

in the matter as he has to his. If the constitution does not bind him and this congress with reference to the Philippines, it cannot bind his successors and subsequent congresses. And there is the danger. Imperialism does not consist in tyranny. It consists in unrestrained power. And unrestrained power, for congress and the president in the Philippines, is what the McKinley policy represents, according to Mr. McKinley himself. He asserts his intention to use it benevolently. But despotism is none the less despotic for being benevolent; and it is in benevolent despotism that malignant tyranny always takes root. If this policy be maintained, we depart from the safe theory of our government that none of its departments can legally pursue any policy or do any act, good or bad, without the authority of the written constitution.

It is only within a few days that the American public has been informed of the barbarous conduct of the British government in South Africa. Even now the information is general and vague. But of the diabolical character of this conduct there is no longer room for question. The cruel treatment of the American patriots by George III. in the last century was almost benevolent in comparison with the treatment of the Boers by the tory government of Great Britain to-day.

It began with the demand of Lord Salisbury for unconditional surrender. Not willing to make terms of peace when the Boers offered the olive branch, he insisted upon the extinction of their republics. And when they refused submission to this imperious demand, declaring that they would fight till the last man had gone down, he copied the methods of Spain in Cuba and turned the war into one of extermination. In February Lord Roberts, commanding in South Africa, had issued a proclamation announcing the entry of the British into the Orange Free State, warning the inhabitants to desist from further

hostility towards Great Britain, promising immunity to those who had taken up arms pursuant to the orders of their government, provided they resumed their ordinary occupations, and threatening all who might oppose his command or give aid or encouragement to their own people with military punishment. His next step was to offer to all who had not taken a prominent part against the British, safe conduct to their homes provided they would lay down their arms and take the British oath of allegiance. That was in March. Thus far Lord Roberts had done no more, possibly, than by a stretch of military authority he might have done in any country he had invaded; though it is safe to assume that if he had invaded France or Germany he would not have intimated a purpose to punish Frenchmen or Germans for having fought under their own flag or for refusing to take an oath of allegiance to Great Britain. But in May he took a long stride in the direction of that policy which justifies President Kruger in describing the British as barbarians. Under orders from the home government he proclaimed to the inhabitants of the Transvaal that if wanton damage were done to property, not only would the actual perpetrators of such acts, and all directly or indirectly implicated in them, be liable to the most severe punishment in person and property, but—

the property of all persons, whether in authority or otherwise, who have permitted, or who have not done their utmost to prevent, such wanton damage, will be liable to be confiscated and destroyed.

In June still more drastic measures were taken. Lord Roberts then issued a proclamation making what he called "principal residents" personally liable for all damage to railways, telegraphs and public buildings in their respective towns and districts. He also authorized the selection from time to time from each district of a "principal resident" to ride upon railroad trains through districts where attacks were anticipated upon the

railroad by Boer raiders, thus compelling unoffending noncombatants to expose themselves to death. Moreover, wherever Boer raiders did damage, the houses and farms in the vicinity were to be destroyed and neighboring residents to be dealt with under martial law. Pursuant to those proclamations business men who have never taken part in the war, directly or indirectly, have been forced by British military officers to ride back and forth upon endangered railway trains, and the families of farmers in the region of De Wet's attacks upon British lines of communication—people who were not responsible for his raids and could not have stopped them if they would—have been driven off their farms, their homes being given to the flames.

This cruel policy became more cruel still as the hope of conquering the Boers died down; and for months the floodgates of British barbarity have been opened wide. On the 9th of July a British army captain, acting as district superintendent of police for the district of Krugersdorp, gave official notice that unless the men then serving in the Boer ranks, who belonged to families in that district, would "surrender themselves and hand in their arms to the imperial authorities by the 20th of July, the whole of their property will be confiscated and their families turned out destitute and homeless." A week later this notice was so far modified as to make the penalty confiscation of stock and supplies instead of destitution and homelessness, words which had too ugly a sound. That was followed on the 11th of August by a proclamation revoking previous promises of protection to noncombatants and declaring that—
all burghers in districts occupied by British forces, except those who have sworn the oath, will be regarded as prisoners of war and transported; and all buildings, structures, and farms where the enemy's scouts are harbored will be liable to be razed to the ground.

Then we have a letter of September 2 from Lord Roberts to the Boer Gen.

Botha, in which the writer tells of having given orders for the burning of all farm houses near where any attempt had been made to injure trains or railways, and threatening that for ten miles around every farm should be denuded of provisions, cattle, etc. Gen. Botha in replying wrote:

Wherever your troops were, not only are houses burnt down or blown up with dynamite, but defenseless women and children are ejected and robbed of all food and cover.

This terrible indictment of British civilization is sustained by numerous reports in British newspapers of all shades of politics. A correspondent of the St. James Gazette reports the British Gen. Campbell as having told him of "orders to 'sweep' the country"; and continuing, says:

A view of his following soon made it obvious that he had not failed to carry out his orders. All farms on the line of march were cleared of horses, cattle, sheep, wagons, carts, etc., the forage being burnt, and the owners bidden to join the ranks of the prisoners, of whom there were already a goodly number.

This is no exceptional instance. All the Boer houses from Vryheid to Dundee, a distance of 50 miles, have been burned. Bothaville and Venterburg have been completely destroyed. In other places, too, whole districts have been laid bare. And so reckless are the British in burning the farms of absent Boers who are supposed to be in the Boer military service that it often happens that those whose farms have been burned are absent because they are prisoners of war in the custody of the British. A correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette, one who is entirely in sympathy with this tory policy of merciless destruction, says that "prisoners of war on their return will find in nine cases out of ten"—think of it! "in nine cases out of ten"—"that their homesteads have been burned down." He says this in connection with a cold blooded proposition to organize a British company for the purchase of these farms for a song.

In magnificent contrast with this inglorious British war of extermina-

tion against noncombatants of all ages and both sexes, is the defiance that Gen. Botha sends out to Lord Roberts. "I desire to give you the assurance," he writes, in answer to a letter from Roberts threatening a continuance of the barbaric policy, "that nothing you may do to our women and children will deter us in continuing the struggle for our independence." Here is a situation that should make American blood flow faster. Have we forgotten that they were British tories who made the British name a synonym for savage cruelty throughout the revolting colonies on this continent when our fathers were fighting for independence? The same tory instinct is now devastating the homes of the Boers. Have we forgotten the stubborn courage of the founders of our government, who devoted their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to the liberation of this land from tory dominion? Can we see no parallel? Are our mouths indeed so full of Filipino blood that we can articulate no word of sympathy for the Boers? The question of the original merits of the war is no longer important. That question was eliminated when Salisbury, refusing arbitration, demanded the extinction of Boer independence. Having declared his purpose to extinguish two nations, and followed that with a policy of extermination more relentless and cruel than any nation claiming to be civilized has ever before pursued toward a civilized people, he raised another issue: Shall that barbarous policy be acquiesced in by the nations of Christendom? Shall the appeal for arbitration which the Boers of South Africa are making and the civilized people of England are seconding—shall that just appeal be ignored? The nation that is silent at such a crisis brings its own civilization into question. Yet France alone thus far has spoken.

The Chicago school teachers have won a victory against the monopoly corporations of Chicago before the

state board of equalization. It is about such a victory as they might have expected to win before a body which is probably more completely at the beck and call of the great corporations than any other official body in the state. The board has decided to increase the assessment of capital stock from about \$26,500,000 to about \$55,000,000—a gain of something like \$28,000,000. To illustrate how gross this undervaluation must be, let us refer to its effect on one of the Chicago corporations—the Chicago City Railway company. The stock of this company is 190,000 shares, of the par value of \$100 each, making the capitalization \$19,000,000. It is worth in the market \$250 a share—an aggregate capital stock valuation of \$47,500,000. The tangible property of the company is assessed at \$1,122,499, which, deducted from the market value of the stock, leaves a taxable stock valuation of \$46,377,501. Yet the compliant board of equalization assesses this stock at only \$700,000! The under-assessment is so gross that no explanation of it, consistent with honesty, seems possible.

It is because these great corporations with their rich franchise holdings are thus favored, that the schools of Chicago suffer. Salaries are cut down, building accommodations are contracted, terms are shortened, and in many other ways the efficiency of the service is minimized. For that reason the teachers have organized to secure a due execution of the tax laws against these parasitical, tax-dodging corporations. They have had a hard fight, and in degree they have won the fight. Though the board of equalization has done but little for them, it has been forced to do something; and public attention has been directed by the fight to one of the main causes of a deficient school fund. But now a voice is raised to the public against this commendable action of the school teachers. It is the voice of the president of the State university. In a public address, he declares that