

so awkwardly constructed. And they don't like to be awkwardly "jollied."

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary, who is responsible more than any other person for the infamous war of subjugation in South Africa, made a defensive statement in parliament on the 20th, which reveals his possession either of a great deal of ignorance of modern American history or of a very low grade of moral sense with reference to property rights. Referring to the conclusion of the civil war in the United States, he said that—

no political conditions were given the Confederates, while their property was confiscated on a tremendous scale.

As no property was taken by the conquering power from the people of the Confederacy on a large scale, except the slaves, who were not confiscated in the strict sense of the term but were set free, it must be inferred, if Mr. Chamberlain knew what he was talking about, that he recognizes slaves as legitimate property. It is rather late in the history of human progress for a man to be accorded credit for the most ordinary moral instincts who refers to an act of human liberation as a confiscation of property.

Cable correspondence from London to the American papers justifies all the more the position taken by Congressman Kern regarding American special representatives at the British coronation ceremony, upon which we commented last week. It appears that such representatives, instead of being honored envoys to the British people are to be made inferior guests at a royal family party. Says one of the dispatches, that to the Chicago-Record-Herald, of the 19th:

The whole system of etiquette for such occasions is very elaborate. Crown princes, representing the emperors and the elder sons of kings, naturally come first, and after them the special envoys, whose precedence is sometimes arranged according to the date of their arrival, and at other times alphabetically. If the latter method is followed, as is predicted,

the United States would come at the end or just before Uruguay and Venezuela.

At last the veil of secrecy and prevarication is removed, and the reconcentrado order of an American general in the Philippines—J. Franklin Bell—comes to light. From time to time the facts have leaked out regarding modified applications in the Philippines of Weyler's barbarous policy of reconcentration, but now its unmodified application is boldly revealed. Gen. Bell's order, issued early in December, requires the inhabitants of the province of Batangas to come within American military camps under penalty of the confiscation and destruction of their property. This is the policy with which Weyler shocked the civilized world and aroused the indignation of our own country when he originated it in Cuba. It is the policy which the British, to their shame, have adopted in South Africa. It is a policy which means disease, starvation, torture and death in the Philippines just as it did in Cuba and does in South Africa. It is a policy for which the responsibility must be placed where it belongs, not upon Bell, the subordinate, but upon President Roosevelt, the commander in chief. Whether he ordered it or not he has the power to stop it.

Epigrammatic and cutting is the admonition with which Dr. Parkhurst favors Mayor Low, of New York city. "There is not much to choose," he writes, "between a Tammany administration that has bad principles, and a reform administration that has good principles but is afraid to use them." This is apropos of the discovery that New York is as "wide open" a town under Mayor Low as it was under Mayor Van Wyck. It is true that Mayor Low has been only a short time in office. But he was not required to get new laws enacted in order to redeem the anti-Tammany pledges. The laws exist. They need only to be enforced. Why they have not been enforced anyone familiar with New York knows. The administration

that should become responsible in the public mind for their enforcement would be damned beyond resurrection. The laws are "hay-seed" laws, imposed by the state legislature, at the solicitation of a small minority of the inhabitants, upon this vassal city. What the political reformers who manage Mr. Low have hoped to do has been to enforce the laws to flatter the minority, without enforcing them enough to enrage the majority. But Dr. Parkhurst is not yet flattered.

Several bankers of Colorado Springs petitioned the governor of Colorado to include in a call for an extra session of the legislature, as one of its purposes, the repeal of the Bucklin constitutional amendment resolution now pending before the people. They state their belief that this amendment, if adopted, would be detrimental to the interests of the state. That is suggestive of much, as Carlyle might have said. The Bucklin bill is a resolution for the amendment of the constitution so as to allow the people of any county to adopt the popular Australasian method of taxing land values if they want to. It was passed by a clear two-thirds vote of each house of the legislature. It is now under discussion before the people of the state, who are to vote on it next fall. If they adopt it, no change in the fiscal system of the state or of any county would thereupon ensue. Nor could any change be brought about without elections petitioned for by tax payers, and after a popular vote in favor of the change; nor even then except in the county voting. Yet these bankers want the legislature to repeal the resolution so as to cut off a popular vote upon the amendment. It is not difficult to understand that proposition. Lobbies can influence legislatures, whereas the public cannot be approached in that way, and the bankers are evidently disposed to rely upon a lobby. Something else is not hard to guess, which is that the petitioning bankers are more deeply interested in real estate speculation than they are in legitimate

banking. The governor has not distinctly complied with their request. but his call for the special session is ambiguous enough in this respect to make room for a question, and a banker's lobby may try to take advantage of it.

In his inaugural address Gov. Cummins, of Iowa, disclosed a purpose and a grasp of political possibilities, which cannot be reassuring to the present occupant of the White House, who has taken into his cabinet an Iowa statesman whom Gov. Cummins "turned down" at the Republican convention last fall. It is evident both that Gov. Cummins has his eye on the Republican presidential nomination, and that this is game which he knows how to go gunning for. He has turned his attention to the question of trusts and the tariff. Much of what he says could be riddled full of holes, but not by anyone who is likely to loom up for the Republican presidential nomination. Economically it is pretty thin stuff, despite several sound but somewhat incongruous generalizations; but politically it is far and away ahead of anything that any Republican aspirant for national honors has yet put forth. A confusing hotch-potch of sense and nonsense, of competitive individualism and paternal state socialism, of dependence and independence, of equality and class interests, the ingredients seem, nevertheless, to be pretty well chosen and very judiciously mixed for the purpose of making the mess agreeable to the Republican palate.

It is difficult to realize the strides that Mayor Johnson has made within 12 months in injecting democracy into the Democratic party of Ohio, and bringing the party to life. It was a mere spoils-hunting machine, absolutely under the control of John R. McLean, when Johnson loomed above the political horizon, and now it has been rescued altogether from McLean's clutches. In the recent reorganization of the state committee all his henchmen were side-tracked,

and he is no longer capable of doing any more harm than can be done in cunning ways by the Cincinnati Enquirer, which he owns. Meanwhile, the street railroad agitation, with which Johnson began the Democratic fight against the monopoly corporations in Ohio, has taken a peculiar turn. On the one hand the three-cent fare proposition, on which Johnson was elected mayor, is being pushed. The city council of Cleveland has authorized bids in accordance with it, to be received on the 10th of February, and of at least one such bid Johnson declares that he is assured. On the other hand his municipal ownership proposition, petitioned for by the Cleveland council, is before the legislature. These two propositions, both of them promoted by Johnson, have thrown the opposition into the utmost confusion. They don't understand Johnson's play. Some of his adversaries, including the representatives of railroad interests, are yielding to the three-cent fare proposition to head off municipal ownership. But even these are in doubt. Johnson has played such an absolutely open game that it seems to them to be a densely mysterious and bewilderingly confusing game. They are more confounded by it than they could be by any amount of concealment, for they are expecting the unexpected to stun them at any moment. Nor are they wholly oblivious to the fact that Johnson's double-head street car movement is only a prelude to radical taxation measures for which it is preparing the legislative mind, and which the pro-monopoly people dreaded more than any other weapons in Johnson's apparently exhaustless collection.

What may prove to be an important political movement in Kansas is to begin at Topeka on the 21st of February. A delegate conference of the People's party of the state is to be held there at that time for the purpose of deciding a question of vital importance. It is to lay out a course for the party to pursue in the dilemma in which it has been

placed with reference to cooperative action with the Democratic party, by the enactment last winter of an obstructive election law by the Republican legislature. This law is intended to prevent temporary fusions of two or more political parties. Under it political parties cannot act together as separate organizations under distinctive names. Similar laws exist in other states, enacted through the influence of political rings in order to protect themselves by preventing combined action by two or more parties against the party in power. Three courses appear to be open to the Kansas conference. It can decide to advise the People's party to go en masse into the Democratic party; or to make no nominations this year, but, populists being nominated by the Democrats, to make the campaign under the Democratic banner and name; or to nominate a complete People's ticket and "go it alone" as a third party. Since the Democratic party of the state is part of a national party, completely organized and with a large following throughout the country, there is naturally no expectation of inducing it to abandon its name and go into the People's party. The third possible course, the "go-it-alone" policy, is wisely not favored. The plan of supporting the Democratic party upon its nominating some populists as its candidates is more popular. But clearly the best plan would be the first. If the populists of Kansas go en masse into the Democratic party of Kansas they can impregnate its somewhat withered tissues with Democratic vitality, can soon control its organization, and what is of most importance, can exert a powerful and beneficial influence upon the policy of the national Democracy and the selection of its national candidates. It is to be hoped that the Kansas conference will have the political acumen and the moral courage to advise this course.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania, furnishes an example of what an able Democratic paper can do if its Democracy is more than a label — if it is truly and aggressively democratic.