

and political liberality, as expressed by himself, are of a much better order than what are expressed for him by Republican and "reorganizing" Democratic editors. For instance, when asked whether he favored Edward M. Shepard for Democratic presidential candidate, he having spoken pleasantly of Mr. Shepard at the Nantasket dinner, he said:

I never discuss candidates for the presidential nomination. In referring to Mr. Shepard, I simply meant that I was always ready to sit with such Democrats, either at the banquet table or council board, receive advice from them, and give it respectful consideration.

Being further plied with leading questions, he replied:

I object to advice by such men as Cleveland, who never indicated his purpose to vote for the Democratic ticket in the last two campaigns. I do not expect that the Cleveland men will control the next Democratic convention. If they do we shall meet the issue at the time. Hill is a candidate for the nomination, but he is not to be trusted. All these appear to be justifiable and judicious discriminations.

It is a conscience-probing letter, that which the committee headed by Charles Francis Adams has addressed to President Roosevelt; and Mr. Roosevelt cannot dodge it, try he never so strenuously. He must either ignore it contemptuously or respond to its demand in good faith. Unless he does one or the other he will irrevocably implicate himself in the official conspiracy to hush up the Philippine atrocities. He may, anyhow.

By way of relieving the President of the necessity of meeting this letter upon its merits, the administration press are challenging the Adams committee to produce their evidence if they want their charges investigated. But that won't do. The committee explains too pointedly why it doesn't embody the evidence in its letter, and offers too definitely to produce it when an official investigation shall have been set on foot. These men distinctly assert that such an investigation—

would demonstrate the following criminal acts, contrary to all recog-

nized rules and usages of war, on the part of officers and soldiers of the United States: (1) Kidnaping and murder under circumstances of aggravated brutality; (2) robbery; (3) torture, both of men and of women, rape of the latter; (4) the infliction of death on other parties on the strength of evidence elicited through torture.

Charges of that character cannot with impunity be contemptuously ignored when they come from men like Adams and Schurz, of high national reputation, and others like Moorefield Storey and Burritt Smith and Herbert Welsh, who, though not so widely known, are men of the highest standing.

Especially can these charges not be ignored with impunity when the men who make them declare that every door of investigation has been officially slammed in their faces, and that there is no process possible, without the aid of the President, by means of which they can elicit the incriminating testimony and bring the culprits to justice. Still more especially can the charges not be ignored with impunity when it is a notorious fact that similar charges have been proved against high military officers, and they have been convicted only to be punished lightly as for a trivial offense. That an atrocious system of outrage and terrorism has prevailed in the Philippines with the consent if not the orders of the American military authorities has long been no secret. Returned soldiers have told about it boastfully. Returned officers have told about and defended it. The Senate investigating committee was put upon track of the evidence, but refused to follow it up. The war department was well advised of it officially months ago, but concealed its information until some of it leaked out, much to the chagrin of the secretary of war, who thereupon took proceedings, but only in those cases. It has been no secret to anybody but Mr. Roosevelt. It is no longer a secret to him.

Census statistics are always to be considered with much caution. But taking for what they are worth those

just published on agricultural values in the United States there is nothing very encouraging in them, not for working farmers. The total farm values are given as \$16,674,694,297. But of this amount only \$3,560,198,191, or 21 per cent., represents the value of buildings. The value of other improvements is bundled in with the value of the farm sites; but as the value of buildings comprises in most farming regions nearly all the value there is to improvements, it would not be far out of the way to estimate the whole \$13,114,492,056, or 78 per cent., as land value. In that case the land-owning, or monopoly, interest among farmers would be more than three times as much as their improvement-owning, or labor-produce, interests. So the figures would go to show that the prosperous fellow in agricultural regions is not the man who does the work, but the man who owns the site—not the farmers who farm farms but the farmers who farm farmers.

But who believes that the sites of the farms of the United States are really worth three times as much as the improvements? If the figures are true, there must be a great number of bonanza farms, to bring up the average, because on small farms the land is usually worth considerably less than the improvements. This bonanza farm explanation is not available, however, for the same collection of census figures is arranged to show that the number of farmers is increasing while the average size of farms is diminishing. It looks a little as if these census figures had been got up by a lineal descendant of the department clerk of whom it is told that when he was ordered to prepare official statistics on a certain question, he innocently asked, "On which side?"

The probability is that the enormous land values of these farms has been arrived at by including suburban lands highly affected with city values. It is well known that in the neighborhood of all cities there are

"farms" which could be sold by the front foot. If these were scheduled as agricultural lands they would carry up the value of sites as compared with improvements very rapidly. And that this has been done would appear from the fact that Cook county, in which Chicago is located, is credited with \$68,265,260 for farm lands, or about 4 per cent. of all the farm land value of the state, while the value of farm buildings is only \$8,839,960. It is not hard to guess what kind of farm land it is that has brought up the farm land value of Cook county so disproportionately to the farm buildings value. Doubtless the owner could raise corn on this farming land, but he can raise the price more easily and to better advantage. Its value is affected by the proximity to Chicago.

The policy of pardoning workhouse convicts detained for non-payment of fines or other pecuniary penalties, which was adopted over a year ago in Cleveland by Mayor Johnson and his chief of the charities and correction department, Harris R. Cooley, has had the effect of reforming the police justice system theretofore in vogue in Cleveland, as it is elsewhere, which discriminates between convicts with money and those without. Police Justice Thomas A. Kennedy, of Cleveland, is credited with having recently made the following sensible declaration:

Although the police fund is bankrupt and I might replenish it by fines from the unfortunates who come before me, I will not levy fines as long as I am police judge. I will not use this bench to incite vice and crime, to force men and women to the depths to get money with which to oil the police machinery. If they deserve punishment they go to the workhouse. If they can reform on the outside, suspended sentences will give them the chance.

Should Judge Kennedy impartially apply this policy to all convicts, letting off no one who happens to have the money to buy immunity, except those that "can reform outside," and then not by fining them but by suspending sentence, he will have set

an example of much needed reform in criminal administration.

It is to the honor of Clarence S. Darrow, Joseph S. Martin, William A. Bowles and others that they have undertaken to raise a fund to secure an appeal for Lewis S. Thombs, now confined in the Chicago jail under conviction of murder and sentenced to be hanged. Thombs may be guilty, and if he is his crime was brutal in the extreme. But he did not have a fair trial (p. 101). One jury disagreed, two of its members, reputable men, being for acquittal because they did not believe the story of the prosecuting witness. The prosecuting attorney thereupon outrageously denounced these jurors in the newspapers as unfit to be in a jury box, and at once brought the case to trial before another jury. This placed the prisoner at a disadvantage to which no one accused of crime should be subjected. Not a man on that jury would have been for acquittal, though he had a reasonable doubt, unless he had been made of the stuff of which heroes are made, and that is not common. This method of forcing convictions should be denounced by the whole bar. It is something to have it repudiated by one or two members who are serious enough in the matter to raise a defense fund.

When the tariff issue was paramount, one of the protection absurdities in the way of argument was peculiarly confusing. We were told that to the extent that the United States imports goods the United States has the goods and Europe has the money, but to the extent that the United States buys home-made goods, the United States has both goods and money and is therefore better off. It was as puzzling a riddle as that about putting ten men in nine beds with a bed for each. But we have come to see through its intricacies now, and to realize that money isn't worth any more than money's worth. But the same trick of argument has come forward in

another and perhaps more confusing form. Suppose, says the riddle-me-ree protectionist, that—

the exports of a country are \$20,000,000 and the imports are \$10,000,000. The balance of \$10,000,000 is favorable, because of the exports probably only about \$5,000,000 of actual value was sent away, being the raw material in the goods exported, the \$15,000,000 being represented by wages paid and profits to the manufacturer. The \$10,000,000 of imports thus represents an actual profit of \$5,000,000 to the importing country.

Could absurdity go much further? Suppose the exporter were a farmer's family instead of a national family. Suppose that this farmer's family exported from the farm to the dealer in the market town \$20 worth of corn, and imported back to their farm in exchange \$10 worth of groceries. Where would the profit to the farmer's family come in? Wouldn't it look to the man up a tree as if that family were out of pocket \$10? "Oh, no," exclaims the riddle-me-ree protectionist, "they have made a profit of \$10. Although they billed the corn at \$20, there was only about \$5 of artificial value in it, being the raw material. The additional \$15 was represented by the wages and profits of the farmer's family. So the \$10 worth of groceries imported would really represent \$5 of actual profit to the farmer's family. See?" Of course we see. Since the farmer's family gets \$5 worth of groceries for \$15 worth of work, they have a clear profit of \$5! And this is the kind of profit the national family reaps when it exports more than it imports.

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

In the case of the strike agitation among West Virginia coal miners, Judge Jackson, a Federal judge of West Virginia, has put the finishing touches upon the scheme for governing workmen by injunction. He has resorted to it to restrain freedom of speech, and to hold that aforesaid American birthright within the limits of his own notions of its proper exercise.

"The rightful exercise of freedom of speech," says this most excellent