

rant and malicious people to denounce them falsely as anarchists. The discharges seem to have been made by the employers in obedience to secret influences, and the victims appear to have been blacklisted. Whether this is the kind of work the Marquette club has been fostering, or is part of the persecuting scheme that Pinkerton, the private detective, outlines in the North American Review, is known, of course, only to the dark room conspirators themselves. But whoever is behind it should be ferreted out by the grand jury, in the interest of good order and respect for law. It is especially important that the grand jury take the initiative in these first cases. The victims are non-resistants and will take no revenge nor make any complaint themselves. But the matter concerns others as well as themselves. It concerns society as a whole. For there is danger that future victims of these stealthy conspiracies will not be non-resistants, and that they may be provoked by the lawlessness of the conspirators to lawlessness in retaliation. In view of that possibility, it is the duty of the grand jury to demonstrate at once that the law may be trusted to put down such persecutions. That body cannot wisely or justly leave outraged victims to infer that their wrongs will go without redress and their rights without protection unless they become their own avengers. Upon no other public men does the responsibility rest so heavily at this time as upon grand jurors, to convince all classes that the law is not a respecter of persons.

The supreme court of Ohio, on the 29th, dismissed the last of the cases which ex-Attorney General Monett had brought against the Standard Oil trust. It did so at the request of Attorney General Sheets. This was entirely regular, not only judicially, since it is proper for a court to dismiss an attorney general's suit upon application of the attorney general, but also politically. For the Republican convention had "turned down"

Mr. Monett, refusing to renominate him because he brought these suits against the oil trust. It nominated Mr. Sheets in his place, and the people of Ohio approved this action of the convention. Politically, therefore, Mr. Sheets was under orders from the people of the state to undo Mr. Monett's work. He has obeyed with all reasonable expedition. His ostensible reason, as announced to the court, was that the trust had dismantled its plant in Ohio and left the state. But Mr. Monett asserts that nothing of this kind has been done except evasively, and that the evidence against the trust is abundant. At any rate Mr. Sheets has faithfully obeyed the mandate he received in his nomination and election to supplant the attorney general of his own party who had been officially upright in his attitude toward the trusts.

The lower house of the Georgia legislature has made a move in the right direction with reference to taxation. By the passage of a franchise tax bill, it aims at taxing franchise values. This it does by requiring the state authorities to deduct the value of the tangible property of corporations from the total value of their stocks and bonds. The difference so arrived at is to be regarded as representing the value of the franchise, and is to be taxed accordingly. As the senate has yet to act, it is too early to be enthusiastic over this measure; but the fact that the measure has passed the lower house has an encouraging significance.

One of the able and influential Democratic papers of the west, democratic with a little d as well as Democratic with a big D, has long been known as the Dubuque Telegraph. By merger with another paper it has recently become the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald. Fortunately for the readers of these combined papers, and for the Democracy of Iowa, John S. Murphy, whose ability as editor made the Telegraph what it was, is the editor of the Telegraph-Herald. A few such editors as Mr. Murphy would

soon change the political complexion of Iowa.

Dr. Hiram W. Thomas, for many years an independent preacher of Chicago, one who left the orthodox fold because he rejected, among other doctrines, what has been perhaps irreverently called the "slaughter-house theory of the atonement," has retired from regular ministerial work. It is to be regretted that this was necessary. Christian preachers are not too numerous in these imperial days, when it is unhappily more than half true that, as Swinburne phrases it, we have "a Christian church which spits on Christ." But Dr. Thomas has done a good work in the past, both as clergyman and citizen, and from what may yet remain to be done, whether in the pulpit or out of it, he is not the man to shrink.

The German tariff on cereals, intended nominally for the benefit of the farmhand class, but really, of course, for the farm landlord class, has worked out precisely as its projectors expected, but not precisely as they promised. Says the New York Evening Post:

It was supposed that these duties would make possible the payment of higher agricultural wages, by enabling landowners to get better prices for their products, and thus keep the peasants from drifting to the cities in search of work in manufacturing enterprises. The main error in this notion is, of course, found in the failure of the new law to provide any means of transferring the higher returns in agriculture from the pockets of landowners to those of laborers.

That is the main error in all plutocratic schemes for "enabling" employers to pay higher wages. What is especially noteworthy about the above quotation, however, is its recognition of a truth of far-reaching importance, the truth that a tariff on products of land—and all goods are products of land—in so far as it is effective at all as a protection to home industry, protects only the industry of owning land. The industry of using land gets none of it.

As an answer—after the Yankee

method of answering inquiries—to the arguments now and then heard in defense of the proposition that slave-owners ought to have been compensated for their slaves, we commend the following brief letter from M. J. Foyer to the Cleveland Chronicle:

You say, in comparing the right of property in land with the right of property in slaves, "it would have been just and proper to make compensation for the capital destroyed by abolition" of slavery. In this connection I should like to inquire if you would be in favor of arresting a runaway slave on the charge of grand larceny on the theory that in running away from his "master" without first compensating him for the property involved he was guilty of robbery?

#### A PARALLEL IN BARBARISM.

Hardly a year has gone by since innocent Republicans were protesting against having the McKinley colonial policy described as a policy of imperialism. But events are now taking place which give to those protests an emphatic negative. If the American government we are developing in the Philippines is not the government of an empire, then it is a nondescript. It is not a republican government. It is not a military government. It is not free enough for a limited monarchy. It is the most absolute government, professing civilization, on the face of the earth. It is more absolute than the Russian government. For autocratic authority it is without a parallel outside the British military lines in South Africa.

It has forced the people of the island of Samar to leave their homes and to congregate in the towns. This is the infamous "reconcentrado" device of Gen. Weyler in Cuba. Partly because he drove the Cubans into the towns, we went to war with Spain, President McKinley declaring that this "reconcentrado" was—

not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave.

Yet, in less than four years after those words were written, the McKinley colonial policy has led us on to doing in the Philippines what President McKinley so vigorously condemned Spain for doing in Cuba.

Nor is that the worst. The later dispatches from Manila tell of a

policy of oppression in the Philippines which goes beyond the drastic laws of the Spanish, when they, as our predecessors, ruled with imperial sway over those unhappy islands. This extreme and unprecedented policy consists in making treason punishable with death, and in defining it with such grim absurdity that the people who are fighting for the liberation of their own country may be executed as traitors by us who confront them as foreign invaders.

Treason! Is it treason? Treason against what? Not against the United States, for under our constitution only citizens can be traitors. These people are not citizens. It cannot be treason against the United States. What then? There is no answer that meets the requirements of public law. They are to be shot as traitors merely because they are in arms against the American army of invasion. It is a war measure. This may possibly be an effective way of carrying on a war of conquest, but it is new to modern warfare, strange to the principles of public law, and abhorrent to all our own traditions. Even in our efforts to subdue the American Indians, barbarous as our methods often were, we never went the length of executing hostile Indians as traitors.

For precedents for this new method of conquering our "pacified" Philippine subjects, we are confined to Great Britain in her war in South Africa. We have left even the Spaniard behind. But with Great Britain we swap precedents. Mr. Chamberlain refers for precedents for his South African outrages to our exploits in the Philippines; and we in turn may cite in support of our Philippine aggressions the exploits of Kitchener in South Africa. Between us we may yet build up a body of precedents for the imperial conquerors of weaker peoples that would make the rough and ready codes of the barbarous conquerors of ancient times seem by comparison like advanced lessons in moral philosophy.

If it were not for their own reverence to barbarism in the Philippines, the American people could contemplate only with horror the kind of warfare which the British are carry-

ing on in South Africa. As with us in the Philippines, their government reaches no farther than their rifles can carry—hardly so far, if recent events are any indication. Yet they, like us, have presumed to declare themselves conquerors. They are there, and they intend to stay, as the American vice-governor of the Philippines says of us with reference to that archipelago. They, too, have adopted the Weyler invention of "reconcentrado." They, too, are killing for treason. But as yet they are a little behind us in that respect. They do not make traitors of the enemy, as we propose to do, but confine their treason killing to inhabitants of Cape Colony. With our Philippine precedent to go by, however, the British also may adopt the handy expedient of proclaiming the enemy as traitors.

And why are the British maintaining this war of extermination in South Africa at enormous cost to themselves? Is it to settle a dispute impossible of settlement otherwise? Not at all. The Boers long ago offered to close the war by arbitration. Indeed, they offered arbitration before the war began. They have even offered to close it upon Great Britain's own terms, provided only that the independence of the two republics be continued. But the British ministry has declined every offer. They demand unconditional surrender. It is for that and that alone, for conquest and nothing else, that they now carry on this terribly disastrous war.

Disastrous is a mild term to apply to a mode of warfare such as that which the British have in their desperation adopted to conquer the Boers. In the matter of "reconcentrado" alone, the facts are appalling. The figures as reported by the British press for the period beginning with June and ending with September are as follows:

	Total number in camps.	Deaths.	Rate per year per 1,000
June .....	85,410	777	109
July .....	93,940	1,412	150
August .....	106,347	1,878	214
September .....	109,418	2,411	264

It will be observed not only that the number of deaths has increased month by month, but that the rate per thousand per annum has likewise increased. The rate for September,