

(p. 486), with the addition noted above, is as follows:

	Total prisoners.	Deaths.	Rate per year per 1000.
June .....	85,410	777	109
July .....	93,940	1,412	180
Aug .....	106,347	1,878	214
Sept .....	109,418	2,411	284
Oct .....	111,879	3,156	336
Nov .....	118,255	2,807	276

The suspicions heretofore noted that the October report was being held back because it probably showed an increase in the number of deaths is fairly confirmed.

**JOHN SWINTON.**

With the death of John Swinton—conventional journalist but unconventional agitator—there passes away another pioneer of the modern American labor movement.

Swinton stood for no particular phase of labor agitation, but for labor agitation in general. Though he sympathized with trade unionists, he was not wedded to trade unionism. Though he had much in common with socialists, he was not a socialist. Though he sympathized with anarchists, he cared nothing for the philosophy of anarchism. He welcomed Henry George's teachings, but he did not espouse them—he did not even grasp them and probably never tried to. He neither had nor wanted a reform programme. So far as his mind was affirmative at all, it was so only poetically. Robust fighter though he was, as well as poetical in temperament, he fought as an iconoclast, trusting with the confidence of the poet that when the bad has been torn away something good will spring up in its place. But while he pushed every programme aside, he encouraged the makers and promoters of all programmes. Belonging to no school of labor agitation, he gave Godspeed to every school. "Stern old iconoclast" that he was, it appeared to make little difference to him how the existing industrial order might be got rid of, or what order might replace it. Since nothing could be worse, as he viewed the matter, the first thing to do was simply to get rid of it.

A strenuous rebel against the existing order, he was always ready to volunteer in a fight with any other rebel for its overthrow. The same spirit had animated him in that ear-

lier form of the American labor struggle known as the anti-slavery conflict, from which he and the late James Redpath and also Wendell Phillips—so unlike personally but so like in humanitarian impulse and rugged crudeness of method—emerged into the modern labor movement. Slavery was to him the sum of all iniquities, and his ideal of an anti-slavery leader was John Brown, of Ossawatimie. But Swinton's all-round hero was Victor Hugo. This great poet and agitator of France was his model if he had a model. Had his environment been similar to Hugo's, his career would doubtless have resembled the Frenchman's. If, like Hugo, he had no programme as an agitator, like Hugo he had convictions; and his convictions, like Hugo's, were on the humanitarian side. Vague though they were in outline, in character they were intense.

A life-long friend of Charles A. Dana, yet Swinton never swapped the impulses of his earlier manhood for gilded flesh pots, as Dana did; and Dana's loyal friendship for Swinton, which ended only with his own death, testifies to his lingering love for the democratic aspirations to which, in common with Swinton, he had once been devoted.

As a rebel waging guerrilla warfare upon hoary wrongs, Swinton's service was doubtless valuable. If he did no more, at any rate he helped stir up stagnant respectability. Better appreciated twenty years ago than now, he may be still better appreciated in the future. Though his usefulness was limited by the negative character of his crusading, he leaves behind him nevertheless a record for moral courage which is badly needed in these days when records of brute bravery are held up to young men as worthy examples.

**NEWS**

The verdict in the naval court of inquiry, organized in August last to report upon the conduct of Rear Admiral (then Commodore) Schley in Cuban waters during the Spanish war, has been rendered. Upon several questions at issue the court is divided. Admiral Dewey, the president, having made special findings at variance with

some of the findings of the official verdict.

This court was appointed at the request of Rear Admiral Schley himself (p. 250), his conduct having been, as he asserted in a letter of July 22 to the navy department, scurrilously impugned by the recently issued third volume of Maclay's history of the navy, the first two volumes of which were then used as a text book at the naval academy. As at first announced, the court consisted of Admiral Dewey, president, Rear Admiral Lewis A. Kimberly and Rear Admiral E. K. Benham (p. 265); but Admiral Kimberly having asked to be excused, Rear Admiral Henry L. Howison was appointed in his stead (p. 280); and Admiral Howison being deposed for his bias (372), the final appointment (pp. 375-76) was of Rear Admiral Francis M. Ramsay. The court as organized consisted, therefore, of Dewey, Benham and Ramsay. Its verdict, accompanied by Admiral Dewey's dissenting report, was made public on the 13th.

A comparison of these two documents with the official directions of the department (p. 265), under which the court acted, yields the following result as to eight of the inquiries propounded, namely (1) Schley's conduct in the Santiago campaign; (2) his movements off Cienfuegos; (3) the reasons for his going from there to Santiago; (4) the movements of the flying squadron off Santiago; (5) Schley's disobedience of department orders; (6) the question of coaling the flying squadron; (7) the question of destroying the Spanish cruiser Colon at the entrance to Santiago harbor in May, 1898; (8) and the question of withdrawing the flying squadron from Santiago harbor to a distance at sea at night:

Regarding the second inquiry, Schley did not proceed with the utmost dispatch to Cienfuegos and blockade that port as close as possible, as he should have done. And no efforts were made by him "to communicate with the insurgents to discover whether the Spanish squadron was in the harbor of Cienfuegos, prior to the morning of May 24," although he should have endeavored to do so on May 23 "at the place designated" in the memorandum delivered to him at 8:15 a. m. of that date.

Regarding the first, fourth, fifth and sixth inquiries, that he did not proceed from Cienfuegos to Santiago