

Rodgers, who cabled officially from Cavite on the 22d as follows:

Active insurrection in Samar. New York leaves to-day for Catbalogan with 300 marines, to return to Basey and Balangiga to cooperate with the army. Nearly all naval force concentrated on Samar patrol. Services Arethusa and Zafiro, two colliers, needed and being utilized.

Concurrently it is reported from Washington (we quote from the correspondence of the Chicago Record-Herald of the 23d) that—

an active campaign, participated in by the army and navy, has been inaugurated against the rebels in Samar. That island is to be swept clean of Filipinos hostile to American sovereignty. They are to be given no opportunity to escape to another island. They will be killed in action, or, in order to prevent being driven into the sea, they must surrender.

Light is thrown upon the inner meaning of that dispatch by one of the 22d from Manila (from the correspondent of the Chicago Tribune and published in that paper of the 21st), which says:

It is not likely that the troops will take any more prisoners, as the war against the treacherous natives will be carried on without asking for or giving quarter.

Part of the American force in this work consists, according to Manila dispatches, of the Macabebes, native scouts, whose relation to the civilized Filipinos is much the same as that of the Indians to the Americans in our Revolutionary war. The Macabebes scouts are relied upon to do the work in the interior of Samar, while the American troops operate along the coast. Another method decided upon by Gen. Chaffee, as reported by the current dispatches from Manila, is the policy inaugurated by Gen. Weyler in Cuba and imitated by Lord Kitchener in South Africa—the reconcentrado policy of compelling the rural inhabitants to go into towns. Gen. Chaffee modifies this policy for Samar, however, to the extent of exempting men who are known to have a steady occupation.

Samar is not the only place where resistance to American occupation of the Philippines has revived. The island of Leyte is described to be as disturbed as Samar, and general uneasiness is reported as prevailing in central Luzon.

Passing now to Afghanistan, where the death of the old ameer (p. 424) and the succession of his son Habibullah (p. 440) were regarded as likely to result in local disturbances that might embroil Great Britain and Russia in war, it seems more than probable that this danger has passed. British dispatches from India have all along denied, though uneasily, that a controversy was imminent. The St. Petersburg dispatches alone predicted trouble. But a St. Petersburg dispatch of the 18th declares that it is asserted in high diplomatic circles there that even should complications arise in Afghanistan in consequence of the death of Abdur Rahman and the accession of Habibullah, these would not lead to concurrent intervention, which means that Russia would give Great Britain no cause for protest.

In France parliament reassembled on the 22d, under circumstances which imperiled the continuance in power of the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry, of which the socialist Millerand is a member. The critical situation is connected with a possible strike in the coal regions of the north of France. The miners' committee had adjourned, after a session of several days, without making public the result of its deliberations. It is to meet again next February. When parliament assembled, on the day of the adjournment of that committee, the 22d, a socialist deputy, M. Basly, demanded immediate consideration of a bill to establish a minimum wages scale for miners, with a work-day of eight hours and a pension of 2 francs a day after 25 years' service. The premier, Waldeck-Rousseau, stated that while the ministry favored the general principle of the bill, and was inclined to continue its examination into the question of miners' pensions with a view to incorporating it in the general question of pensions, it was opposed to fixing a minimum wages scale, and, though desirous of ameliorating labor conditions everywhere later, could not now act upon the eight hour question without injury to national production. He added that the ministry would not yield to the pressure of influences generated by temporary irritation. Upon this declaration the ministry was deserted by the socialist deputies. Mr. Viviani, their leader, denounced it vigorously for refusing now to fulfill pledges which both Waldeck-Rous-

seau and Millerand had made to the labor party. But the loss of socialist support was offset by conservative accessions, and the position of the ministry was sustained by the narrow majority of 66.

Labor controversy in the United States is again involved somewhat conspicuously as well as significantly in the question of "government by injunction." This is in connection with the injunction order against the striking machinists, granted August 23d by the federal judge, Kohlsaat, of Chicago (p. 329). Arguments upon continuing that injunction were heard in September, and on the 21st of October Judge Kohlsaat decided against the strikers. The permanent order, as signed, omitting merely formal phrases, commands all persons—

to desist and refrain . . . from in any manner by violence or threats of violence interfering with, hindering, obstructing or stopping any of the business of the complainant, the Allis-Chalmers company . . . and from entering upon the grounds or premises of the complainant against its wish, for the unlawful purpose of interfering with, hindering or obstructing its business in any form or manner, or from compelling or inducing, or attempting to compel or induce, by threats or intimidation of any sort, or by force or violence, any person to leave the employment of said complainant, or not to enter its employ if desirous of so doing . . . and from congregating at or near the aforesaid respective plants or factories of the complainant . . . to intimidate, or obstruct, surround or impede, or in any manner calculated to intimidate, or for that purpose, any of the employes of the complainant, or any person or persons seeking employment from said complainant in the operation of its said business by an act of violence or any act calculated to intimidate such persons, and from in any manner interfering with the complainant in carrying on its business in said respective plants or factories in the usual and ordinary way by and in the manner aforesaid . . . and from picketing, guarding, obstructing, impeding, besetting or patrolling the streets, alleys or approaches to the aforesaid several premises of said complainant or ordering the same to be done, for the purpose, or in such manner as to intimidate, coerce or by any act or language tending to intimidate, or induce any other employes of the complainant from remaining or continuing in such employment, or for the pur-