided on under the title shall be determined by the nearest direct route around all mud holes, chuck holes, stumps and hog wallows. If during the trip the vehicle shall be stopped at two or more points to permit the driver to secure liquid refreshments or give the motive power of said vehicle a bag of oats or a wisp of hay, said stops shall be counted as a part of the distance traveled.

Section 2. That any vehicle, before receiving compensation under this title, shall have with it on each trip at least one spotted purp for each cubic yard of vehicle bed capacity and any other kind of a purp for each additional half yard cubic measurement of said bed.

Section 3. That the owner of said vehicle, before receiving compensation under this title, shall agree in writing to turn over said vehicle to the government of the United States whenever it is deemed necessary for the government's safety.

TITLE III.—Any Old Kind of Fishing.

Section 1. That from and after the 1st day of June, 1902, the secretary of the treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the public treasury any money not already

mortgaged to J. Pierpont Morgan or the Standard Oil Company, bounties as follows:

To any owner of said vehicle who shall carry friends to the nearest fishing resort, two dollars per passenger, provided that each passenger furnishes his own bait and gives bond to tell the truth about his catch.

TITLE IV.—General Provisions.

Section 1. The president of the United States shall from time to time enforce this act if he is not too busy changing his cabinet.—The Com-moner of April 4.

"THE BEST GOVERNED COMMUNITY IN THE WORLD."

THE AMBITION OF MAYOR TOM L. JOHNSON FOR CLEVELAND, O.

By Frederic C. Howe, of the Cleveland City Council, in the World's Work for February.

Walter Bagehot, with his keen insight into democratic institutions, has observed, in speaking of Sir Robert Peel, that the successful constitutional statesman is the man of "common opinions and uncommon abilities." He is the sort of man whose opinions are those of the street; who does not stray too far in advance of the current of popular opinion. He is a man of whom the average person will say that he is safe and sound. In much the same way Lord Palmerston once commented on a member of the English ministry—that he did something that he was not compelled to do, a most uncommon proceeding in a statesman.

Mr. Tom L. Johnson, the mayor of Cleveland, is not this type of man. His opinions are as uncommon as his abilities, and most of the things he does are things he is not compelled to do. And he does not wait for public opinion. He makes it, and, if necessary, breasts the waves which break about him.

Some time ago in a public meeting he resented being termed a "reformer." A reformer, he said, was like a crab, because he goes backwards. And under whatever name he may bear, Mr. Johnson is not going backwards. His ideas and achievements are revolutionary, radical, or just, according to the temperament of the onlooker.

Like Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Johnson became a successful politician after he had become a successful business man, and the career of the present colonial secretary of England as councilor and mayor of Birmingham offers many analogies to the mayor of Cleveland. Mr. Johnson frankly admits that his wealth came from special privileges; that

these privileges were public franchises, government patents, and the protective tariff, and that he does not believe in any of them. The protective tariff he strove to abolish while in congress; and as for public franchises, he would tax them, and, eventually, bring them under public ownership. As to the special privilege of private ownership in land, he would destroy this by the single tax. In his opinion, the present inequalities of wealth are largely traceable to special privileges, privileges acquired as free gifts from society and used under the powers thus acquired for personal profit. With these abolished, the worst economic evils of the day would remedy themselves by the free and unrestrained power of competition, and the country would adjust itself to a higher industrial and social plane.

Mr. Johnson does not discuss the fundamental principles of his philosophy. Possibly he has none, save a devotion to the principles of the single tax; and to the adherents of this idea the philosophy of Henry George alone is enough. But if it is possible to gather his political religion from his public utterances, it would seem to be the religion of justice. His attitude on privileges, as well as on the question of taxation, is but a corollary of this principle. For special privileges are a derogation of the equal rights of all in favor of a few.

Mr. Johnson is a strong man and he has overcome the greatest obstacles to success. To him the struggle for existence is natural, and it seems easy. The means of relief is greater freedom in the operation of nature's laws. And by conviction he has become the foremost exponent in America of the teachings of Henry George. Because of his belief, his life to many is a paradox. Identified by tradition and class instincts with wealth and conservatism (for he was born of an old Kentucky family), his political views have always been opposed to the means by which his wealth was created. In his youth he was employed in a subordinate capacity by a street railway company in Louisville. From that position he became an operator in similar properties in Indianapolis; and while still a very young man became an important factor in the Cleveland Street Railway situation. There he acquired a controlling interest in railways of apparently little value, which he developed by shrewd maneuvering into

a system of commanding importance to the other urban lines. When the time for consolidation arrived, he was so fortified as to secure a large interest in the consolidated properties, and to be an influence in the management of what is known as the Big Consolidated Railway. Since that time, with his brother Albert, he has operated railways on a large scale in the city of Brooklyn and the city of Detroit, and through the reorganization of street railways in these cities he has become a rich man. It is with this intimate knowledge of the street railway situation that he became mayor of Cleveland upon a platform of lower fares and ultimate municipal ownership. Even on the basis of private management, Mr. Johnson is a believer in low fares; and he says that he demonstrated while operating the railroads in Detroit that as much money can be made out of three-cent as out of five-cent fares; for a corresponding increase in traffic follows any reduction in rates, and any loss is made up by the great increase of short hauls and the wider dispersion of that portion of the population which now either walks to its work, or lives, through necessity, in the neighborhood of its employment.

Cleveland has always been a storm center in political matters. Probably no city in America contains a constituency more radical on industrial lines. The voting population is inclined to be independent, and a long agitation of franchise management has awakened the public to a full appreciation of the values of such properties. When Mr. Johnson declared in favor of municipal ownership, he adopted a platform with which the public were already familiar and which sounded in no sense revolutionary to the less conservative members of the community. By that he does not mean the acquisition of these properties at their present market value, which is many times the figures represented by the actual investment or the physical property. Ohio is fortunate in having limited franchises, and those of the street railways in Cleveland have but from three to thirteen years to run, some of them maturing in 1904. The immense volume of "water" in the stock of these companies must first be reduced by taxation and a lowering of fares. When that is done, or on the expiration of the franchises, the city can step in and take possession of the property at a fair valuation. Ulti-

mately, Mr. Johnson thinks that the street railway service should be free. Years ago toll roads were almost universal, and the highways of the country were obstructed by keepers who exacted a tax for permission to use them. Advancing civilization has seen their abolition. So, as time goes on, the railways will be maintained and supported by public taxation as a means of facilitating transit throughout the community. They are but part of the highway, an accessory existing for the same purpose as the streets themselves.

For the present, however, Mr. Johnson believes the chief object of municipal concern should be to see the equitable and proper taxation of such properties, the acquisition of the roadbeds, and, if advisable, the operation of the roads themselves for the municipal well-being. He does not believe in exacting profit from such industries, but the service should be rendered at cost.

To the conservative mind such suggestions are revolutionary, but the cultivated and well-to-do classes have ever been as fearful of catching revolution as an old woman of catching cold. To the argument that municipal operation will offer increased opportunities for machine politics, Mr. Johnson replies by pointing to the Brooklyn bridge, which has been operated for years and been perfectly free from political or machine control.

And Mr. Johnson is a devoted advocate of the single tax. With the introduction of this system he believes many of the industrial ills of the day would disappear, while the inequalities of taxation would be eliminated and the entire burden of government would be laid upon that fund which is the creation of society and not of individual labor. It is probable that the campaign for tax reform which was carried on in Ohio last fall had this ultimate object in view. But it is to be achieved without violent alteration of existing conditions and through the avenue of local option in taxation. This is to be obtained by legislation permitting each county to raise its revenues in any way it sees fit. The revenues of the state are to be collected from enumerated sources, as corporations, licenses, fees and the like. With each community empowered to assess such property as it chooses for local purposes, the burden of introducing any single reform which is supported by a small body of determined men will be great-

ly simplified. And it is to the attainment of local option and the proper taxation of public service corporations that the present dramatic and vigorous campaign in Ohio was waged.

The local campaign in Ohio for the legislature was also waged along tax lines. National issues were ignored, and this issue together with that of reformed and direct primaries, municipal home rule and local option in taxation were the rallying cries. And the legislative campaign was carried on in a unique manner. The meetings were held in a large tent, which was moved about from one part of the city to another. To these meetings the Republican candidates were invited to defend their position. National politics were not discussed. By the adoption of such tactics public interest and curiosity were aroused and maintained. The county, though strongly Republican, went Democratic by a large majority.

Immediately after Mr. Johnson's inauguration a "Tax School" was inaugurated for the purpose of correcting the inequalities in real estate valuation. A number of experts were employed, and what is known as the Somers method of valuation was adopted. It was contended that taxation, like any physical force, follows the line of least resistance, and that the large corporations, being able to engage eminent legal talent, in large measure escape at the expense of the small property holder. It was to correct these inequalities that the work has been carried on. Just what the outcome will be is yet doubtful, owing to questions of a legal nature which have arisen, and which are now before the courts.

Mr. Johnson has been mayor for so short a term that his achievements can yet hardly be enumerated. For public changes come slowly. On his inauguration he announced a liberal policy toward saloons, but adopted a vigorous one toward those which were disorderly. Instead of raiding them a policeman in uniform was placed at the door, and the name of every person who entered was taken down. The result was that rough or disorderly places were closed up or the nature of their business was changed. Police raids have been discontinued. Only in rare instances have arrests been made, and these were for the enforcement of the policy adopted and not for the purpose of revenue. Police court fines in most cities are but a guarantee of

non-interference for a given time. They are so regarded by those who are fined, and aside from the unfortunate publicity given, the opportunity for blackmail and the like, they make the city a participant in vice and lawlessness.

In those administrative matters which are social rather than political Mr. Johnson's ideas are very pronounced—to some minds dangerous. Upon his accession to office he found the city workhouse, to which are committed all persons guilty of misdemeanors or petty offenses, filled with persons who had been committed because of the non-payment of fines. Many of these were first offenders. Others were detained from 30 to 60 days while working out their sentences. Mr. Johnson termed this imprisonment for debt a punishment for being poor. While the well-to-do were able to pay their fines and go free, a man who was merely a suspicious character, or who had been arrested for intoxication or some other minor offense, was separated from his family and kept in durance for a long time, with the strong probability that upon his release he would be less able to support himself and much more dangerous to society than at the time of his arrest. Since then there has been what many people consider a wholesale jail delivery. Great numbers of men and women (more than 300) have been released after an investigation of their offenses, and less than 20, a comparatively small percentage, have been recommitted, thus demonstrating that they were detained not because they were inherently vicious, but rather because of misfortune.

A like liberal spirit has characterized his administration of the park system. Several play grounds have been established in the most thickly congested portions of the city, while in the parks themselves, golf, baseball, tennis and all sorts of manly sports have been encouraged. "Keep-off-the-grass" signs have been abolished, and the children have the fullest and freest access to the turf. The idea of public baths has received his indorsement, as well as the extension of the small park idea into the crowded portions of the city.

In the public works department a system of cleaning the streets by direct labor, by the "white-wings" system, has been adopted, while a radical departure has been inaugurated in the water works department of reducing rates and installing universal me-

ters. By the latter plan it was urged that great economy in the consumption of water would be brought about and the city saved millions of dollars in extensions to the pumping machinery, water mains and the like.

It is a fortunate thing for a large city to have an executive who can think in large figures. The average public official becomes embarrassed when his mind is called upon to contemplate sums in more than four units. His experience has been limited, and public matters involving large expenditures and large ideas find him wholly at sea. Mr. Johnson's experience has been with big things. In consequence, it is possible for him to adopt and carry out plans, which, to other men, would seem too large, or too hazardous for a city to undertake. The city of Cleveland is about to erect a number of large public buildings. The opportunity was appreciated by many of so grouping and harmonizing these structures that a splendid architectural effect would be produced. This involved the expenditure of large sums of money, and after the public committees appointed to report upon the subject had reached the limit of their own ideas, Mr. Johnson advocated a larger and more comprehensive plan which would lead to the destruction of a considerable area between the business center of the city and Lake Erie, and the development there of a magnificent court of honor which would be a standing monument to our civic institutions. This matter has been energetically taken up, and if legislative aid is secured, it may be carried to a successful completion.

Mr. Johnson is a man of genial personality. If life has been a serious business with him, he does not show it. He seems able to encompass great results with little effort and to be wholly indifferent to obstacles. In fact, he does not seem to know what obstacles are. Somehow they vanish before his logic or his engaging manner. His firmness is the firmness of persuasion rather than of force, and his achievements are the result of a generous graciousness towards others and of a willingness to seek and to accept the cooperation of anyone who will work in harmony with him.

He can hardly be said to possess a style of oratory, although he is a graceful, forceful speaker. It has been said that you might as well try to extract a nail by hitting it on the head as to convince men by argument. Mr. Johnson convinces men by suggestion, by the Socratic method of

drawing an idea out of another man's mind as his own.

Altogether, the chief executive of the city of Cleveland is one of the most interesting figures in contemporary political life. He has appreciated that the great field of present political endeavor lies in our cities; that this is the weakest part of our political system; and that in this arena the greatest good can be achieved and the surest political preferment secured. But if the latter ambition is his, he has been indifferent to ordinary political traditions. National issues have been consistently ignored by him, and every platform which he has suggested has confined its declaration to local and state issues. The county democracy at its last convention declared in favor of the taxation of franchises and the reform of our state taxing system; local option in taxation and municipal home rule; a reformed primary law and the direct election of senators by the people. All of these are suggestive of the new ideas which are making themselves felt throughout the country. They are alien to national issues and affect the people at home. And there are many who think that Cleveland will be pioneer in showing that American cities, manned by American genius and force, will be the best governed communities in the world.

KICK HIM.

If you see a fellow down,

Kick him;

If he has no friends in town,

Kick him.

When you see him, look askance;

If he struggles to advance,

And falls, trying, there's your chance—

Kick him.

If he ever has done wrong,

Kick him;

If he tries to move along,

Kick him.

Though his punishment has been

Ten times greater than his sin,

Hell's his portion—shove him in—

Kick him.

—Nebraska State Journal.

Up to the time when this issue of Life went to press,

No relief had yet been afforded to Cuba;

Nothing else had been done to Gen. Miles;

The Boers had not yet captured Gen. Kitchener.

Events always seem to move slowly when one is waiting.—Life.

Whenever anything in the nature of tariff reform was proposed in Congress, the Trusts shuddered.

"What do these rube men know of

a Mother's Duties?" protested they.—Life.

When Tom Johnson indicates which candidates he would like to have elected in Cleveland it is almost useless for the other fellows to spend money.—Chicago Daily News of April 9.

"If man sprang from a monkey what did woman spring from?"

"Don't know."

"Why, a mouse."—Chicago Tribune.

"You do not speak English, madam?" inquired the interviewer.

"Ver' leet!," replied the operatic celebrity, smiling sweetly. "Only zis: 'How I lofe America!'"—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Leaves from a Life Book of To-Day," by Mrs. Jane Dearborn Mills (Swedenborg Pub. Association, Germantown, Pa. Price, 50c), is a sweet story of domestic love, its trials, temptations and tragedies, that serve as purifying fires to bring out the perfect beauty of a true marriage. Mrs. Mills treats her subject with delicate and sympathetic touch, believing that it lies at the heart of all human problems and is entitled to the larger consideration by thoughtful minds. While love is the universal topic of the novel writer who appeals to human interest, Mrs. Mills gives to her subject the deeper and more spiritual significance which is so often missed by the sensational story teller. For this reason there is a higher moral quality involved in this book than is usual in stories of the affections, pure and simple. "Leaves from a Life Book" avoids the common tragedy of marriage by having for its hero a man like Ralph Maynard, whose high sense of honor and extreme sensitiveness of affection avert the danger of an actual indifference and unfaithfulness, such as the jealous wife suspects. Instead of suffering in silence, the ordinary common-place, matter-of-fact man would have reacted roughly against Marlon's lofty attitude, and we should have had the mutual accusations, recriminations, heart-burnings, misery and marital inharmony which the newspapers and novels of to-day record. The lesson of the book is indicated by this motto by James E. Mills, "The finest of all the fine arts is the art of home-making, and the wife is the artist." There is a lovely truth in those words. And when we take into consideration the hundreds of unhappy and inharmonious households that pass as homes in our field of observation, a question of causes appeals to our candid and impartial judgment. Is it the intelligent, aspiring woman reaching out in the mistaken ways of Mrs. Huntingdon for the larger life of thought and action; or is it the ignorant, selfish, vain, superficial, small-minded, gossiping woman with petty aims and low ambitions who is responsible for the domestic infelicity and the wreck of so many homes that should be the very gardens of Heaven? But in either case there is still another element to reckon with. In home-making as in world-making there must be the sympathetic cooperation of the two supreme principles of the universe to evolve the perfect home, the redeemed world. A. L. MUZZEY.

PERIODICALS.

—Eugene V. Debs tells in the April Comrade (New York) how he became a socialist.
—The Craftsman (Eastwood, N. Y.) for

April is devoted to the subject of beauty in book-making.

—The Railroad Trainmen's Journal for April (Cleveland) contains an excellent article on "Our Fantastic Evolution," by Jose Gros, whose numerous economic contributions to the labor press all over the country are always readable and stimulating; and it is followed by a paper by F. A. Burieligh on "Education," more sane than papers on that subject usually are, and by a refreshingly rational discussion, by W. H. Stuart on the conflicting methods for promoting socialism.

—Mark Twain's racy discussion of the question "Does the Race of Man Love a Lord," in the North American Review for April, is entertaining to read and serious to think about, as most of Twain's writings are. In the same number Robert L. Cutting has an article on the Northern Securities company and the anti-trust law; and the editor so far ignores the anti-anarchy hysteria as to include a contribution from Kropotkin. Hamlin Garland throws light on the Indian question.

Volume IV of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$2.00. will be ready for delivery about May 1. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

VOLUMES II AND III.

We have on hand a limited number of volumes II and III, bound in the regular half leather style of THE PUBLIC at \$2.00 per volume. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

WANTED—Foreman for factory making general Builders' Mill Work, High-Grade Interior Finish, Bank, Office and Store Fixtures. Must have experience and references. Address J. S. MACLEAN, Columbus, Ohio.

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.

The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 50c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 123 E. 23th St., New York City.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. I reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS.

| | |
|--|--------|
| Annual Subscription | \$2.00 |
| Semi-Annual Subscription | 1.00 |
| Quarterly Subscription | .50 |
| Trial Subscription (4 weeks) | .10 |
| Single Copies | .05 |

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
1501 SCHILLER BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Hoanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley E. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1288 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

THE PUBLIC WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for **10 CENTS.**