

them with the number reported as engaged in agriculture we shall have to reduce the estimated average earnings by something over \$20, making the average labor income of those engaged in agriculture less than \$214. This would be still further reduced had we considered the amount paid as taxes on farm property.

To obtain the annual increase in the value of farm property, the census has taken one-tenth of the amount representing the difference in the value of farm property as reported in the censuses of 1890 and 1900. As there was no increase but a decrease in the value of farms and improvement from \$21.31 an acre in 1890 to \$19.82 in 1900, the increase in the value of farm property at the last census is the result of the inclusion of property not enumerated in 1900. According to the census there was an increase in the number of farms from 4,564,641 in 1890 to 5,739,657 in 1900, with an increase in acreage from 623,218,619 acres in 1890 to 841,201,546 in 1900. This unprecedented increase forms the only basis for the claim that the census indicates unparalleled agricultural prosperity.

Much of this increase results from the settling of new lands, but a very large proportion is fictitious. According to the census there was an increase in farm acreage in Illinois of 2,296,451 acres. In Ohio the increase shown is 1,149,577 acres. Here in Cook county, which is practically Chicago, according to the census there is also a remarkable agricultural development, the increase in farm acreage amounting to 19,718 acres. This is over 30 square miles of territory, and if in one tract would occupy an extent of over 6 miles long and 5 miles wide. How do they get it? Why, by enumerating as farms all the potato and cabbage patches on city lots. Even the Pingree potato patches in the district in which the writer resides were enumerated as farms. Enumerators were paid 18 cents for each tract thus enumerated, while they received but 4 cents for each death reported and were required to hunt up the attending physician and obtain his statement of the cause of death. They seem to

have got in everything that could possibly be enumerated as a farm, though their report as to mortality was very defective. The census schedule of 1890 did not admit the enumeration as a farm of any tract of less than 3 acres unless there was a product to the value of \$500 actually sold from it. Larger tracts were also excluded unless they required the labor of at least one able-bodied man for the year.

It is absurd to suppose that there could be any considerable increase in farm acreage in old settled States like Ohio and Illinois. On the contrary there must have been an actual decrease through the growth of cities and towns and the appropriation of land for residence and manufacturing purposes.

The inclusion of a larger number of small tracts as farms at the present than at the former census tends to decrease the average size of farms, and the fact that this average has increased from 136.5 acres in 1890 to 146.6 in 1900 is accounted for by the increased number of "bonanza farms."

The census reports 47,276 farms of 1,000 acres and over—the average size being 4,237.3 acres—making a total of 200,324,045 acres in farms of 1,000 acres and over, and almost one-fourth of the entire farm acreage of the United States, which is reported as 841,201,546 acres. In 1890 there were but 31,546 farms of 1,000 acres and over. The average size was not reported.

While there seems to be no reason to question the correctness of the census reports as to great farms, the reported increase in the small ones is largely fictitious. If there is prosperity among the farmers, then, as the census figures are said to show, it must be among the bonanza farmers, and not among the small ones. Not the land farmer, therefore, is prospering, according to the census, but the land monopolist.

HENRY L. BLISS.

## NEWS

To perfect the arbitration agreement in compromise of the anthracite coal strike (p. 438), a delegate

convention of anthracite coal miners' unions met at Wilkesbarre, Pa., on the 20th. The convention had been called on the 15th for the purpose of acting upon a unanimous recommendation of the executive boards of districts 1, 7 and 9 of the Mine Workers' Union of America, "that all mine workers now on strike return to their former positions and working places and submit to the commission appointed by the President of the United States all questions at issue between the operators and mine workers of the anthracite coal fields." When the convention met there were 662 delegates in attendance, the basis of representation being one delegate from each local union for every 100 members.

Mr. Mitchell opened the proceedings with a speech, in the course of which he made the following significant suggestions with reference to reciprocal relations between the coal miners' union and the coal trust in the future:

For our opponents we entertain no feeling of malice. While they have maligned our characters, impugned our motives and sought the victory by methods which we should scorn to use, yet on this day when we have secured an avenue of redress, on this day when the realization of our hopes and ambitions seems near, when the prospect of a brighter and happier future seems assured, we should hold out to them the hand of friendship and ask them to join us in providing for such business relations as shall for all time establish peace and tranquility in the coal fields. The day is past when great organizations of capital can maintain the false position that their employes shall be denied the right to organize into compact bodies and speak through the organization of which they are members. We recognize the right of capital to consolidate, to federate and to speak and act through its organization, but in according these rights and privileges to capital we demand and shall assert the same privileges for those who toil. Between the combination of capital, on the one hand, and the organization of labor on the other, there should be and need be no irreconcilable conflict; each is a factor in the economic development of our civilization and the application of business judgment and plain common sense by each would enable them to work in harmony.

No definite action was taken by the convention on the first day of its session, but on the 21st, after a long debate over a minor question, the convention accepted the proposed

compromise. The resolution, which was adopted unanimously, is as follows in full:

The Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.—Dear Sir: We, the representatives of the employes of the various coal companies engaged in operating mines in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, in convention assembled, having under consideration your telegram of Oct. 15, 1902, addressed to John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, which reads as follows:

I have appointed as commissioners Brig. Gen. John M. Wilson, E. W. Parker, Judge George Gray, E. E. Clark, Thomas H. Watkins, Bishop J. L. Spalding, with Carroll D. Wright as recorder. These names are accepted by the operators and I now earnestly ask and urge that the miners likewise accept this commission. It is a matter of vital concern to all our people, and especially those in our great cities, who are least well off, that the mining of coal should be resumed without a moment's unnecessary delay.

We have decided to accept the proposition therein embodied and submit all questions at issue between the operators and mine workers of the anthracite coal region for adjustment to the commission which you have named. In pursuance of that decision, we shall report for work on Thursday morning, Oct. 23, in the positions and working places occupied by us prior to the inauguration of the strike. We have authorized John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America, with such assistants as he may select, to represent us in all hearings before the committee.

The compromise agreement having been now accepted by both sides, President Roosevelt issued a call to the arbitration commission to meet at Washington on the 24th at 10 o'clock.

Coincident with the settlement of the coal strike in the United States came news of the end of the civil war in Hayti. Since our last previous account of this convulsion (p. 362), several battles have been reported. One occurred at Limbe on the 17th of September, in which the government troops under Gen. Nord were said to have been defeated. Gen. Nord subsequently recovered his position at Limbe, but on the 11th of October was said to have been again defeated and to be retreating. In a battle on the 12th at Montroiuc, the revolutionists successfully resisted an attack; and on the 16th government troops were marching on Gonaives, the revolutionary headquarters, while the revolutionary leaders were evacuating the place and fleeing the country. This is regarded as marking the end of the

revolution, but its sudden collapse is wholly unaccounted for by the dispatches. There may or may not be significance in the news reports from Washington about a month before the collapse, which were to the effect that the American government had decided to intervene and insist upon an immediate declaration of peace. It seems, furthermore, that on the 14th the American minister to Hayti took the initiative in securing a concert of action on the part of the diplomatic corps in proposing a cessation of hostilities in order to arrange for peace. About the same time the United States cruiser "Cincinnati" arrived, and three days later the revolutionary leaders abandoned their capital apparently without resistance and left the country.

When we last reported the revolutionary conflict in Venezuela (p. 377), President Castro was believed to be in a serious position and retreating from Ocumare, in Bolivar, before the insurgent troops after defeat in battle. On the 14th, however, it was reported that he had routed the insurgents at La Victoria and saved Caraccas. This report was followed by others of a highly sensational character, which told of the prolongation of the battle from the 13th to the 18th, and of the flight of the revolutionary army under Gen. Matos. The insurgents were said to have suffered casualties to the number of 3,000. But later advices, though from insurgent sources as the others were from government sources, are to the effect that the insurgents had merely abandoned the field after finding that they could neither capture La Victoria nor draw President Castro into open fight. That the battle was not decisive is vouched for by the American minister.

On the other side of the ocean and across the African continent the "mad mullah," whose mysterious title appears frequently in the newspapers, has won a victory over the British in Somaliland. British Somaliland lies on the southern coast of the Gulf of Aden and touches Abyssinia on the northeast. It is a British protectorate with a consul general. The "mad mullah," Haji Mohamed Bui Abdullah by name, is a native Mohammedan priest, the son of a Somali shepherd, who claims to be the successor of the Mahdi whose following Gen. Kitch-

ener slew at Omdurman (Vol. i., No. 23, p. 9; Vol. ii., No. 87, p. 8). The "mad mullah" had assumed a hostile attitude toward the British protectorate, announcing that he intended to rule the interior of the country himself, while leaving the coast to the Europeans. Thousands of natives joined his standard, and in March, 1900, he attacked an Abyssinian expedition which had been sent against him. His attack was so ferocious that although the Abyssinians repulsed him, they feared to follow up their victory. But in the Spring of 1891 the British arranged a joint expedition with Abyssinia against the "mad mullah" under the command of Col. Swayne. After several engagements Col. Swayne encountered the mullah near Hassan Ughaz, July 17, 1901, and defeated him with severe loss, effectually scattering his forces as was then supposed. About the middle of November of the same year it was reported that the mullah had fled with some of his followers into Italian Somaliland. But it now appears that he had not left the field to his British enemy. On the 6th of the present month he completely routed Col. Swayne at Erego, killing 50 of his men and wounding 100 more. Swayne was, at last reports, trying to retreat, but was in a trap. The British government have ordered troops from India to relieve him.

Peaceable warfare over the tariff question has been in progress in the German reichstag (p. 280) since it reconvened on the 6th, and is now approaching a climax. The discussion of the tariff bill proposed by the government began on the 16th, and test votes were taken on the 21st. The government on these votes suffered defeat by 194 to 145 on one proposition and 187 to 152 on another. The minority was composed of National Liberals, Socialists and Radicals, while the victory was won by the landed interests, which demand a high protective tariff on grain.

The British parliament reassembled on the 16th after the Summer recess (p. 295), and the opening scenes were marked with much disorder over the Irish question. Patrick O'Brien moved that one day be devoted prior to Christmas to the discussion of the Irish crisis caused by the suspension of civil rights in many Irish counties (pp. 362, 377, 433). His motion was opposed by