

mittees are expected to do. There was no necessity for reconcentrado camps at all (and it is admitted that our army established them), except to drive the inhabitants into them and devastate the country so that the enemy would have no place to draw supplies from. Is it not probable, then, that the people were driven in on pain of death and their homes destroyed? At any rate the question is whether the American reconcentrado policy has been what our correspondent describes or not. If it has not been, why not open the doors to testimony? Why suppress the facts? If it has been, why prate about "the honor of the army?" Why not either excuse the barbarity bluntly, as our correspondent does, or frankly admit, what all authorities on civilized warfare teach, that it is atrocious?

Meantime let us not be diverted from the main issue, which is colonialism, imperialism, un-Americanism, and not specific questions of cruelty. Cruelty is a nominal concomitant of colonialism. If the latter is just and wise and beneficent, the former must be patiently endured. Though it is right to expose the incidental cruelties for the purpose of illustrating the wickedness of the colonial policy, it is after all not particular outrages but the general policy that is at issue. The Springfield, O., Democrat, although it rather unjustly criticizes the Democratic senators for too much discussion of individual outrages and failing to center their fire upon the colonial question—unjustly because much attention was given to colonialism in those speeches—is nevertheless right in its main contention when it crisply says of the Philippine civil government bill:

It will rest with the saner Democratic press and speakers during the campaign of the Summer and Fall to enlighten the people upon the iniquities of this colonial scheme. The measure will have become operative meanwhile, but that will be no reason why its unconstitutional and un-American character should not be made known to the great masses of our patriotic people. The encroach-

ments of imperial power upon popular prerogatives throughout history have almost always begun in far-off provinces and, insidiously and unseen, crept like slow poison to the center of national vitality. The Democracy is the only herald left in the field to warn the people and arouse them to resist this liberty engulfing policy.

Mr. Mitchell's address to the public in behalf of the striking anthracite miners is an important document in more ways than one. It is important in the first place as a frank presentation of the case for the striking miners, and in the second for its exposure in detail of the cold-blooded policy of the coal trust. But one of its most important features is the proof it offers of the fact that our much vaunted prosperity, which Republican leaders have exploited for obvious party purposes and certain labor leaders have confirmed for purposes not so obvious, is a delusion.

It is shown by Mr. Mitchell that the average earnings of the anthracite miners is less than \$300 a year; and that while a 10 per cent. increase was granted to save the election in 1900, most of that was afterwards extorted by the trust as the price of abolishing an old powder grievance, and the remainder and more has been swept away by higher living expenses. The "purchasing power of a miner's earnings is less now," says Mr. Mitchell, "than before the strike of 1900," which Mr. Hanna settled so snugly on the eve of the presidential election. Nor is that all. Although wages have been raised only nominally, and their purchasing power has diminished, so that the miners are getting less than in 1890, their productive power has increased. The daily product per employee in 1890 was only 2.16 tons, whereas in 1901 it was 2.36 tons. And as to value of product the showing is similar. For the eleven years preceding 1901 the average selling value of coal loaded on the cars at the mines was \$1.48 per ton; whereas in 1901 the average price was \$1.87. That makes an increase of 39 cents in the value of the

product, while the operators themselves claim an increase in cost of production of only 13 cents, leaving a net gain for the trust of 26 cents. Here, then, is a sample of our boasted "prosperity." The trusts get an increase in product and values, while the workmen produce more but get less. This is the kind of prosperity which Senator Hanna regards as so good that it should be "let alone."

Mark Bangs, the Chicago lawyer who died this week at the advanced age of nearly 81 years, deserves to be remembered for more than his accidental fame as one of the oldest citizens, or his well earned reputation as a lawyer. He was a democrat—one of those democrats who retained their democracy through all the shifting positions of political parties, from his youth to the very latest years of his life. It was as a democrat that he became one of the founders of the Republican party, then the only party of real democracy; and as a democrat that he saw with sorrow this party of his young manhood turn from its ideals and become to the generation of to-day what the degenerate Democratic party of Pierce and Buchanan was to the generation of more than half a century ago. As Mark Bangs had been an anti-slavery man, so he continued. His abolition was not limited by the social crime of another section of the country than his own. It was a living and universal principle, which made him welcome the leadership of Henry George as that of a later prophet in a newer abolition for the destruction of a more subtle slavery.

#### THE LIMITATIONS OF EXPERTS.

It is a remarkable and very significant fact that experts are seldom pioneers. When Sir Isaac Newton has been named, the list of men who have ranked high as experts in any calling, yet who have led in the development of its great primary truths, is almost exhausted.

To be sure there are many who come to rank high after the truths they disclose have been generally ac-