

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1902.

Number 218.

**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.

The treaty of peace with the South African Boers, falls far short of being the "unconditional surrender" which the Tory ministers of Great Britain had theretofore stubbornly demanded. Considered with reference merely to that imperious demand, it is not the Boers alone that have surrendered, but the British government as well.

Yet it must be confessed that in spite of the concessions which the British have made upon paper, their substantial victory over the Boers is complete. Not only do the two Boer republics pass absolutely away with this treaty, but the whole of South Africa becomes British. At the expense of conceding a few conditions, most of them only verbal and none of them vital, and thereby dropping from their high and lofty demand for "unconditional surrender," the British government has accomplished the substantial object of the war. The Boers have indeed surrendered.

As matter of sentiment—national, racial and republican—they surrendered abjectly by acknowledging allegiance to the person of an individual—Edward VII., king and emperor. Although this personal allegiance is a fiction under the British constitution, the difference between "subjects" of the British king and "citizens" of a republic being only formal, nevertheless nothing could be much more revolting to the sentiment of most republican citizens born and bred, than the ceremonial of swearing allegiance to the person of a sovereign. Even though it be

only a ceremonial, and the substantial change of allegiance be not from a republic to a king, but from a republic with republican forms to one with monarchical forms, this sentiment is outraged. Let the American who doubts it ask himself which would be easier for him, as matter of sentiment, to swear allegiance to the Republic of Mexico or to the person of King Edward? While almost any American would rather be British than Mexican, there are few who, though they would experience only a pang of regret at severing the ties of American citizenship in order to take an oath of allegiance to the Mexican republic, would not feel a sense of humiliation upon swearing allegiance to the person of the British king. And their humiliation would be intensified if the British king were also the conqueror of their country. That sentiment is doubtless as strong with the Boers as with Americans—if there is any difference, it is stronger with them,—yet they have consented to outrage it. To end the war and return to their homes they agree to swear allegiance to the person of a foreign king, whose army has conquered them.

But the Boers have surrendered more than sentiment. Except for the conditions reserved, their surrender is absolute in every respect. And what are those reservations. Prisoners of war captured by the British and carried to foreign lands must be transported home. But no British ministry would have dared to refuse transportation over seas to their native land, of prisoners of war whom they had expatriated, no matter how the war ended. So that reservation is in substance no reservation at all. Second, prisoners of war so returning are not to be deprived of their person-

al liberty or property. Does anyone suppose that Great Britain could have executed these war prisoners and confiscated their property if there had been no treaty? That reservation, also, is in substance none at all. In the third place, no civil or criminal proceedings are to be instituted against the surrendering Boers. But what civil or criminal proceedings could have been instituted against them if they had not surrendered? None. They were not rebels resisting the authority of their own government; they were soldiers resisting the advance into their own territory of a foreign foe. This condition, too, is therefore without substance. All the foregoing reservations in behalf of the Boers are referred for plausibility to the British proclamation of September, 1901, declaring the war at an end and denouncing penalties against the Boers if they kept on fighting. That proclamation was the laughing stock of the civilized world. It was a rank absurdity in warfare, which might as well have been issued at the beginning of the war as in the middle of it. Yet the foregoing reservations or conditions of surrender are nothing more than an agreement on the part of Great Britain not to enforce the penalties of that absurd proclamation. They seem to rest upon the familiar tory theory, as common with those of Great Britain, that two or more consecutive absurdities make a substantial plausibility.

Then as to the fourth reservation of the treaty, that the Dutch language shall be taught in the public schools, where parents desire it, and shall be allowed in the courts; and as to the fifth, that arms shall be allowed only under licenses. The latter is a restriction upon and not a reservation

in favor of the Boers. Calculated to prevent rebellion, it is the same old restriction that the British Tories of a century and a quarter ago imposed upon our own ancestors in the American colonies. But the former clause is a substantial reservation, or would be if it could be enforced; for it is by means of distinctive language that the traditions, aspirations, characteristics and other peculiarities of a people are preserved. Distinctive language, not peculiarities in the life fluid of individuals, constitute the blood of peoples. Consequently, if the Dutch language were perpetuated in South Africa, the Dutch race would be perpetuated there and Dutch characteristics be preserved. But no language can be perpetuated anywhere as a language "on the side." The public schools are to be English, with permission to parents who demand it to have Dutch taught. This incidental teaching of Dutch will not make Dutchmen in South Africa, any more than the incidental teaching of German in American public schools makes Germans in the United States. As to the courts, the inevitable tendency where two languages are used is toward the abandonment of the incidental one. In this connection it is to be observed that there is no reservation in favor of the Dutch language in legislative bodies. The whole scheme looks to the decay of the Dutch language and Dutch sentiment. This is welcome, of course, to the British mind, and Americans are apt to sympathize in that respect with the British. But it is from the point of view of the Dutch mind that we are considering this surrender; and from that point of view we cannot see but that the surrender is in substance absolute and complete.

There is a reservation, to be sure, in favor of the displacement of military by civil government, and the establishment of representative institutions leading up to self-government; but this is so indefinite as to time and circumstances that the Boers would have been as well as-

sured of representative institutions without the reservation as with it. The only substantial concessions to the Boers are financial. They are to have compensation for certain war losses, and loans at three per cent. for the repair of others; and no war indemnity is to be exacted by Great Britain. Beyond this, the British have made no substantial concessions whatever.

Evidently the Boers were unable to resist any longer. It is not conceivable that a people who had made so brave and patient a fight for nearly three years—with all the governments of the world, including our own, either actively or passively aiding their invading enemy,—would have surrendered so completely had any fighting energy been left in them. They must have been irrecoverably exhausted. In that condition they are entitled to universal sympathy, and it would be hard to blame them even for sacrificing their Natal and Cape Colony allies. These are left to be dealt with as rebels and traitors under British law, with the single reservation that the punishment of non-officials shall be limited to deprivation of voting rights for life and the concession that that of officials may be anything short of death. It is to be regretted that the Boers might not have secured for their allies, self-sacrificing volunteers in their cause, at least the same assurances as to personal and property rights which they secured for themselves. But when it is considered that their fighting power was exhausted, condemnation for abandoning their Natal and Cape Colony comrades must come slow-footed, while the great service they have rendered mankind is recognized with ever increasing clearness. They have given all imperialists a lesson in the expense of invasive empire which will not soon be forgotten. Though they have lost their independence, and will soon have lost their language and their distinctive civilization, the English language is rich enough in the vocabularies of freedom to per-

petuate the sad story and the great lesson of their lost cause.

This unhappy close of the Boer struggle recalls the fact that the late Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, that great democratic-Republican, who died about a year ago, made a pilgrimage to South Africa. He died while on his way home. It is not so well known that he had completed a book on his experiences and observations, in which he protested against the British war of conquest. The manuscript of his book was delivered last month, so says the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, to Tom L. Johnson, Gov. Pingree's intimate friend. It was sent, continues the *Plain Dealer*—

by Mrs. Pingree, in accordance with the wish of her dead husband. The tribute of Mr. Pingree's esteem was received just a year and a day after its dedication on the waters of the Atlantic. It had been Gov. Pingree's intention personally to deliver the manuscript to his friend upon his return to America, but he was destined never again to set foot upon his native land. Mayor Johnson was deeply affected when he received the manuscript. It was almost a voice from the dead. Gov. Pingree and Mr. Johnson had many ideas in common and grew to be sincere friends during the mayor's stay in Detroit. The dedication of the book, however, was a surprise to Mr. Johnson.

As reproduced by the *Plain Dealer* the dedication is as follows:

To my friend, Tom L. Johnson, that unbending foe of inequality, that champion of honest government, of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, I dedicate as a token of sincere esteem this story of an oppressed and outraged people battling heroically against terrific odds for freedom and civic unity.

H. S. Pingree,

On board the Melbourne, Messageries  
Maritime Service.  
May 22, 1901.

The admirers of both these men, as well as all sympathizers with the Boers in their ill-fated struggle, cannot but be interested in this impressive testimony to the common aspirations for human liberty of two such distinguished characters, who, though of opposite parties in politics, were bound together in the same fundamental political faith.

As a private citizen Mr. Roosevelt

has ventured to declare a Philippine policy. For it was not as President but as private citizen that he spoke at Arlington on the 30th. What he said as orator of the day there does not bind him as President nor commit the country or even his party; and he scrupulously abstains from putting any declaration of policy into official form.

Even this unofficial declaration, which has been heralded by the imperialist press as a guarantee to the Filipinos, gives no assurance of any but an imperialist policy. Let us quote the paragraph upon which all the stress is laid:

We believe that we can rapidly teach the people of the Philippine islands not only how to enjoy, but how to make good use of their freedom, and with their growing knowledge their growth in self-government shall keep steady pace. When they have thus shown their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government, then, and not till then, will it be possible to decide whether they are to exist independent of us or be knit to us by ties of common friendship and interest. When that day will come it is not in human wisdom now to foretell.

Instead of indicating an anti-imperialist policy, even indefinitely, those words confirm the worst suspicions that the secret policy of the Republican party is imperialistic. It would be impossible to outline more accurately a policy in imitation of British imperialism.

Not until the Filipinos have "shown their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government" (according to the standard, of course, of the party in power in the United States), will it be possible to decide whether on the one hand they shall have independence or on the other shall be somehow "tied" to us forever. In other phrase, until that time, and "it is not in human wisdom now to foretell" when it will come, the Philippines are to be held by the United States as a dependency of the kind which in the British scheme of imperialism is called a "crown colony." Here is

a flat declaration, then, in favor of the adoption by this country of the same policy of imperialism which prevails in Great Britain.

Mr. Roosevelt laid special emphasis on what he called "the slowly learned and difficult art of self-government," describing it as "an art which our people have taught themselves by the labor of a thousand years." This art, he said, "cannot be grasped in a day by a people only just emerging from conditions of life which our ancestors left behind them in the dim years before history dawned." Mr. Roosevelt ought to know that it is a dangerous thing to subordinate the simple truth to fine rhetoric; but as orator of the day at Arlington he fell into that error when he referred to the Filipinos as people just emerging from the prehistoric experiences of our own race. Though there are some primitive tribes in the Philippines, they comprise comparatively few of the inhabitants. The remainder of the population of the islands consists chiefly of Mohammedans in some places and of Roman Catholic Christians in others; and the Mohammedans are not far behind the civilization of Islam, nor are the Christians far behind the civilization of Christianity. Such is the testimony of our own public records. The Arlington orator must have got his facts about the Filipinos from Republican campaign documents.

It is to Mr. Roosevelt's reference, however, to the "difficult art of self-government" that we wish especially to call attention; for this is a repetition of what has been the chatter of tyranny whenever and wherever self-government has been suppressed. That self-government is a difficult art is true enough. It is this kernel of truth that gives vitality to the falsehood in which it is always imbedded. For the point that Mr. Roosevelt really raises is not merely that self-government is a difficult art per se, which is true, but that superimposed government is not dif-

ficult, or at least not so difficult, which is false. Self-government is an easier art, even among the most primitive peoples, than superimposed government. Though Ireland, for instance, might find self-government difficult, who dare say it would be so great a failure as the superimposed government of Great Britain? Self-government among the Germanic peoples was not a model in many respects, but its survivals show it to have been better for those peoples than the superimposed government of Rome. Self-government among the American Indians prior to the European invasion had defects. They had not fully acquired it. But it was better for them than that which the governmental experts of our race substituted for it when they began, as rapidly as possible, to teach the Indians, what Mr. Roosevelt wants to teach the Filipinos, "not only how to enjoy but how to make good use of their freedom." Under self-government they thrived and were advancing; under our government they have been exterminated.

When Americans talk, as Mr. Roosevelt did, of their race as having taught itself the "difficult art of self-government" by "the labor of a thousand years," they really have in mind, as he had, something very different from learning the art of self-government. What our race has really been learning during the past thousand years has not been so much the art of self-government as the art of ridding itself of superimposed government—of government superimposed sometimes by foreign and sometimes by domestic tyranny. The whole struggle of the English from the beginning of their history down to the latest extension of the suffrage has been a struggle to overthrow tyranny and regain ancient liberties, and not to learn a new and difficult art in government. The same is true of this country. We have been so busy trying to unload superimposed tyranny, from the colonial conflict with the mother

country on down to the dominion of trusts of to-day, that we have had little time to learn Mr. Roosevelt's "difficult art."

And that precisely is the meaning of the Filipino struggle. The Christian Filipinos derived their civilization not from any benevolent discipline by the Spanish government, but from the early Catholic missionaries. The Spanish government was a corrupt and corrupting burden, and their energies for over 50 years were expended in trying to throw it off. When they had finally thrown it off, they set up a government, which, according to our own official reports now on file in Washington, was recognized by all the Christian population and stood for months as the only bulwark against anarchy. It was an attempt at self-government, and as long as we allowed it to last, a successful attempt. This peaceable government, this irrefutable exhibition which the Filipinos made of "their capacity for real freedom by their power of self-government," President McKinley assailed by his proclamation of sovereignty and destroyed by an invading army. So long as the arbitrary authority thus asserted continues, the Filipinos will have no opportunity to learn the "difficult art" of self-government. They will be too much concerned about ridding themselves of our superimposed government. And this will be so whether the burdens of foreign domination be light or heavy.

Sixto Lopez shows an infinitely better knowledge than Mr. Roosevelt of human nature when he writes in the June number of Gunton's magazine:

A self-imposed burden however heavy may be borne with cheerfulness; it does not crush the soul. But when one is compelled to bear even a feather weight the free spirit implanted in God begins to rebel. This was true of the American patriots of 1776. The tax on tea did not seriously touch any one's pocket, but it touched every one's pride. Surely the manly American must have temporarily forgotten this

when he speaks of "giving" the Filipinos "prosperity under American rule."

Mr. Lopez evidently understands what Mr. Roosevelt apparently does not, that "the difficult art" of self-government is to be learned not by precept under tutelage but by observation and practice in freedom.

Mr. Roosevelt's palliation, in his Arlington speech, of the army atrocities, by a "you're another" retort, was not happy, in whatever light it may be viewed. Because some of the more notable speeches in condemnation of these army atrocities were made by Southern senators and representatives, Mr. Roosevelt sought shelter for the army behind a denunciation of lynching. He did not use the words "lynchings in the South." He could not very well have done that, for he must know that the same spirit of race hatred that prompts the lynchings of Negroes at the South is felt in the North, and that it has expressed itself in lynchings in such states as Kansas, Colorado and Ohio. But he clearly implied that lynchings at the South are a sufficient rebuke to Southern senators who condemn army atrocities. On this point he said that the atrocities in the Philippines—

afford far less justification for a general condemnation of our army than these lynchings afford for the condemnation of the community in which they have taken place. In each case it is well to condemn the deed, and it is well also to refrain from including both guilty and innocent in the same sweeping condemnation.

The assumption here is that the communities are not responsible for lynchings and that the army likewise is not responsible for the Philippine atrocities. It is a false assumption in both cases. Communities that try to prevent and do adequately punish Negro lynchings are not responsible and ought not to be condemned for such as occur. Neither is an army to be condemned because some of the men in it commit crimes, provided the army tries to prevent the crimes and adequate-

ly punishes the criminals. But when, as in some of the Southern states, and in some parts of Kansas, Colorado and Ohio, the community encourages Negro lynchings and shields the lynchers, it does become responsible for the lynchings. Such communities are not innocent and it is not well to refrain from including them along with the lynchers in "the same sweeping condemnation." On the contrary, they ought to be included. Similarly with the army. When it encourages and its general officers even order atrocious crimes, and atrocious criminals are merely reprimanded upon conviction, it makes itself a partner in their guilt. There is only one difference between the army in those circumstances and a community which encourages lynchings. The army as a whole is not a free agent, while the community is. Consequently the guilt of an army is not the guilt of all its members but of those officers whose commands all the members must obey. When, therefore, an army encourages atrocities and shields offenders, the guilt rests upon the commander-in-chief who might enforce different conduct, but who at first suppresses the ugly facts, and when they finally leak out apologizes for the offenders and palliates the offenses. The honor of an army and the honor of its commander-in-chief are pretty much the same thing.

The policy of suppression practiced by the party in power with reference to American atrocities in the Philippines until the facts burst their confines and horrified the American people, is pursued now with reference to the general sentiment of the Philippine people. No Filipino witness not in sympathy with the policy of American imperialism is allowed to testify. But to give an appearance of a willingness to listen to the Filipinos, a live Filipino has been imported in the person of Felipe Buenacamin. This man was in Aguinaldo's cabinet. He became a bitter enemy of Aguinaldo and was captured by the Americans. They en-

couraged him to organize the Federal party of the Philippines, a paper organization with officeholders under the American regime at the head, of which he is now the leader. The encouragement consisted in appointing him to a \$3,500 office. And now he is imported into this country to pose as a Filipino orator and witness who, like Benedict Arnold and for similar reasons, loves the foreign invaders of his country, and wants them to remain in possession. He has testified before a committee of the lower house of Congress. But when the minority asked for the examination of Sixto Lopez, a Filipino who does not hold a \$3,500 office at Manila, but who does voice the Filipino sentiment, the committee decided, by a strict party vote, not to call him. The boldness with which the party in power thus makes evidence to suit its purposes, and suppresses evidence that does not, is another testimonial to its confidence in the great capacity of its followers for being buncoed.

The Churchman, which may be fairly regarded as the representative of imperialists in the Episcopal church, those who turn with proselyting fervor toward the Philippines and preach that "God did it," commends the Senate bill for the government of our Philippine colony because it leaves "all courses open to the experience of the future." This is an excellent description of the policy of imperial drift. But does the bill make it imperative that the flag shall "stay put" no matter what course is taken? If not, how can President Roosevelt sign the bill without stultifying himself?

Another judicial assault upon the freedom of the jury was made in a Chicago criminal court last week. The culpable officer this time was Judge Kavanaugh. A man charged with murder had been acquitted by the jury, Judge Kavanaugh being on the bench. Whether the man was guilty or not, we do not pretend to know, nor is it material to the question. Judge Kavanaugh did think

him guilty, and if he had reserved an expression of this opinion until the jury had been discharged and he himself had left the bench and had then voiced it as a citizen and not as a judge, he would have been rendering a public service. It is the right and duty of private citizens, as such, to criticize both judges and juries for error and to denounce them for corruption, not in advance of a trial nor during a trial, but after the trial and for what they have done. In this way judges and juries may be held to the faithful performance of duty. But Judge Kavanaugh censured the jury in this case for its verdict, while it was still in the box and he upon the bench. That was a gross violation of his duty. He seemed to know this, for he correctly prefaced his censure with the significant words: "Of course, it is in your province to decide upon the facts." That being so, it was not in the province of the judge to censure them from the bench for their decision. Yet he went on to say, with evident disappointment and displeasure—

but I am truly at a loss to understand how you arrived at such a verdict. This man was clearly guilty. I should not have been surprised, under the aspects of the case, if you had not inflicted the death penalty. You had every reason therefor, in spite of the facts and the considerable evidence. But to declare him not guilty simply passes my comprehension.

Now, the jury would have committed no greater impropriety, nor made so dangerous an innovation, if in the course of the trial the foreman had addressed Judge Kavanaugh in this manner, a mere paraphrase of his own remarks:

It is your province to decide upon the admissibility of evidence, but we are truly at a loss to understand how you arrive at the conclusion to exclude the evidence which you have just rejected. It is clearly admissible. We should not have been surprised if you had admonished us to consider it cautiously, but to exclude it altogether passes our comprehension.

If the foreman had addressed the judge in that manner, there would

doubtless have been a serious reckoning. Yet the foreman would have been no more censurable for such an unwarranted invasion of the judge's province than Judge Kavanaugh is for his equally unwarranted invasion of the jury's province.

#### THE APOSTLE OF FREE TRADE— RICHARD COBDEN.\*

If it be true that "whoever made two blades of grass or two ears of corn grow where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind than the whole race of politicians put together," the name of Richard Cobden must always be held in grateful remembrance by the friends of humanity the world over. Whether the political and economic doctrines with which his name has been identified are ever to receive that universal concrete recognition which he fondly hoped for or not, it may at all events be predicted that many future generations of reformers will derive courage and inspiration from the example of his life as well as from his teachings.

The message which Cobden conveyed to his contemporaries was an extremely simple one. Briefly, it amounted to this:

Men of all nations, I say unto you, trade freely with one another; let each of you buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest; by dealing thus with each other you will learn how interdependent you are, and how identical are your interests. Disband, therefore, your immense armies, your standing monuments of international distrust, and enter into the fullness of those peaceful blessings which can only be realized through intelligent and far-reaching cooperation and the mutual recognition of the principle of "live and let live."

Surely this was no new discovery; it was simply the reiteration of an old-fashioned economic principle upon which plain, simple individuals have ever acted since the division of labor became a living principle in society. The only thing strange or epoch-mak-

\*Born on a farm near Midhurst, in Sussex, England, 98 years ago—June 3, 1804. Died in London, April 2, 1865. Described by John Bright, on the floor of the House of Commons, the day after his death, as "the manliest and gentlest spirit that ever quitted or tenanted a human form."

ing about it was the fact that it was addressed to nations and not to individuals. Yet what could be more strange than that? Nothing could be more utopian than to expect the same standard of wisdom to be applied in the government of nations and in the dealings of the latter with each other as is habitually followed out between the citizens composing those nations. The best governed nation is probably not so well governed as the worst managed business establishment in New York or London. If the nations of Europe only displayed in their international relations as much common sense as is ordinarily displayed by the dullest country shopkeeper in the conduct of his business, how much more pleasant it would be for all of us? How much blood would be saved? How much misdirected human energy would be available for the uplifting of humanity.

Cobden saw with his clear, practical vision the commercial principles which he knew to be right trampled upon and ignored by the laws of his country. He saw that his countrymen were doing under legal compulsion what not one of them in his senses would have done voluntarily—buying their goods in the dearest market. They were paying 65 shillings a quarter and upwards for English corn—those of them who could afford to buy it at that price, while they could have got from France and Germany all the corn they wanted at a much cheaper rate, were it not for the protective tariff which forbade them to import foodstuffs from abroad. And while hundreds of thousands of English workmen and their families went to bed supperless, because they could not exchange cloth for corn, the same number of French peasantry went barefoot and half clad because they could not exchange their superfluous corn for the products of English looms. Such a state of things did not, to his strong, practical mind, require any heroic or philanthropic treatment. It simply needed the application on a national scale of qualities that are reputed ordinary, viz., common sense and self-interest. Carlyle has said that the utilitarian standard of self-interest was the lowest to which human nature could fall. But Carlyle was mistaken. Human nature, as exemplified in the government of nations, very often does fall lower than self-interest, and very rarely rises as high. Revenge and jealousy are grades of human nature not provided for in his moral ther-

mometer, and both these motives have played and still continue to play a very large part in the government of the world.

Besides, the great common interest of a whole people, which was the thing that Cobden aimed at, implies the elimination of much of the jarring elements of individual selfishness, and is not to be confounded with the self-interest of a ruling oligarchy which is so often the dominant political influence even in the most democratic countries. England, in maintaining the corn laws and keeping bread dear, was not acting in the interests of her people as a whole, but only in the interests of a few thousands of landowning aristocrats—surely a much lower standard. "Protection for British agriculture" was the name given to this system of legislative robbery. How much of that protection went to the agricultural wage-earners may be inferred from the pithy sentence of a Wiltshire laborer quoted by John Bright: "I be protected, and I be starving."

"Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest!" What man ever rose to the rank of a prophet on the strength of a message so stale? The natural reply would surely be that Queen Anne was dead. But no. The fortress of commercial folly was not so easily shaken, nor was common sense so common as might be supposed. Lord Melbourne, prime minister of England, declared from his place in the House of Lords that to abolish the protection of agriculture was "the wildest and maddest scheme that had ever entered into the imagination of man to conceive." What the prime minister thought, the parliament, lords and Commons thought also, and so did the country so far as it had any articulate voice. The man who as good as told England that two and two make four was thought to be insane.

The corn laws were there; justice demanded their removal, and Cobden considered himself the fitting instrument of that justice. He might have said with Pitt: "I am quite sure that I can save the nation and that nobody else can." He and his sturdy friend John Bright made up their minds to convert the nation to free trade, and to leave no stone unturned till the odious enactment should be wiped off the statute book. It would have been difficult to imagine a more hopeless task at that time. The Whig and Tory parties—both of them recruited

from the landlord classes—divided political power between them. Outside of these two parties there was, at the time of which I speak, no political power, and Cobden belonged to neither. Born the son of a farmer, trained as a commercial traveler, and eventually becoming a master cotton printer, he had so far as social and political advantages went but a scanty equipment for the task he had undertaken. He had in his life's busy pathway kept his eyes wide open; he had traveled largely both in Europe and the United States, and where others only observed scenery he took notice of the condition of the people and of their social and political institutions. To a clear perception of the interacting forces of social life he added the gift, if indeed it be not the same thing, of lucid common-sense exposition. Transparent earnestness and strength of purpose, seem to run through whatever he spoke or wrote—for he was a prolific pamphleteer as well as an orator. He and Bright were, each in his own way, towers of strength to such a movement; yet the prospect was such as might well have daunted even strong men. The people of the towns had first of all to be converted, and after that the farmers. It must have been relatively easy to convert the former class to free trade, seeing that it would give them cheap bread, and the money wherewith to purchase it, but to convince the general body of farmers—a class never very receptive to new ideas—that cheap wheat would, through the enhanced general prosperity of the country, be better for them than dear wheat, required considerable labor and tact. Everything, however, yielded to the indomitable purpose of the leaders of the Anti-Corn Law league, of whom Cobden was the guiding spirit. What the league accomplished during the short space of its existence (it was formed in 1839 and dissolved in 1846), the deluge of argument it kept up by means of meetings, tracts and pamphlets in all parts of the country—how it eventually created a tidal wave of public opinion which swept before it a prime minister and a parliamentary majority that had been elected to keep the obnoxious corn laws in force, must always be reckoned as the most remarkable example of triumphant agitation recorded in English history. Cobden won for his starving countrymen cheap bread, and from that day forth, the principles of free trade rapidly gained ground until they became the



fixed policy of the greatest commercial nation in the world.

The repeal of the corn laws was, however, only one step in Cobden's scheme of political reform. He wanted all custom houses abolished, all ambition of foreign conquest discarded, non-intervention in foreign affairs, reduction of armaments, all taxation to be paid direct by each citizen instead of indirectly through the consumption of dutiable goods and other reforms of a like tendency. He was, in fact, the father of that tribe which has since obtained the name of the "Little Englander," by way of reproach from their opponents. He saw the world through the commercial traveler's spectacles. The world was a big market. Nations were so many business firms. Citizens were shareholders, and governments were boards of directors with certain narrow and well defined duties to perform, which they were on no account to exceed. Of course no existing government came up to his standard. He writes to his friend Bright, touching the question of the French commercial treaty which was then in the air: "Governments seem, as a rule, to be standing conspiracies to rob a bamboozled people, and why should that of Louis Napoleon be an exception? The more I see of the rulers of the world, the less wisdom and greatness do I find necessary for the government of mankind."

He believed that the interests of governments differed from the genuine interests of the people they ruled; and all he asked was that the governments should stand aside and let the people go to and fro and buy and sell as they thought fit. Much of the evils of government arose, in his view, from the manner in which taxes were raised from the people. If each citizen only knew how much money he really paid to the state (which could be brought about by direct taxation) he would be sure to keep a watchful eye on all governmental folly and extravagance; but by taxing commodities and not individuals, and by dignifying the taxing of imposts with the name of "protection," governments were enabled to keep the people in the dark, so that the latter could exercise no effective check upon either the methods or the objects of national expenditure. He thought the best method of stopping wars, which were so recklessly entered into, and which generally brought evil to both sides, was to bring home to

each individual citizen the exact measure of his responsibility, pecuniarily as well as morally, for the acts of his government. Swords would then end in plowshares, and men who went out to fight would finish up by making bargains. The idea of nationality would soon be lost, the nation would go the way of the tribe, and the human race would thus be knit together by the strongest of all possible ligatures, which, according to him, was "commercial interests."

This has been described as a bagman's millennium, and it certainly leaves out of account some of the most potent tendencies of human nature. There is more of the savage left in civilized man than Cobden made allowance for. Cobden's principles, if put in practice, would have given cheap bread to mankind. But he forgot that it was cheap blood and not cheap bread that mankind in its present stage seem to desire.

Cobden's ideals have been condemned as mean and sordid because he made self-interest the cornerstone of his social edifice, and took no account of the sentimental side of human nature. But that was because he considered it no part of his business to deal with sentiment. If he could only construct a satisfactory basis for society—and no basis that left a large portion of his fellow-creatures without the necessaries of life was in his view satisfactory—the superstructure might be left to take care of itself, and he did not doubt that the free intercourse of nations would give rise to a loftier and purer sentiment than a narrow local patriotism which lived upon ignorance and blind superstition. They do Cobden an injustice who think that he meant to deify industrialism as typified by the factory system and the social degradation which it so often brings in its train. Ruskin himself could hardly have penned a more sentimental passage than the following:

We were born and brought up amidst the pastoral charms of the south of England, and we confess to so much attachment to the pursuits of our forefathers (always provided that it be separated from the rick-burnings\* and pauperism of modern agriculture), that had we the casting of the role of all the actors in this world's stage we don't think we

\*Rick-burning was a kind of incendiarism resorted to by the peasants of the south of England during the distress which preceded the repeal of the Corn Laws. By burning the ricks of corn they sought to raise their own wages because "high prices make good wages."

should suffer a cotton mill or a factory to have a place in it. . . . We think a system which draws children from home, where they formerly worked in the company of parents, and under the wholesome restraint incident to disparity of years—nature's own moral safeguard of domestic life—to class them in factories according to the equality of age, to be productive of vice.

But as a practical philosopher he adds:

The factory system which sprang from the discoveries in machinery has been adopted in all civilized nations of the world, and it is vain for us to think of discontinuing its application to the necessities of this country. It only remains for us to mitigate, as far as possible, the evils that are, perhaps not inseparably, connected with this novel social element.

Next to the repeal of the corn laws, the greatest success that Cobden scored for his country was the commercial treaty with France. It was indeed, like all Cobden's work, a service rendered, not to one, nor even to two nations, but to the world; for as Sir Louis Mallet says, "the consequences of that treaty were not confined to France and England; it was an act which both by its moral effect and its direct and necessary influence on the legislation of continental countries, led to a general reduction of about 50 per cent. of the tariffs of Europe." That important treaty was the result of an informal understanding between two men, viz., Cobden and Louis Napoleon, without any of the pomp and circumstance of official diplomacy. The fact in itself forms one of the strongest arguments for Cobden's political views, for he held that if real business is wanted it is to individual enterprise and not to official statecraft that one must have recourse. Cobden was not an accredited diplomatist; he was simply a private individual; although the British government tacitly approved of his action, and Mr. Gladstone, then chancellor of the exchequer, gave him active support, the fact was that the two governments were not at all on good terms. The English people had become very suspicious of Louis Napoleon's intentions. The cry was that the French were going to seize Morocco. This did not in the least disturb Cobden's equanimity. "For my part," he wrote in 1859, "if France took the whole of Africa, I do not see what harm she would do us or anybody else

save herself." And so Cobden pegged away at the treaty, not caring for the raging of the political storms. He found Louis Napoleon not nearly so black as he had been painted. It was a case of giving a dog a bad name. The emperor's chief motive was to give the British people some earnest of the pacific nature of his intentions, and so to rehabilitate his character, which the English press had vilified. He was therefore all the more ready to listen to Cobden's arguments. But he had his fears for the result. Cobden writes that the emperor in one of his interviews repeated to him the petition of M. Magne, his minister of finance: "If you make a serious reduction (of tariff) then for every piece of foreign manufacture admitted into France you will displace a piece of domestic fabrication." "I told him," says Cobden, "that nearly one-fourth of his subjects did not wear stockings, and I begged him to remind M. Magne that if a few thousand dozens of hose were admitted into France, they might be consumed by these bare-legged people without interfering with the demand for native manufacture." Common sense and perseverance ultimately prevailed, and the treaty became an accomplished fact. France undertook to abolish the prohibition on all staple manufactures, and to reduce the duties on English coal, iron, tools, machinery, textiles, etc., while England agreed to take off all duties on manufactured goods and to lower the duties on French brandy. The two peoples were being brought closer than ever together, and made to feel their identity of interests, until France took another convulsive political fit, and abandoned the pathway of international conciliation and commercial freedom.

Although such a firm believer in the principles of government by the people, Cobden did not attach much value to the form of government, so long as the prosperity and happiness of the people was amply secured. He wanted the people to be taught to think and act for themselves, and not to rely upon the aid of governments, believing with Thomas Paine that all governments are bad, and that the form of the badness is a minor matter. Thus in his pamphlet, "England, Ireland and America," he says: "We don't advocate republican institutions for this country; we believe the government of the United States to be at this moment the best in the world; but then the Americans are

the best people." In a foot note he explains: "We mean individually and nationally. As individuals, because in our opinion the people that are the best educated must morally and religiously speaking be the best. As a nation, because it is the only great community that has never waged war except in absolute self-defense—the only one which has never made a conquest of territory by force of arms." Whether, if he had been living in these days of annexation and imperialism, his judgment would have undergone no alteration may well be questioned. At all events, he saw that it was not republicanism that made the American people good, and that a republic was quite as capable as a monarchy of sheltering tyranny and oppression if only the people were to relax their vigilance, or cease to act for themselves. On American questions his judgment was unusually sound. He had visited the United States more than once and had weighed carefully the trend of public feeling and the condition of society. The consequence was that while most Englishmen, especially the upper classes, thought (and no doubt wished) that the South would triumph, Cobden confidently held the opposite opinion. Events after a while began to confirm his judgment, and he knew that with English society nothing succeeds like success. Accordingly we find him at this time writing to his friend, Mr. T. B. Potter:

In a few months everybody will know that the North will triumph, and what troubles me is lest I should live to see our ruling class—which can understand and respect power better than any other class—grovel once more, and more basely than before to the giant of democracy. This would not only inspire me with disgust and indignation, but with shame and humiliation. I think I see signs that it is coming. The Times is less insolent and Lord Palmerston is more civil.

He was spared the shame and humiliation which his sensitive spirit dreaded. The civil war was scarcely ended when he was laid to rest in an English country churchyard, amidst the truest indications of national sorrow. Parliament joined in honoring the memory of the great reformer, and both Palmerston and Disraeli made sympathetic allusions to the loss of an opponent who, they knew, had never attacked them except upon the loftiest grounds of principle. He had left behind him an example of consistency and incorruptibility which,

apart from the value of his teaching, gave him exalted rank among statesmen. During his parliamentary career he never accepted office, although often pressed to do so. Mr. McCarthy relates that when Lord Palmerston offered Cobden the presidency of the board of trade—a position he was so eminently qualified to fill—Cobden called upon the prime minister and told him that he could not think of taking office because, amongst other things, he had called Palmerston the worst foreign minister that England ever had. "But," said Palmerston, "Milner Gibson has often said just the same of me." "Yes," replied Cobden, "but then I meant it."

He no doubt felt that he was in his proper place as an independent educational and reforming force, operating upon the wide field of public opinion, untrammelled by the conventional restraints which official responsibility would have involved, and that he was better employed in preparing the ground and sowing the seed than in the more formal and showy work of administration. But the fact of his never having been an official statesman did not prevent him from being the most remarkable and the most powerful political force of his time.

Since Cobden's death fully a generation has passed away, during which his doctrines have received a severe sifting at the hands of fate. The dream of peace and good will in which he indulged has not been realized. Wars have become more numerous than ever. France has rejected the boon of the commercial treaty, and reverted to the gloomy path of protection. The United States—Cobden's model country—not only has gone in for a policy of protection, amounting in some cases to prohibition—but it is actually waging war upon other countries for purposes other than that of self-defense. England after half a century's devotion to free trade is about to resort to the "protectionist" trick to help to defray the expenses arising out of the cruel and wasteful war in which she is now engaged. Even Manchester may be said to be going back upon the "Manchester school." Of "peace, retrenchment and reform," nothing is now heard or heeded. The extension of the franchise to the English working classes has not conduced to economic government, but the reverse. And if we turn to the armaments of Continental Europe we find that the



oppressive weight of military taxation is so great as to fill with alarm the minds of the monarchs and potentates themselves. And so forth.

This sort of evidence is frequently adduced to show that Cobden was a false prophet, that his standard was a vulgar and unsound one, the result of an imperfect knowledge of human nature, and that the future commercial policy of nations must, as in the past, be determined by expediency—that is, upon the judgment of governments as to whether in any given case the simple formula of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, irrespective of political boundaries, is to be applied. But to say that the world has not adopted Cobden's advice is not to prove that advice unsound any more than the fact that the world has not followed Christ's teaching thereby proves Christ's doctrine unsound.

Suppose other nations had their Cobdens; suppose public opinion were as well enlightened in, say France and Germany, as it was in England, and the war of 1870-71 had not occurred,—that war which gave such a fatal impulse to militarism and compelled the adoption of the subterfuge of "protection" as the smoothest way of robbing the wage-earners to pay the idle soldiers; suppose free trade had been given a trial by these three nations during the last few decades. What a happy Europe there would be compared with what we now see! It was militarism that checked free trade and prevented the realization of Cobden's dream. Militarism and protection go together.

Cobden had the exaggerated fancy of the zealous reformer, but beneath it lay an indisputable mathematical proposition. As it is safe to bet that under any conceivable circumstances two and two will make four, so it is safe to conclude that nations, which are only numbers of individuals, will be acting in their own best interests by exchanging their commodities freely with each other, and that the wider the area within which freedom of trade is allowed to operate, the more advantageous it will be for all within the area. Even protectionist nations understand this. Their actions in this respect speak plainer than their words. Do they not, while refusing to trade with their neighbors, still make foreign conquests in the interests of trade extension? Only instead of suiting their products to their customers, they too often force their customers at the point of the

bayonet to buy the products they have.

T. SCANLON.

## NEWS

At last the British war in South Africa has come to a definite end, a peace agreement having been signed at Pretoria on the 31st of May.

At the time of our last previous reference to this war (p. 55) news had stopped. There were no reports either of fighting or of peace making. But peace negotiations were then known (p. 41) to be under way, and the details have since been officially disclosed by the British government. They may now be recited as the events occurred. In consequence of the correspondence between Great Britain and the Netherlands (vol. iv. p. 694), in which the Netherlands undertook to act as an intermediary for peace, Gen. Schalk Burger, vice president (and in Mr. Kruger's absence acting president) of the South African Republic, informed Lord Kitchener of his desire to make peace proposals. This was on the 12th of March. The conference with Lord Kitchener, heretofore reported in these columns (vol. iv. p. 808) resulted. It took place at Pretoria, as then stated, on the 23d of March, and was attended in behalf of the Boers by Schalk Burger, Botha and Reitz. Arrangements were there made for a meeting of these leaders with Steyn, De Wet and Delarey, of the Orange Free State, which came off on the 12th of April. At that meeting the Boers proposed terms which Lord Kitchener forwarded to London. The British government rejected them because they contemplated the independence of the republics. The Boer leaders then protested that they were incompetent to surrender the independence of their country, but offered to submit the proposition to their people if Great Britain would state the terms which subsequent to relinquishment of independence she would grant. Out of the replies to this offer came a representative conference or assembly of the Boers at Vereeniging. It met on the 15th of May, and on the 17th appointed a commission, with plenary powers, consisting of Louis Botha, Christian De Wet, Hertzog, Delarey and Smuts, to confer with Kitchener. The conference took place at Pretoria on the 19th, when the commission of-

ferred to surrender independence as to foreign relations, retaining self-government under British supervision, and to make over absolutely part of the territory of the two republics. This offer was refused by Gen. Kitchener and Lord Milner, the British lord high commissioner for South Africa, who was present; and Lord Milner prepared a document for submission to the Vereeniging conference for a yes or no vote to be taken not later than the 31st. This document, having first been approved by the British ministry, with some minor amendments, was communicated to the Boer commissioners on the 28th, and by them submitted to the Vereeniging conference, which adopted it on the 31st by a vote of 54 to 6. It was formally signed late at night of the same day at Pretoria.

The document referred to defined the terms of peace. In substance it provides:

1. The Boers are to surrender all arms and ammunition under their control, and acknowledge King Edward VII. as their lawful sovereign; the details of surrender to be managed by Kitchener for the British and Botha, De Larey and De Wet for the Boers.

2. Exiles and prisoners of war are to be transported by the British back to their homes as soon as transportation can be provided, upon their declaring their acceptance of the status of subjects of King Edward VII.

3. Persons so returning are to be secure in person and property.

4. No proceeding, civil or criminal, is to be taken against them, or any Boers surrendering, for any acts in connection with the war, except in certain specified cases involving conduct contrary to the usages of war, which are to be tried by court martial after the cessation of hostilities.

5. The Dutch language is to be taught in the public schools of the former republics (now the Transvaal and Orange River Colony) when parents desire it. It is also to be allowed in the law courts.

6. Persons needing rifles for protection in either colony are to be allowed them only on taking out a license.

7. Civil government is to be established in the colonies by the British as early as possible, and representative institutions leading to self-government are to be introduced as soon as circumstances permit.

8. The question of giving voting rights to native races is not to be decided until after self-government is established.

9. No special land tax is to be imposed to defray the expenses of the war.

10. The British are to provide for the restoration of the people to their homes and for supplying them with indispensable seed, stock, implements, etc.; also to pay war losses of individuals incurred under the laws of the South African Republic to the extent of \$15,000,000, in addition to lending to individuals to an unspecified amount at 3 per cent. interest.

The foregoing agreement is signed in behalf of the British by Lord Milner as high commissioner; in behalf of the South African Republic by Gen. Schalk Burger as vice president acting as president, Gen. Reitz as state secretary, and Gen. Botha as commander-in-chief; and in behalf of the Orange Free State by Gen. De Wet as acting president in place of President Steyn (the latter being ill and having appointed De Wet to act for him), Gen. Bremner, Judge Hertzog and Delarey.

No provision regarding the Boer allies of Cape Colony and Natal was made in these terms of settlement, but at the time of handing the document to the Boer commissioners for submission to the Vereeniging conference, Lord Milner read a statement, of which he gave them a copy, to the effect that—

the treatment of Cape Colony and Natal colonists who joined the Boers in the war will be determined, if they return to their own colonies, by the colonial governments; and as to Cape Colony that the government there agrees that the rank and file who surrender, and before a magistrate acknowledge themselves guilty of high treason, shall be punished only by denial for life of registration as voters, provided they have not been guilty of murder or acts contrary to the usages of civilized warfare; and that those holding official positions may be tried for high treason and punished at discretion provided that the death penalty shall not be inflicted.

Thus ends the British war in South Africa, reports of which have appeared regularly in these columns, from time to time, as the facts were disclosed through the daily press. By utilizing the reference pagings, inserted in most of the items, to trace them back from the last to the first, the reader may begin with the Cape Colony elections of 1898 (vol. i. No. 21, p. 10) and without further search follow the story of the war, told as it progressed, in a continuous serial narrative down to its close. In recognition of Lord Kitchener's services the king requests parliament to enable

him to grant Kitchener \$250,000. The Irish members announce their intention of opposing the grant at every stage.

The passage by the United States Senate of the Philippine civil government bill comes hard upon the heels of the South African treaty of peace, this bill having after prolonged debate been passed on the 3d. It was reported favorably on the 31st of March by the Senate committee on the Philippines, of which Mr. Lodge is chairman. The bill is very long, and is designed to be temporary in operation. It sanctions the existing American government in the Philippines, set up by the President; it provides for a census, as soon as peace shall have been established, with a view to organizing a permanent representative government; it authorizes the commission to lease and alienate the public lands; it authorizes it to grant franchises; and it provides for coinage and banking, with the silver standard. The bill makes no intimation of the intention of the United States with reference to the future of the islands. Consequently the minority of the committee recommended a substitute looking to the ultimate recognition of the Philippines after the manner of the organization and recognition of the Republic of Cuba. When the question came to a vote on the 3d, the majority of the committee had already caused the bill of rights of the United States constitution, except the clauses relative to juries and the bearing of arms, to be inserted in the bill; and several proposed amendments were voted on prior to the submission of the main question. One of these would have admitted Philippine products into the United States at 50 per cent. of regular customs duties. It was rejected. The substitute was also voted down. Morgan, of Alabama, and McLaurin, of South Carolina, Democrats, voted against the substitute and with the Republicans; while Hoar, of Massachusetts, and Wellington, of Maryland, Republicans, voted for it and with the Democrats. Mason, of Illinois, refused to vote either way on any of the amendments. On the final vote, that on the passage of the bill, the only Democrat to vote with the Republicans was McLaurin, of South Carolina. Hoar, Wellington and Mason voted with the Democrats in the negative. With these exceptions the bill passed by a strict party vote, the

affirmative vote being 48 and the negative 30. The bill is now in the House, where it is expected to come in conflict with the measure approved by the Republican committee of that body.

Upon the eve of the vote upon the Philippine bill in the Senate the war department announced that the effective strength of the army in the Philippines will be reduced in less than two months to 25,000 men. Already orders had been issued reducing the army as a whole from 77,287 to 66,497.

On the subject of labor strikes in the United States, to which considerable space was devoted last week (p. 119), there are several important facts to report.

The anthracite coal strike (p. 119) was strengthened on the 2d by the accession of from 75 to 80 per cent. of the men engaged in pumping out the mines to save them from destruction by water; and in support of the employers a large body of "coal and iron police," a private armed force, hired and controlled by the coal combinations, has been sent out to patrol the coal fields. The professed object of this movement is to prevent disorder and protect property from violence; though the strike leaders assert that there is no danger of violence and that the real object of privately policing the country is to incite individual strikers to breaches of the law.

In the tugmen's strike on the great lakes (p. 119), summonses have been issued by the steamboat inspectors at Chicago against the licensed tugmen who refuse to work on boats of the towing trust, but nothing further of interest is reported.

The Chicago street car strike, which seemed imminent last week (p. 119), has been settled, as rumor then had it. The settlement, effected through the mediation of Franklin MacVeagh, as a member of the arbitration tribunal of the National Civic Federation, secures all that the employes demanded. It is to hold for one year, and guarantees that—

1. The companies (the Consolidated Traction Co., the Union Traction Co., and the Chicago General Street Railway Co.) withdraw all opposition to the organization of their employes into the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employes of America.

2. The companies reinstate in their former positions all employes who have been discharged for taking part in forming this organization.

3. The companies will meet and treat with the committees of this organization on all questions and grievances that may arise in the future.

4. Future disputes shall be settled by arbitration.

The other strike mentioned last week, that of the Chicago teamsters against the meat trust (p. 119), became formidable, and was attended with threatening riots, but it has now been settled. The rioting began on the 2d, when the meat trust made a concerted effort to break the tie-up caused by the strike by manning their wagons with clerks and other non-union men and driving them through the streets in procession under police guard. A mob of strike sympathizers followed the wagons, others blocked their progress with barricades, and in a little while the police were in a fight with the people of the neighborhood. No lives were lost and but few persons were injured. Altogether there were four riot calls on that day. There were similar disorders on the 3d, when the first shot was fired. The man who fired it was a special officer employed by one of the packing houses. To the taunts and jeers of friends of the strikers in the streets he replied with his revolver, wounding an unoffending man in a carriage. The trust managers declared their intention of sending out their wagons in increasing numbers under police guards until the strike was wholly broken. They said they could get drivers from other cities and the country, and they supplied themselves temporarily by forcing their clerks and other employes to take the striking drivers' places under penalty of discharge. On the 4th they turned out a larger caravan of meat delivery wagons than before, which were driven in procession, guarded by police, through the principal downtown streets. They were followed by mobs, and bystanders pelted them with missiles. The police attacked the mobs and also spectators on the sidewalks, clubbing them regardless of whether they were disorderly or not, and before the day closed there was every prospect of one of the most violent labor conflicts in the history of the city. But in the evening, through the efforts of Frederick W. Job, chairman of the state board of

arbitration, and Mayor Harrison, a settlement was effected.

The strike was principally over the question of organization, though questions of wages and hours were involved. The strikers had demanded an agreement in substance as follows:

1. The employers agree to employ none but members of the Packing House Teamsters' union, Local No. 10, in good standing and carrying the regular working card of the Teamsters' National Union of America.

2. The minimum wage scale shall be 22 cents per hour on single wagons and cars, 25 cents per hour on two-horse wagons, 27½ cents per hour on three-horse wagons, 30 cents per hour on four-horse wagons and 32½ cents per hour on six-horse wagons; time to start from time of calling for number or check in the morning until reporting back said number or check in the evening, and not less than ten hours to constitute a day's work, and no limit; time and a half for Sundays and legal holidays.

3. Any employe who is receiving more than this scale of wages shall not suffer a reduction after this scale goes into effect.

4. There shall be a steward for each barn where members are employed, appointed by the Packing House Teamsters' union, whose duty it shall be to see that all members live up to the rules of the Teamsters' National Union of America and rules of barn.

5. The organization on its part agrees to furnish teamsters at all times when in its power to do so.

6. The organization agrees on its part to do all in its power to further the interests of employes.

7. It gives employers the right to hire all teamsters, providing they notify the officials of the union within 12 hours after employing said teamster; and if there be any charge against said teamster that the employer agrees on his part to discharge said teamster within 12 hours after receiving notice from the officials of the union.

8. Should any difference arise between the employe and said firm which cannot be adjusted between them it shall be referred to arbitration.

To these demands the packers objected that the 1st, 4th, 7th and 8th demands required them virtually to surrender the management of their business interests; and some of these objections are allowed in the settlement, which retains the 8th demand along with the 3d, 5th and 6th, but modifies the others as follows:

1. Employers not to discriminate against union men.

2. Wage scale to be improved.

4. Employers to appoint barn stew-

ards and union rules not to be enforced.

7. Employers may employ non-union men, but these may afterward join the union if they wish.

In American politics the leading event of the week is the state election of Oregon, which took place on Monday, the 2d. It has resulted in the election of the entire Republican ticket except the candidate for governor. For that office George E. Chamberlain, the Democratic candidate, defeats W. J. Furnish, the Republican candidate (who was formerly a Democrat), by a small majority, probably about 750 in the whole state. There is no political significance to the election, unless it be that the state is still Republican. Chamberlain's success was due to his personal popularity and the personal unpopularity of Furnish. The state platforms of the two parties were substantially identical, and no contest was made by the Democrats on national lines. On the Federal senatorship (a new law in Oregon allowing advisory nominations for that office to be placed on the official ballot and voted for by the people), the vote is not at this writing (June 5) reported from the whole state; but in Multnomah county, in which Portland is situated, C. E. S. Wood, the Democratic nominee for United States senator (pp. 67, 93) polls 4,400 votes, slightly less than the general Democratic vote. The Republican convention made no nomination for United States Senator, but ex-Gov. Geer was nominated by petition and received in Multnomah county 7,700, slightly less than the general Republican vote. The press dispatches give no news as to the fate of the constitutional amendment providing for the initiative and referendum, but from responsible sources we learn that it was carried by an overwhelming vote.

The Democratic convention of Indiana assembled on the 4th. As the head of the ticket in that state this year is the candidate for secretary of state, the convention is important only with reference to its platform, which does not indorse the Kansas City national platform, but does put forward as the leading national issue the Philippine question. It denounces the Philippine policy of the party in power as a stultification of the Declaration of Independence. Alfred Schoenover was nominated for secretary of state. The Republican convention, which was held in April,

nominated for that office Daniel E. Storms, and indorsed the Philippine policy of the administration.

At the Tennessee Democratic convention, held on the 29th, at which James B. Frazer was nominated for governor, the Kansas City platform was in terms indorsed, a tariff for revenue favored and Philippine independence demanded.

A unique political situation is taking shape in Chicago in the Democratic party. Owing to faction fights within the party in the city, and independent movements within it and upon the edges, the executive committee of the county committee decided on the 13th of May to choose an advisory committee of representative citizens from all factions and interests, to suggest candidates and the formulation of issues, and to participate in the campaign after the nominations have been made. As chairman of this committee, Judge Murray F. Tuley, who possesses in extraordinary degree the confidence of the people of Chicago of all classes and parties, was named; and he selected an executive committee from the general advisory committee of 100 or more. This executive committee prepared, and on the 3d the general advisory committee unanimously adopted, a report which gives general satisfaction. It will recommend to the county convention three persons for each nomination and the following planks for insertion in the platform:

The municipal ownership of street railroads and all other public utilities. The initiative and referendum.

The direct nomination of candidates in the primaries without the intervention of a nominating convention.

The extension of civil service to all state and county offices, such law to be similar, as far as practicable, to the present city civil service law.

In reporting this plan the executive committee said:

Your committee of 15 was not a unit in favor of municipal ownership, nor in favor of the initiative and referendum, but, realizing that if harmony is to be secured no one Democrat or set of Democrats can always have his or their own way at all times, or in all things, and knowing that there is a large and growing sentiment in favor of such legislation, we concluded to incorporate the same in our recommendation. If such legislation should prove to be unwise or impractical it can easily be repealed. The people of every city should have a right to

decide whether or not they wish municipal ownership of all public utilities. No good Democrat should ever object to submitting to a vote of the people any measure which brings governmental power nearer to the man who casts the ballot.

Politics in France revived after the parliamentary elections (p. 90) upon the assembling on the 1st of the newly-elected chamber of deputies constituting the lower house of the French legislature. For provisional president of the chamber, M. Deschanel, the candidate of the moderate republicans and who was president of the preceding chamber, was defeated by Leon Bourgeois, the candidate of the various radical groups, by a vote of 303 to 267. Two radicals were elected vice presidents.

At a cabinet council held at Paris on the 3d, over which the President of France, M. Loubet, presided, Waldeck-Rousseau, the premier, formally presented the resignation of the ministry to the President. In explanation he referred to his ill-health, adding, however, that the task which he had taken up as premier is terminated, and that the recent elections had produced a majority sufficiently powerful to assure not only the maintenance, but the development of republican institutions, thus rendering his continuance in office unnecessary. President Loubet has called upon Henri Brisson, the radical republican leader, to organize a new ministry.

The only other news of importance comes from Chili, and refers to the disturbing relations (vol. iv. p. 616) between that country and its neighbor, Argentina. When President Riesco opened the Chilian parliament on the first he submitted for approval three agreements between the two countries, as follows:

1. A treaty of general arbitration to cover controversies of every nature arising between Chili and Argentina, provided the said controversies do not affect the constitutional rights of the republic or cannot be decided by direct negotiations. This treaty is to last ten years, and the arbitrators are to be two foreign powers, of which Great Britain shall be one.

2. The protocol providing for the neutrality of each republic in regard to pending questions with other countries. This protocol contains a clause that the Magellan straits are not to be fortified.

3. A protocol to reduce the arma-

ments of each republic to an equal footing and to cancel the contracts for the warships under construction. As the carrying out of this protocol presents certain technical difficulties, the British admiralty will decide any question, if the respective parties do not agree within a certain period.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Sylvester Pennoyer, twice governor of Oregon, died on the 30th.

—Four criminals were executed at Ponce, Porto Rico, on the 3d with the garrote.

—The American congress on tuberculosis, in session at New York, adjourned on the 4th.

—The Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows, president of Oberlin college, died at Oberlin on the 3d.

—The twenty-ninth annual conference of Charities and Correction closed its session at Detroit on the 3d.

—The appointment of Gonzales de Quesada as minister from Cuba to the United States was confirmed by the Cuban senate on the 3d.

—The White county, Tennessee, Republican convention held at Sparta on the 3d, adopted resolutions indorsing Senator Hanna for president.

—An injunction against the meat trust was issued by Judge Chester, of the supreme court of New York, on the 4th, under the provisions of the state anti-trust law.

—The Cuban house of representatives voted on the 31st to annul all military orders that interfere with liberty of the press; and on the 2d it voted a pension of \$6,000 a year to Gen. Maximo Gomez.

—Michael Henry Herbert was appointed on the 4th to succeed the late Lord Pauncefote as British ambassador to the United States. Mr. Herbert is now first secretary to the British embassy to France.

—Almost every street car line in Rhode Island was tied up on the 4th, in a strike in behalf of the ten-hour law of the state. The companies refused to obey the law, claiming that it is unconstitutional, and the employes struck to enforce it.

—On the 20th the supreme court of Ohio heard the case brought by the Toledo police commissioners appointed by Gov. Nash, against Mayor Jones, to oust the old police board in conformity to the Toledo "ripper" bill of the recent session of the Ohio legislature (p. 72.)

—After the 15th the Lake Shore and Pennsylvania railroads are to run 20-hour trains between New York and Chicago at an excess fare of \$8, or a total of \$28. The Lake Shore trains are to leave Chicago at 12:30 p. m., and New

York at 2:45 p. m. The Pennsylvania trains will leave Chicago at noon and New York at 3 p. m.

—The city board of tax equalization of Cleveland, which was legislated out of office by one of the "ripper" bills of the Ohio legislature this year (pp.99, 109), has instituted mandamus proceedings to compel the county auditor to appoint clerks and messengers for it and to furnish it with the assessor's tax returns, etc. This proceeding is brought to test the validity of the "ripper" law.

**PRESS OPINIONS.**

**END OF THE BOER WAR.**

Nashville Daily News (Dem.) June 2.—The war has cost Great Britain life and money. It is no wonder that her people rejoice at the termination of the terrible conflict.

Kansas City World (Dem.) June 3.—England has her new possessions, but they can never repay her for the desolate homes and broken hearts that are always the bitter fruits of war.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.) June 3.—The war has dispelled some illusions and prejudices, and leaves the parties in conflict with a better understanding of each other than has prevailed in South Africa in 50 years.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.) June 3.—Even those who have not been classed as pro-Boers will rejoice that these brave men were not obliged to accept the original British demand for unconditional surrender. They did not fight the last year for nothing.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.) June 3.—There is no glory in the war for Great Britain. It emerges from the struggle with its prestige gone, its treasury depleted and more than 26,000 of its soldiery lying in South African graves. Twice that number are maimed and crippled.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.) June 2.—The face of every true American patriot must blush to acknowledge that the greatest of all monarchies had the secret connivance and open assistance of the greatest of all republics in the ungodly conquest of two small republics in the heart of Africa.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.) June 3.—The Boers are deprived of nominal independence, but they have won terms such as have not before been accorded a conquered people—terms which must be far from satisfying to the soul of Joseph Chamberlain, and which might disturb the rest of Cecil Rhodes in his grave.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.) June 3.—The Boer republics have been blotted from the map, but the Boers remain. The Boers have ceased their fight for independence, but they still cherish the thought of independence. So long as they do that and have the superiority in numbers in South Africa so long will the South African question remain unsettled.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.) June 3.—The burghers have lost absolute independence, but it is probable that in the end South Africa will have gained a freer and more enlightened government than would have been possible had President Kruger been able to fulfill his purpose to drive the British into the sea.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.) June 3.—Two republics—and there were too few in the world, as it was—have been wiped off the map, and over their territory has been raised a royal standard. . . . The friends of popular government throughout the world can view only with helpless and vain regret this advance of the imperial and this reverse of the democratic idea.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), June 3.—The Dutch drove a hard bargain. Never before

did England concede as much except when she had been ingloriously whipped. Never before in the history of warfare did a conquering nation make such vast concessions. Verily, the grumbling members of the house of commons were right. England got the peace and the Boers got the honor.

Buffalo Inquirer (Ind.) June 2.—England has paid every farthing of the "price that staggers civilization." And the marvelous defense of their independence by the South African republics has not been in vain. From the bloody battlefields of the veldt has been uttered to the oppressors, of the earth a tremendous warning that in the modern conditions of war it is unsafe for a world power, arrogant in strength, to attack a feeble republic.

Chicago American (Dem.), June 5.—The peace terms that end the Boer war are creditable no less to the vanquished, who made such a heroic fight, than to the victors, who have taught the world a lesson of tolerance and moderation by the generosity of their concessions. . . . The final, formal victory of England, though the world may regret that it was against such a gallant little band, means much for progress, and the opening of one more great field for the supply of the people of the earth with what they need.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.) June 2.—England has reaped no glory from this war, but she can now gain credit and respect by liberal and generous treatment of the defeated Boers. Self-government cannot long be withheld from them. The crown colony scheme of administration is not adapted to the conditions prevailing in South Africa, and the Boers would not submit to it except as a temporary and provisional arrangement. In the near future South Africa will be free and federated and the Dutch will be the dominant element.

**PHILIPPINE QUESTION.**

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.) June 1.—Can the question of independence be so easily shelved and can American principles be so lightly dealt with? What logical objection is there to a statement that if the Filipinos give evidence of an ability to administer a government satisfying international demands as well as their own aspirations there is and will be no desire on our part to hold them in an unwilling vassalage?

**OREGON ELECTION.**

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), June 5.—The election of Mr. Chamberlain does not imply that a political revolution has occurred in Oregon. The parties are probably about as equally divided as before. But it does imply, or rather it demonstrates, that . . . while the Democracy is getting together the Republican party is disintegrating.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.) June 4.—Though a Democrat is elected governor the minor state offices are all won by Republicans by pluralities in the neighborhood of 10,000, and, what is more significant the Republicans not only carry the legislature but score a most decisive victory in the election of congressmen. . . . The spirit shown is that which prevails all along the Pacific coast because of the conviction that expansion must mean the expansion of the coast trade.

**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, May 26-31, 1902.

**Senate.**

Before resuming consideration of the Philippines bill on the 26th the Senate listened to an informal discussion of the subject of lynchings, upon a resolution of Mr. Gallinger proposing an inquiry (p. 6336), at the conclusion of which Mr. Patterson began a speech on the Philippine bill (p.

6340). Having suspended, owing to fatigue, he was followed by a desultory discussion of the subject between Mr. Foraker, Mr. Hoar, Mr. Carmack and Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, and the remainder of the day was given over to private measures. On the 27th during the morning hour the committee on privileges and elections reported (p. 6377) that a majority favored the Dewey amendment to the measure providing for the election of senators by the people and that as so amended a majority of the committee opposed the measure. The report went over for the day (p. 6379). Also during the morning hour a resolution calling upon the President for information (p. 6381) as to the possibilities of Filipinos coming to the United States and stating their views to the President or Congress was agreed to. Senator Patterson then resumed his speech on the Philippines bill; and on the 28th Mr. Rawlins offered an amended substitute (p. 6421) as now proposed by the minority of the Philippines committee, representing the opposition, for the bill proposed by the majority and now under debate. Mr. Lodge proposed amendments on the 29th inserting a bill of rights and making other changes (p. 6490) in the pending bill, and speeches on the bill were made by Mr. Morgan (p. 6461), Mr. Clay (p. 6493), and Mr. Spooner (p. 6500), the speech of the latter not being concluded until the 31st, the Senate having adjourned over the 30th (Decoration day). When Mr. Spooner had concluded on the 31st Mr. Pettus (p. 6536), Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi (p. 6537), and Mr. Carmack (p. 6539) spoke on the same subject.

**House.**

No business of general interest was done on the 26th, but on the 27th consideration of the immigration bill was resumed (p. 6390) and after amendment was passed (p. 6411). The House then ordered the previous question (pp. 6414-15) on a motion to take up the bill (H. bill No. 12704) for increasing the subsidiary silver coinage, and on the 28th (p. 6435) adopted the motion. This bill was under consideration the remainder of that day, and also on the 29th, when it was passed (p. 6506), a motion to recommit with instructions, made by Mr. Shoforth (p. 6506), being rejected (p. 6510). After transacting some private and local business the House adjourned to the 2d of June.

**Record Notes.**—Speeches of Representatives Grosvenor on illiteracy as a test of fitness for citizenship (p. 6322), Gadsen on oleomargarine (p. 6330), Mann (p. 6332) and Lattimer (p. 6529) on immigration, and Padgett on the Fowler banking and currency bill (p. 6372); also of Senator Burrows on the Philippine question (p. 6515).

Epitome of the history of the Philippine policy prepared by Erving Winslow (p. 6476); chronological statement of executive steps taken to establish civil government, as submitted by Senator Burrows (p. 6519); and synopsis of reports of governors of Philippine provinces (p. 6526).

Text of treaty of peace at Biacnabota between Spain and Aguinaldo, Aug. 9, 1897 (p. 6490).

**MISCELLANY**

**DIRGE FOR A SOLDIER.**  
Close his eyes; his work is done!  
What to him is friend or foe-man,  
Rise of moon or set of sun,  
Hand of man or kiss of woman?  
Lay him low, lay him low,  
In the clover or the snow!  
What cares he? He cannot know;  
Lay him low!

As man may, he fought his fight,  
Proved his truth by his endeavor;  
Let him sleep in solemn night,  
Sleep forever and forever.  
Lay him low, lay him low,  
In the clover or the snow!  
What cares he? He cannot know;  
Lay him low!

Fold him in his country's stars,  
Roll the drum and fire the volley!  
What to him are all our wars,



What but death bemocking folly?  
Lay him low, lay him low,  
In the clover or the snow!  
What cares he? He cannot know;  
Lay him low!

Leave him to God's watching eye;  
Trust him to the hand that made him.  
Mortal love weeps idly by;  
God alone has power to add him.  
Lay him low, lay him low,  
In the clover or the snow!  
What cares he? He cannot know;  
Lay him low!  
—George H. Boker.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTER TO JOHN  
BULL.  
HE OBJECTS TO HEROD REPUBLICANS  
AND HORSE MEAT.  
For The Public.

Printed from the Original Manuscript.

Dear John: Did you read Hoar's speech? Who'll be my next senator to square himself with the Lord? You see, John, it's this Philippine business. There's a row between the Herod Republicans and the Pilate Republicans as to which ought to stand for it. The Pilate Republicans charge it up to the Herod Republicans, and the Herod Republicans say there are others just as cussed as they are. Besides, they don't want the Pilate Republicans a-washin' their hands and throwin' the dirty water on them. They say: "You knew all the time something was wrong; that there is no use for a censorship, unless there's somethin' nasty to cover up. Why didn't you vote as you talk?"

What makes the Herod Republican so swearin' mad is to have this Philippine dead cat hung round his neck, just when he is smoothing things over for the next election, and the trusts are givin' him all he wants to answer for.

I'm worried myself, John, about these trusts. They are eatin' me up; but I've got to keep quiet. You see, I voted for 'em—voted for a full dinner pail; and, Jimminy, I got it—got it full of horse meat and Billy O'Margarine. Fact! I'm eatin' horse meat! Never had to do that under any Democratic administration. Never had to do that in America before! Why, out in Chicago they advertise for old horses, "killers," they call 'em. "Highest price paid for killers; will call," and, John, I'm a-gettin' them. Now, I don't object to the Republican party as a party, and I don't object to a dead horse as a dead horse; but I don't want ary one of 'em to make me eat the t'other.

Yours for better times,

UNCLE SAM.

There are a good many necessary evils that are not really so necessary as they are convenient.—Puck.

THE LABOR PROBLEM IN SOUTH  
AFRICA.

In April, 1897, a commission was appointed by the Transvaal Volksraad to inquire into the complaints of the British mine owners and to make recommendations for the removal of the alleged causes of dissatisfaction.

This commission made its report a few months later in a volume of 747 pages, published at Johannesburg, which has been practically inaccessible in England until an association known as the "Aborigines Protection Society" undertook in June, 1901, to republish such parts of it as related to the problem of native labor.

It appears from the report just published by this society that the gold and diamond mine owners were dependent on the Kaffirs for their labor supply, and were put to great expense and inconvenience in bringing their African laborers from remote regions to the mines. They were obliged in the first place to pay some one several shillings and sometimes as much as a pound per head for the business of collecting the natives and forwarding them to their destination. Then they had to pay the railroads for their transportation, and risk getting back the amount later on by deducting the same from the wages of their laborers. In addition to this, they had to feed their workmen on the route and pay the costs of a complicated series of fees and passes which the South African republic—at the instigation of its citizen farmers and alien mine owners—had imposed upon the Kaffirs before permitting them to travel in any direction in search of work.

It will thus be seen that the British mine owner had to incur considerable expense in getting his laborers to the spot, and as he paid them not more than 50 or 60 shillings per month, they would have to work quite awhile before they would be able to pay back with their toil what their employer had advanced in getting them there.

Most of the Kaffirs had been living on "kraals" before engaging to work at the mines, and were accustomed to a simple pastoral life. With their cattle and their small farms they could live comfortably with their families at small cost and with little exertion. Only the strongest and toughest natives could stand the hardships of the mines, and heavy manual labor in the bowels of the earth became quickly distasteful to

these black sons of the forest and the open plain. The result was that most of them would refuse to abide by their agreement and they deserted the mines every year in large numbers.

This tendency was accelerated by a determination on the part of the mine owners to reduce wages to the lowest point possible. But the lower the wages were reduced the more the Kaffirs would desert, and although stringent laws existed to punish them for breaking their contracts, these laws for the benefit of British mine owners were seldom enforced by the South African republic. It is a thankless task to enforce a fugitive slave law for the return of somebody else's wage slave, and so no doubt the Boers regarded it. Perhaps they did not blame the Kaffirs very much for preferring an agricultural life to that of a contract miner. Anyway, in their stolid Dutch fashion they continued to ignore the complaints of the British, and contented themselves with polite excuses and a general do-nothing policy, which greatly incensed the mine owners.

Finally, the "Industrial Commission of Inquiry" was appointed by the Boer government and the British mine owners were invited to appear before it and state their grievances and their recommendations.

Extracts from the report of this commission are interesting reading. Not only do they throw a curious side light on the part that the labor question played in bringing about the South African war, but they expose the true relations which exist between capital and labor in all countries. The mark of benevolence being laid aside the capitalist mine owner bluntly states the conditions of the labor problem as he understands them.

A gentleman by the name of George Alba presents the capitalist's views of the situation to the commission as follows:

The reduction of native labor is necessary for two reasons; the one is, to reduce our whole expenditures; and the second has a very far-reaching effect upon the conditions which may prevail with regard to native labor in the future. The native at the present moment receives a wage far in excess of the exigencies of his existence. The native earns between 50 shillings and 60 shillings per month, and then he pays nothing for food and lodging; in fact, he can save almost the whole amount of what he receives. At the present rate of wages the native will be enabled to save a lot of money in a couple of years. If the native can save 20 pounds a year, it is almost sufficient for



him to go home and live on the fat of his land.

Happy native! To have a home and land somewhere that he can go back to and live on! He is not a thorough wage slave as long as he has this option. Mr. Alba continued:

In five or six years' time the native population will have saved enough money to make it unnecessary for them to work any more. (I. e.—In the mines.) The consequences of this will be most disastrous for the industry and the state. This question applies to any class of labor, and in any country, whether it be in Africa, Europe or America. I think if the native gets sufficient pay to save five pounds a year, that sum is quite enough for his requirements, and will prevent natives from becoming rich in a short space of time.

After some further explanations were offered in reply to the questions of the Boer representatives, the following conversation took place between Mr. Alba and a Boer member by the name of Smit:

Mr. Smit—Do you intend to cheapen Kafir labor? How do you propose to effect that?

Mr. George Alba—By simply telling the boys that their wages are reduced.

Mr. Smit—Suppose the Kafirs retire back to their kraals? In case that happened would you be in favor of asking the (Boer) government to enforce labor?

Mr. George Alba—Certainly—a Kafir cannot live on nothing.

Mr. Smit—You would make it compulsory?

Mr. Alba—Yes. I would make it compulsory, and without using force a tax could be levied. If a white man loiters about he is run in. Why should a nigger be allowed to do nothing?

On his own land, that is. Take it from him by taxation—a brilliant idea, quite worthy of an Anglo-Saxon philanthropist—reduce him to the status of the proletariat in Christian England and America.

Mr. Alba (continuing)—If there is a famine in the district the government has to pay for it, and that falls back again on the industry. Therefore, I think a Kafir should be compelled to work in order to earn his living.

Mr. Smit—Do you think you would get the majority of the people on the Rand with you in trying to make the Kafirs work at a certain pay?

Mr. Alba—I think so.

Mr. Smit—Would it not be called slavery?

Mr. Alba—Not so long as the men earned a certain amount of money.

It would be called "the dignity of labor" and is so called elsewhere in this report by one of the British mine owners.

Mr. Smit—If a man can live without work, how can you force him to work?

Mr. Alba—Tax him, then. If I have five pounds to spend, I don't want to do any work; but if the government passes a law that all gentlemen at large (who you may know in South Africa often call themselves that) must pay three pounds per month tax, there only remains two pounds, and I am forced to work!

Mr. Smit—Then you would not allow the Kafir to hold land in the country, but he must work for the white man—to enrich him?

Evidently this Boer is taking a sly stolid enjoyment in the rare sight of a benevolent Briton unmasked.

Mr. Alba—He must do his part of the work of helping his neighbors. How would the government like us to sit down and say that we have enough money; where would the state drift to?

Where, indeed? Possibly not into the South African war!

Mr. Alba (continuing)—There is always competition in labor, and when once a man tastes the fruits of his labor, he will work.

Without hypocrisy this is meant to read: "Whenever once a man is deprived of the fruits of his labor, he will work—at any loathsome and killing task."

Mr. C. J. Joubert, minister of the mines, now takes hold of the witness, and probes for further expressions of the commercial longing for the reestablishment of slavery—the British being credited with its abolishment in South Africa.

Mr. Joubert—You said yesterday that if a law could be made for enforced labor, it would be a great assistance. Is that your opinion?

Mr. Alba—Yes.

Mr. Joubert—Is there a law in England to get forced labor?

Mr. Alba—No; nowhere in the world as far as I know.

Mr. Joubert—Then why would you like it here?

Mr. Alba—I have not asked for it. But I told you what the consequences would be if we reduced the price of labor and the natives refused to work here. Then I suggested to impose a head tax, and I think Mr. Smit asked me if I thought it would be a good thing to have forced labor. I—as an employer of labor—say it would be a good thing to have forced labor, but another question is whether you could get it. You could exercise a certain amount of force among the natives if you impose a certain tax upon each native who does not work, or if he has not shown he has worked a certain length of time. . . . The law then should be for the native that if he does not work for a certain number of years, or if he is too rich to work, he must pay.

Mr. Joubert—You know of no other country where there is such a law?

Mr. Alba—There are no Kafirs in any country I have been in, but the rich man who does not work has to pay a higher tax than the poor man who has to work. . . . The proportion of taxes goes up in proportion to a man's wealth.

Alba probably knows this to be false, but hopes the Boer does not. If it were true, the rich man would be compelled to go to work again.

Mr. Joubert—But although in London there are no Kafirs, there are poor whites?

Mr. Alba—Oh, yes!

Mr. Joubert—Are these compelled to work?

Mr. Alba—You do not need to tell a man to work there; he will work if he can only get it!

Having no kraals to retire to — no lands to live on.

Mr. Joubert—Is it the same here?

Mr. Alba—No. A Kafir can get work if he will come.

Mr. Joubert—But still they live?

Mr. Alba—Who?

Mr. Joubert—The poor at home.

Mr. Alba—Oh, yes! They live!

The report before me gives extracts from the testimony of 14 mine owners and managers who practically agree in their plea for a reduction of wages, and an urgent demand that the Boer government shall use its powers first as a detective agency in compelling deserter to return to the mines, and secondly as a slave driver in taxing the natives so heavily that they will be driven by hunger to forsake their kraals and work in the mines for a bare subsistence wage.

It is vastly to the credit of the members of the Boer commission that they replied to the insolent and inhuman demands of the British mine owners by refusing flatly to recommend to their government the imposition of a higher tax on the long-suffering Kafirs (who are already taxed beyond the limits of a white man's endurance) or any measure that would be equivalent to forced labor.

Under British pressure they did recommend, however, "the establishment of a government department for the procuring and supplying of native labor for use in the gold mines"—and of a local board by which the British owners could practically control the action of the Boer government in the matter of labor representation.

The recommendations of the commission were naturally distasteful to the Volksraad. That they were not satisfactorily carried out was one of the complaints (on the part of the British) which led to the breaking out of the South African war.

The "Aborigines Protective society" adds that "they are now being zealously and imperiously urged upon the present administrators of the Transvaal."—Miss Caroline H. Pemberton, in *International Socialist Review* for September, 1901.

Dublin, N. H.

Postmaster General Payne has received a letter from a resident of a little town in the state of Washington, complaining that the postmaster there is trying to make a profit for himself out of the sale of postal cards. The letter follows:

"To the General Postmaster, Washington, D. C.—Dear Sir: Our postmaster told me that he loose money

to sell postal cards at 1 sent each. He sold me nine for 10 cents. I never paid more than 1 sent before. Please let me know if he has a right to charge more. I thank you ahead. Lars Olsen."—Washington Dispatch.

Many a man has gone to hell backwards with his face bravely turned toward heaven.—Dorothy Vernon, of Haddon Hall (Macmillan).

**WHAT'S IN A SKIN.**

It's sort o' childish, don't you think, To be down on a feller Because your skin is white, while his Is black or brown or yellor.  
—The Whim for February, 1902.

**PERIODICALS.**

—The apostolic succession is the subject of a lengthy discussion in the Open Court (Chicago) for June.

—The March number of the Medico-Legal Journal, published by Clark Bell, under the auspices of the New York Medico-Legal society, contains an important thesis by Dr. J. W. Klime, of Iowa, on the use of light in the treatment of tuberculosis.

—The Arena (New York) for June is exceptionally interesting. If Samuel C. Parks's "Causes of the Philippine War" could be read everywhere, the Philippine question would soon be settled and settled right. This splendid article is followed by one on Cecil Rhodes, and that by one on the physical basis of history which is peculiarly interesting. An "Echo of the Inquisition" deals with the Pearson heresy case, and in the "Russian Remedy," Dr. Ecob sees Russia as a bold young giant leading the world in settling social problems. Besides a story there are other attractive articles and the usual group of strong editorials from the pen of Mr. Flower.

TELEPHONE WEST 1073. NOTARY PUBLIC  
**CHARLES A. JOSLYN, JR.**  
AUDITOR AND ACCOUNTANT

A specialty made of Opening, Closing and Examining Books of Small Concerns.  
Satisfaction guaranteed and charges reasonable.  
Call or address 351 SOUTH TROY STREET.

**Women's National Single Tax Conference.**

(Change of Date.)

For the convenience of delegates expressing a desire to attend, the Executive Committee of the Women's National Single Tax League have deemed it advisable to change the time of holding the Annual Conference from the 12th, 13th and 14th, dates heretofore announced, to the 26th, 27th and 28th, of June, 1902. The Conference will be held at The Tuxedo, corner of 59th Street and Madison Avenue, New York City, beginning at 10:30 o'clock, Thursday morning, June 26th.

It is hoped that every state and territory will be represented by one or more delegates. The annual fee for club membership in the League is one dollar for every five members of the club. Individuals may also become members of the League upon payment of an annual fee of one dollar. Women desiring to attend the Conference, or wishing to be represented by proxy, can obtain desired information by addressing Mrs. John S. Crosby, President W. N. S. T. L., No. 7 West 106th Street, New York, N. Y. Friendly papers please copy.

**The Australasian Tax System.**

Believers in home rule in taxation, have had their attention called to the campaign now in progress in Colorado, for an amendment to the state constitution. This amendment provides that any county so electing may levy a tax on land values for local purposes. An appeal for funds to assist the workers in Colorado was recently mailed to all known friends of the movement in the state of Illinois; but the responses have not been as numerous as we had hoped they would be. Many, no doubt, have intended to contribute but have allowed the matter to escape their attention. The committee cannot believe that the neglect is intentional on the part of those who understand the import of the Bucklin amendment.

Advocates of taxation reform in this state should make a generous contribution to this worthy causes. It is not often that so good an opportunity is presented for work along practical lines. We trust, therefore, that no personal reminder will be necessary on our part to the friends of this important movement. It is a privilege to be allowed a place in this opening fight on monopoly. Much depends upon the fate of the first battle. Victory in Colorado this fall means an easier fight wherever the next stand is made. The result should be decisive.

A vigorous campaign is being made in Colorado, but the workers are few in number; and, although they are making personal sacrifices for the cause, they are crippled for lack of money. Already they have circulated 100,000 copies of Senator Bucklin's report, but this is less than half of the number of voters in the state. They are looking to us for aid, and they have a right to expect it, for it is our cause as much as theirs. If the amendment is defeated for lack of finances to make a thorough campaign, the failure will be due, partly, to those who neglected to aid to the extent of their ability.

If you intend to make a contribution, please advise the committee at once. Do not wait for a personal solicitation, as that requires time and money on our part which cannot well be given. Subscriptions in any amount may be made, payable either in a lump sum or in monthly installments. If the latter way be chosen, it is desired that remittances should reach us not later than the 10th of each month, on which day our collections are forwarded to the secretary of the national committee. There are no expenses in connection with the Illinois committee, and the entire amount collected will be used for the purpose intended by the contributors.

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the treasurer and mailed to the secretary.

Illinois Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.  
EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN,  
Chairman and Treasurer.  
U. A. H. GREENE, Secretary,  
No. 128 Jackson Blvd., Chicago.

**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.

**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. It 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**

1641 UNITY 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 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

**FRED. CYBUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1263 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.  
NEW YORK.

Liberal Religious Literature free on application. Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Ave., Chicago.

**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. 60c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 128 E. 28th St., New York City.