

all rich now, what of the tenants who are hiring their farms? These tenants are not rich; but owing to the increase in the price of land and the fact which the Journal notes that there are "no more cheap lands," they are compelled to become tenants. Here, then, is Mr. Bryan's critic confounded by his own logic. For if, as the Journal of Commerce concludes, "tenancy appears from the last two censuses to be decidedly on the increase in this country," what difference does it make whether the tenants are impoverished ex-landlords or rent ridden young men. The essential thing is that tenancy is increasing, and that in consequence of the increasing price of land and the disappearance of cheap land it is tenancy of the hopeless kind.

In fact, however, tenants are not altogether newcomers. The same individual often does descend from the level of landlord to that of tenant. It is no uncommon thing for farmers to sell their farms and then hire them; it is a very common thing for farmers to sell their farms and then hire farms elsewhere. And one or the other or both will become more and more common as men who, in trying to be owners instead of tenants have been obliged to give purchase money mortgages in order to get any land at the higher prices, find that they must submit to foreclosure.

Hamlin Garland has won the noble distinction of getting roundly hissed at an old settlers' meeting in Wisconsin for paying a just tribute to the memory of Black Hawk, the Winnebago chief. So long as white men sing of heroes who strike for the "green graves of their sires, God and their native land," Black Hawk is entitled to be counted in. That is precisely what he did. And white men should none the less account him a hero because it was men of their own race who made it necessary for him to strike. Hissing a speaker who dares tell them so, as Garland did, does not lessen their race's guilt.

Neither can they explain it away by pleading that as Black Hawk's people were few while the whites were many it was the right of the whites to appropriate the Indians. That plea is in the last degree hypocritical. When the claim of a few hundred people to the land of England is recognized by white man's law as good against the millions of English landless; when less than half the American people own any land, while millions upon millions of acres are fenced in against the rest; and when this is defended by the whites as just, it ill becomes them to denounce Black Hawk as a land monopolizer and attempt to justify their treatment of him upon that ground.

Senator Mason's intimation of his intention to support McKinley this fall should not be taken too much to heart by those who have admired his magnificent speeches in behalf of the elementary principles of democracy. He has given no intimation of any intention to support McKinleyism. It should not be forgotten that Senator Mason, like Senator Hoar, by supporting McKinley, makes his anti-imperial speeches all the more effective against McKinley.

The democrats of the Columbus district of Ohio give evidence of their power of discrimination and appreciation in making John J. Lentz for the third time their candidate for congress. Mr. Lentz, while a party man, is a democrat of the Jefferson order, who, in two terms of service, has proved his supreme fitness for congressional work. He is an attractive orator, a convincing speaker, an intelligent and tireless worker, and a fighter whose courage serves as well in passive resistance as in the excitement of conflict.

A firm of Baltimore bankers, Hamblin & Co., solicitous for the substitution of Gorman as the democratic candidate for president in place of Bryan, has circularized large numbers of business men and bankers in the south and east in Gorman's be-

half. This uneasy firm of financiers apologizes for thus entering into politics by saying that while wishing it were otherwise it is nevertheless— a regrettable fact that politics and finance are so indissolubly connected that it is impossible to mention the one without alluding to the other.

This is, indeed, both a fact and regrettable. But it is the Gormans of both parties and not the Bryans of any party, that have made it so. It is Gormanism, not Bryanism, that puts government into private business and private concerns into government business. And that is what connects finance with politics so indissolubly. Bryanism would break the connection.

In announcing the fact that the Pennsylvania railroad has secured control of the Philadelphia & Reading railroad, one of the newspaper reports explains that—

this completes the partition of the anthracite coal territory between the New York Central and the Pennsylvania systems.

That is an exact expression. In the old days great barons partitioned territory between them; but now it is great railroad corporations. The effect, however, is the same. Now, as then, the people are the sufferers; and now, as then, it seems quite the proper thing—so supinely do the people adjust themselves to injustice.

Gen. Otis has repeatedly assured the American people that the Philippine "insurrection" has been put down, and that only robber bands, or ladrones, are now resisting American authority in the islands; but now he makes this discomfiting admission in a newspaper interview:

For a number of years it will be impossible to control the situation with fewer troops than we now have in the Philippines. When the terms of the volunteers expire they must be returned to this country, but the troops withdrawn must be replaced by others. For the present the islands will have to be governed by a military government.

"For a number of years," then, we must maintain an army of 65,000 troops in a country where there is no

popular resistance to our authority! How large an army does Gen. Otis think we shall have to send out there if another "insurrection" breaks out?

THE CHINESE "BOXERS."

In the face of the sensational news from China, with its terrifying accounts of cruelly murderous assaults upon Christian missionaries, men and women, the feat of listening to the Chinese side of the question is not without its difficulties. One cannot consider with patience, what may seem to be a plea in palliation of wholesale murder, in a strange land by strange people, of men and women of one's own race. Nevertheless there is a Chinese side to this sad affair, and it will harm no one to try at least to see it.

Perhaps that may be most easily done by calmly putting ourselves in imagination for a moment in the place of the Chinamen whose outrages have aroused our indignation and excited our demands for vengeance. No fair-minded person will object to doing this. For these Chinamen are men like ourselves, differing only as their peculiar associations and training, their traditions and their outlook upon the world, have accustomed them to see things from a different point of view from ours.

If we put ourselves in their place, we shall see to begin with that the "boxers" must be something quite unlike what the current newspaper explanations that they compose a secret society of conspirators would imply to the American mind. Though the movement may take on the form of a secret society, because that is either the customary form of popular uprisings in China or is the only one which such an uprising can assume with approximate safety, it is evidently what we of this country would distinguish as a "patriotic" movement.

That it is a popular uprising can hardly be questioned. It is not in human nature that a mere conspiracy should expand to such proportions.

And that it is "patriotic" in character is evident from a consideration of what the stories about it would at once imply if under like circum-

stances they related to ourselves. A similar movement in this country would probably signalize its exploits with some such cries as "Down with the Irish!" "To hell with England!" "The Chinese must go!" or "Burn the nigger!" according to the kind of foreigner that had excited the patriotic spirit; or "Hurrah for old glory!" if the uprising were against cosmopolitan tendencies. And instead of calling itself "I Hó Chuan" or "Righteous Harmony Fists," and being dubbed "boxers," it would take the name of "Primrose league," or "Sons of Their Fathers," or "Anti-Chinese," or "White Man's Brotherhood," and be nicknamed "sand lotters," or "kuklux," or "know-nothings," or "jingoes." These names would be as cabalistic to the pagan of Asia as "Righteous Harmony Fists" and "boxers" are to American Christians. But the spirit is doubtless the same whatever be the name or the nickname; and it is evidently the spirit which, when it manifests itself among ourselves, we are accustomed to denominate "patriotism."

Let us pursue the comparison.

Suppose the Chinese had come among us as we have gone to China. Suppose their merchants had got a foothold upon our coast. Suppose these merchants, finding the liquor traffic especially profitable because of our passion for drink, but checked by stringent prohibition laws like those of Maine, had called upon the emperor of China to force that traffic upon us from China, in spite of our laws. Suppose that the emperor's interference had brought on a war upon our own soil, in which by some magical superiority in death-dealing machines the Chinese had slaughtered our people in great numbers and forced us to yield to their demands. And suppose that, in the adjustment of terms of peace, we had been compelled not only to pay an immense money indemnity to China, but also to surrender to her the right of occupation and sovereignty over a commanding position upon our coast.

If China had thus outrageously foisted herself upon us, it would have been precisely as England did to her, except that the subject of the quarrel

in that case was opium instead of liquor.

But suppose, further, that the Chinese had sent missionaries to this country, and that the missionaries had not only built Joss-houses but had established outlandish schools and barbarian hospitals and had set about converting Christian people and their children to paganism. Beyond this, suppose that the Chinese had introduced methods of Sabbath breaking entirely new and unspeakably offensive to us, and in still other ways had outraged our religious prejudices, superstitions and traditions.

Suppose, moreover, that their policy in dealing with the occidental barbarians had been imitated by the Mongolians, the Manchurians, the Thibetans and the Japanese, all of whom were clamoring and quarreling among themselves for trading rights, and harbor privileges, and spheres of influence, and railroad grants, and landed concessions in our devoted country. And then suppose that Asiatic statesmen and diplomats and gossip mongers were discussing the possibilities and the proprieties of dismembering the United States and dividing its territory among their several nationalities in the interest—not of greed, Joss save the mark!—but of Jossism and the oriental civilization.

Suppose, too, that their popular Asiatic poets were egging on the Asiatics to civilize us according to their standards by singing of that duty as "the yellow man's burden." And suppose, with all the rest, that these strange people were flocking to our shores; were settling in groups apart, making Chinatowns wherever they dropped down; were perpetuating their own customs and institutions—civil, social, political and religious—and threatening ours with extinction; were, in brief, well on the way towards transforming the United States into tributary provinces of Thibet, Japan and the Chinese empire.

What, in those circumstances, would happen in this country?

Need we ask what would happen? Could we doubt what would happen? Do we not know what actually has happened, only in minor degree, upon the bare possibility of even a peaceful Chinese invasion? There would be an uprising in this country