

has directed the attorney general to assist in prosecuting them. The authorities of Colorado have no easy job before them in this attempt the governor is making to vindicate the majesty of the law against these fiendish lynchers. A perverted public sentiment in the county where the lynching crime was committed may make it exceedingly difficult if not impossible to secure convictions. For that reason there should be such an unrestrained expression of opinion against the lynching, and against the people of any community who will allow so grave a crime to go unpunished, that no jury in Lincoln county could be found to acquit any of the lynchers whose participation in the outrage is legally proved. Nothing could be more wholesome in its bearing upon the race problem than the conviction and full punishment for murder of some of the leaders in a negro lynching. It will be to the lasting honor of Colorado to set the example.

The echo of a familiar sound comes back to this country from London. A distinguished member of parliament, Sir Howard Vincent, who is also honorary secretary of the United Empire Trade league, proclaims the desire of his league to compel American manufacturers to contribute annually several millions sterling to the British exchequer, by means of a protective tariff. "Preferential duties would help us tremendously," he says; "they would make you Americans pay something for the use of our rich markets. You charge us about 40 per cent. ad valorem for the privilege of selling our goods in America, and we commit an egregious folly in admitting your goods free of duty."

Sir Howard's words read like McKinleyism translated into British. Here is all the familiar nonsense about charging foreigners for the privilege of markets. Foreigners do not pay for market privileges. Those privileges, when there is a charge for them, are paid for by the home buyers. By imposing a tariff of 40 per cent. upon

British goods sold in America, we of this country thereby increase the price of those goods to American buyers; for competition would compel the English to sell them to our people for less if it were not for the tariff. Precisely so, if the English impose a tariff upon American goods, will English buyers of those goods have to pay that tariff. There is something spectacular in the egregious folly of full grown men who think that tax duties upon foreign goods are borne by the foreign seller instead of the domestic consumer.

HENRY GEORGE, DEMOCRAT.

I.

"Whenever you call a man a democrat," once observed a shrewd Texan negro, "you always want to specify the brand; because there are more different kinds than of any other cattle, and they don't all herd."

It was a wise bit of political philosophy. Democrats vary in their democracy all the way from the "hail fellow" species at one extreme to the exclusive order at the other, with a great diversity of types between.

The exclusive species of democracy is described by persons acquainted with it as most delightful. It flourishes at its best in England. Within the charmed sphere of the British aristocracy the democratic spirit is said to be all-pervasive. Wealth distinction cuts no figure. Even ancient lineage and superior titles are upon the common level in this holy of holies, where all who are considered fit to enter at all are considered equally fit. The ideal is equality of rights, regardless of every superficial distinction. But to the British aristocracy, whoever is outside is "canaille," having no rights except such as the law happens to secure.

Somewhat similar is the democracy of our own southern states. Purer democracy, as far as it goes, one could hardly wish for or expect to find. But its fraternal principles do not extend to the negro race. Within their own circles southern whites cling to the equality doctrine of the declaration of independence with a devotion and apply it with a fidelity that excite admiration until one dis-

covers how exclusive they are. Yet this exclusiveness is not a conscious exception to democratic principles. It is an expression of a more or less subconscious conviction—an inheritance from the slavery regime—that the negro is not a man.

Within their narrow limits, exclusive types of democracy are democratic to the core; but the "hail fellow" variety, which is at the farther extreme and is most common in the northern states of this country, is nothing but veneer—a wretched counterfeit of democracy. Though its devotees are condescending good fellows with men who are regarded as inferior, and bumpily obtrusive with those who are recognized as superior, they are champions of nobody's rights as rights, not even of their own. To the democratic principle of equality of rights among men, with its correlative duties, they are utterly indifferent.

From these two extremes there is a gradation of variety in democracy to that perfect type which acknowledges as within the scope of its fraternal principles the whole human race, regardless of all distinctions. Of that order of democracy Henry George stood preeminent as a representative.

Not that George alone adopted the true democratic ideal. The roll is a long one of the men who have done that. But George did more. He not only made this his ideal of democracy, but he pointed out the way, the only way, in which that ideal can be realized. To the desire for democracy he married the know-how. To that intense love for justice, which is the essence of democracy, he united that political and economic wisdom whereby alone justice can be secured. Thereby he developed democracy from a nebular sentiment into a social force. It is this that makes him preeminent as a democrat.

II.

The story of the life of such a man cannot fail to interest democrats of every grade; especially in times like these, when the nobler ideals of democracy are boldly challenged even in countries where the democratic movement has made its greatest ad-

vances. And right well is that story told by George's son, upon whom has fallen the congenial task of telling it.*

In this biography there is no attempt at philosophizing. George's place in history is left, without a plea, to the critics who are yet to deal with his work. There is nothing fulsome where much in that way might be forgiven. Nor is there any affectation. The story is told as unreservedly, as simply and as candidly as if it had come from the pen of a stranger, yet with an evident warmth of affection which testifies no less to the loyalty of a devoted disciple than to the personal respect and love of a son and companion. It comes up to the full measure of the publishers' estimate, who describe the book as "a strong, dignified and impressive record of one of the most extraordinary men our country has produced."

So well has the younger George performed the delicate task of writing his eminent father's biography, that while his book, together with the writings of George himself, furnishes all the material future historians will need to account for this great democrat and to assign him his true place in the intellectual development of the race, it also lays before the reader a biographical narrative of exceptional human interest and of peculiarly American flavor.

III.

Henry George was born in Philadelphia, of Scottish-American and Anglo-American ancestry, on the 2nd of September, 1839, when the abolition agitation was beginning to excite that rancorous discussion which culminated in the civil war and the extinction of chattel slavery.

Though his parents were in moderately comfortable circumstances, his school education was cut off early by his own ambition to get out into the world. At less than 14 years of age, when he had been in the high school only five months, he induced his father to let him go to work. Becoming first an errand boy in a Philadelphia crockery house, he afterward obtained a clerkship with a marine adjuster, and two years later, at the age

of 16, went to sea, making a voyage around the world in a sailing vessel before the mast. After 14 months of a sailor's life, he became a type-setter in a Philadelphia printing office. But that employment he soon abandoned for a trip to Boston as able seaman on a topsail schooner loaded with coal; and after repeated failures he secured sufficient influence to get him a berth as ship's steward on a United States lighthouse steamer bound for San Francisco, on which he sailed through the Golden Gate in 1858, a youth of 19, with but little means and no prospect of employment.

At this time there was a gold-digging craze in the Frazer river valley, and George joined the procession of gold seekers, working his way from San Francisco as a sailor. But his hopes of wealth were disappointed. Within a few months he returned to San Francisco "dead broke."

Then followed a fluctuating experience.

Now he was a compositor in a printing house, from which he was driven for lack of work. Then he became a weigher in a rice mill, which soon after closed down. As a "hobo" he tramped toward the California gold diggings, but was unable to reach them. Once more as a compositor, at boys' pay on a San Francisco weekly, he rose to the foremanship. Forced out of that by a change of owners he formed a partnership with some San Francisco printers for the publication of an evening paper; but the introduction into San Francisco at that time of telegraphic news controlled by a monopoly, deprived the young paper of all possibility of competition, and it went down.

At this crisis in his career, and with but a single coin to his name, George married a young woman no richer than himself. They removed to Sacramento, where he had obtained precarious work as a "sub" compositor on a daily paper, and there their eldest child, the author of the biography, was born. An altercation with the foreman of the composing room culminated in George's discharge, and he returned with his little family to San Francisco.

Here his battle with poverty was renewed, continuing until it reached

the extreme and drove him to the verge of despair. He canvassed for newspaper subscribers on commission. He tried to sell clothes wringers from house to house. He set type at odd intervals as opportunity offered, sometimes failing to get his pay for work done. He started a job printing office with two friends, which proved so profitless that he had to abandon it. When his poverty was at its worst, his second child—Richard F. George, the sculptor—was born. So great had the deprivations of the family been that the boy came into the world starving, and George desperately went upon the street determined to get money from the first man whose appearance might indicate that he had any to give. Fortunately the first wayfarer of that description was a modern Samaritan who believed George's story, and, feeling for his distress, gave him the five dollars he demanded. Telling of this experience years afterward, to illustrate his belief that criminal actions are attributable rather to environment than to wicked natures, George said that if this man had not given him the money, he believed he was desperate enough to have killed him.

But brighter days were at hand.

George got more profitable work at his trade as a printer and began to study and practice writing. His first serious attempt at composition, a bit of personal introspection in the form of an essay on the profitable employment of time, was prophetic of the powers he subsequently developed as a profound thinker, close reasoner and forcible and charming writer. That was in the spring of 1865, when he was 26 years of age.

Soon afterward he wrote "A Plea for the Supernatural," which was published in the Californian, to which Bret Harte and Mark Twain were the star contributors, and was republished in a Boston periodical.

Upon Lincoln's assassination he sent to the Alta Californian an intensely dramatic essay on this great murder, which appeared with the announcement that it was from the pen of one of the paper's printers. Upon the strength of that composi-

* The Life of Henry George, by his son, Henry George, Jr. New York: Doubleday & McClure Company. Price \$1.50.

tion the editor of the *Alta Californian* brought George down from the composing room to a reporter's desk.

While working as a reporter George wrote for his paper a "letter to the editor" on Lincoln's character, which, to his surprise and gratification, appeared the next day not as an irresponsible communication, but as the leading editorial. Although he did some type-setting after that, his career as a journalist had now begun. In 1867 he became managing editor of the *San Francisco Times*. In 1868 he was for a short time managing editor of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, which he left because De Young's policy was repugnant to him, going east as the agent for an independent news association. He was editor of the *Oakland Transcript* in 1869 and of the *Sacramento Reporter* in 1870, leaving the latter because the railroad interests bought it, and he was given the option of quitting the paper or editorially supporting railroad monopoly.

At intervals meanwhile he had contributed important articles to other papers and magazines, including among the former the *New York Tribune*. Under the managing editorship of John Russell Young, the *Tribune* engaged him to write up the new transcontinental railroad and the country through which it passed, but under the editorship of Whitelaw Reid his letters on this subject were suppressed.

His most important production at this period appeared in the October number, 1868, of Bret Harte's "*Overland Monthly*." It was entitled "*What the Railroad Will Bring Us*," and is especially remarkable now for the accuracy of its prediction as to the future of California.

George's observations of the telegraphic monopoly of the east, and the tendency to land concentration on the Pacific coast, inspired him with a desire to get into the legislature for the purpose of trying to check these evils. He had been a republican protectionist until a protection speech he listened to made him a free trader, after which he affiliated with the democratic party. To this party, therefore, he applied for a legislative nomination. But the party machine re-

fused because he would not pay an assessment.

At a subsequent election he was nominated but defeated, the railroad interests, which he had opposed even at the risk of his livelihood, making him an especial mark of their hostility. Several years afterward he was a candidate for delegate to the California constitutional convention. The candidacy was self-announced, his object being to put himself in a position to urge the land and tax reform which he was then developing and with which his name is now irrevocably associated. Both the democratic party and the workingmen's party, under the leadership of Denis Kearney, nominated him after his announcement; and he would certainly have been elected but for his refusal to submit to Kearney's dictation. Asked at the workingmen's ratification meeting to subscribe to the party platform and acknowledge Kearney's leadership, he replied that he would acknowledge no man as leader to do his thinking for him, and that, as there were some planks in the platform to which he did not agree, he would oppose them. His speech in which he took this ground and declared that he would receive the nomination as a free man or not at all, was greeted with hisses and the Kearney nomination was revoked. At the election, having only the democratic nomination, he was defeated, though he led the ticket.

Meanwhile, in 1872 he attended the national democratic convention as a delegate, and was the member from California of the committee appointed to notify Horace Greeley of his nomination for the presidency.

At that time George was the editor and part proprietor of a new paper, the *San Francisco Evening Post*, which, under his editorship, was an aggressive and successful people's paper. But in an evil hour the paper borrowed money of Senator John P. Jones for the purpose of enlarging its plant. This was upon the generous suggestion of Mr. Jones. In the midst of the financial hurricane that soon afterward struck the city and caused the suspension of even the *Bank of California*, Jones foreclosed his debt. George might nevertheless

have remained in editorial charge. Jones wished him to do so. But that would have necessitated his supporting the railway ring, and for the second time he decided to abandon his private interests rather than conserve them at the expense of what he regarded as his public duty. He accordingly walked penniless out of the office of the paper he had after so much labor succeeded in establishing.

Had it not been for the good will of the governor of the state he would have walked back into apparently hopeless poverty. But Gov. Irwin appointed him state inspector of gas meters. The duties of this office, the only public office George ever held, were not onerous, and he found time for public speaking, for writing occasional articles on public questions, and especially for the creation of the book that has made his fame national and international and in all probability will long perpetuate it—"Progress and Poverty."

When this book had been completed George encountered great difficulty in securing a publisher. After the eastern houses had rejected the manuscript he published a small edition by subscription at San Francisco, and it made a deep impression. But still no eastern publishers would give the work their imprint. Finally, however, Appleton, of New York, and Keegan Paul, Trench & Co., of London, took it up. This was in the early eighties, when George had but slightly passed his fortieth year and had gone to New York to live. The book soon obtained a large sale, though not a profitable one to the author, and its influence upon public thought began to tell.

Additional books from his pen followed as the years went by, though his time was well occupied with other work. He went to Ireland and England in 1881 as a newspaper correspondent, incidentally taking a minor part in the Irish agitation, and returned to England in 1884, for a lecturing tour that made his name a household word throughout England and Scotland.

Among his magazine contributions at this time was one on "*Money and Elections*" in the *North American Review* for March, 1883. It advocated

the introduction of the Australian ballot, and was the forerunner of the agitation which culminated in the general adoption in the United States of that system of voting.

In 1886 Mr. George made his memorable campaign for mayor of New York. He ran as the labor candidate on a platform which explicitly demanded what has since come to be known as the single tax.

When the nomination was offered him he shrank from trying to make a third party, knowing that such movements, by the insignificant vote they command, usually do their cause more harm than good. But he agreed to accept the nomination provided a petition signed by 30,000 voters were obtained requesting him to do so. His object was to secure a reasonable guarantee of popular support. The petition being promptly signed by the required number George accepted the nomination.

His adversaries were Abram S. Hewitt, who was elected, and Theodore Roosevelt (now vice president-elect), who came out third in the contest. Roosevelt was the regular republican candidate. Hewitt was the union candidate of the two machines of the democratic party—the county democracy and Tammany hall. Then as now, Tammany hall was a stench in the nostrils of all the “better element” of New York; but no sooner had George’s candidacy given signs of extraordinary strength than the “better element” welcomed affiliation with Tammany hall to “save society” from Georgeism.

George’s motive in making this mayoralty campaign was not for the sake of a possible office, but in the hope of arousing the democratic masses to a realization of the nature of the economic and political evils from which they suffer. An incident which his biographer narrates illustrates his purpose rather emphatically. At a conversation between himself and William M. Ivins, a politician who was then the city chamberlain, and who assumed that George’s ambition was personal, Mr. Ivins assured George that he could not be elected mayor, or, if elected, could not be counted in, and offered if he would withdraw to procure him a congressional nomina-

tion that would be absolutely equivalent to election. George asked:

“Why, if I cannot possibly get the office, do you want me to withdraw?”

“You cannot be elected,” was the reply, “but your running will raise hell.”

George’s answer ended the negotiation. “You have relieved me of embarrassment,” he said; “I do not want the responsibility and the work of the office of the mayor of New York, but I do want to raise hell.”

In the sense in which both men meant it, George’s running did “raise hell.” Never before had politicians of both parties and all factions, and plutocrats of every variety, been so unpleasantly disturbed. Never before had they rushed so precipitately into each other’s arms. Never before had the “better element” and Tammany hall felt so much at home in each other’s society. It seemed to them as if the common people of New York had risen in mass to drive the money changers—both the “better element” among them and the worse element—out of the political temple. And George’s vote of 68,100, nearly 8,000 more than Roosevelt’s and barely 25,000 less than Hewitt’s, afforded startling testimony that the fears of the privileged classes had not been groundless.

Immediately after the mayoralty campaign of 1886 George began the publication at New York of a weekly paper, the Standard, which for almost six years was the newspaper representative of the ideas with reference to labor and land that he had sought to popularize and for the dissemination of which all his energies, from the time he began to write “Progress and Poverty,” had with undivided purpose been devoted, as they continued to be to the hour of his death.

It was in furtherance of this purpose that he came enthusiastically to the support of Grover Cleveland in 1888 and 1892, when Mr. Cleveland had raised the free trade issue, to the agitation of which George looked for the propagation of his own more radical views. His motive was the same when, a few years later, he accepted a call to lead another mayoralty fight,

this time in Greater New York, toward the end of which he died.

The opening words of his last speech in that campaign, uttered to an audience of workmen on the evening before he died, are the key to his aspirations and character as an agitator, and distinguish his quality as a democrat. Having been introduced by the chairman of the meeting as “a great friend of labor” he began:

“I have never claimed to be a special friend of labor. Let us have done with this call for special privileges for labor. Labor does not want special privileges. I have never advocated nor asked for special rights or special sympathy for workmen. What I stand for is the equal rights of all men.”

IV.

It was George’s experience in New York in 1869, when he came east to act as agent for the Pacific coast independent news association, that gave final direction to his career and made him at last the prophet of a new crusade.

He had indeed seen poverty, and had known poverty himself; but until then he had never come face to face with the shocking contrasts between poverty and luxury which the American metropolis has long displayed. He had never yet observed debasing and hopeless want in the midst of abounding wealth. When this diseased condition had thrust itself upon his attention, the thought of it would not let him rest. It forced him to ask himself over and over again why poverty persists when and where wealth abounds. This was to him the problem which the sphinx of fate puts to modern society, and which not to answer is to be destroyed.

He at once began a thorough study of political economy. But he accepted the dicta of no teacher. He demanded proof for every proposition. Not that proof which consists in collections of obscure little facts and masses of dubious statistics, but that which consists in the harmony of the large, determining and familiar facts of social life.

The answer to the riddle of the sphinx did not come to him at once.

But when he did perceive it, it burst upon him as a flash of light. While editing the Oakland paper, when the extension of the transcontinental railway from Sacramento to Oakland was still an unaccomplished but promising project, it was his custom to seek recreation and exercise by taking long horse back rides into the open country. One day, when upon one of these rides, and far out into the foothills, he met a teamster, whom he asked, merely by way of passing the time of day, what land was worth there.

"I don't know, exactly," replied the teamster; "but there is a man over there who will sell land for a thousand dollars an acre."

George had long before noticed that with the expectation of increased population to follow the extension of the great railroad to Oakland, land in Oakland had risen in value. But he had connected the increase of land value with the expected increase of population only in a loose way, and had not associated the two facts at all with his vexatious problem. It had never yet occurred to him that the universally familiar phenomenon of increasing land values with expectation of increasing population was the key to the other common phenomenon which had been forced upon his attention by its emphatic manifestation in New York—the phenomenon of the persistence of poverty with advancing wealth. But now, in the light of this enormous increase in the value of common pasture land to \$1,000 an acre in the expectation of its being needed soon for building lots, all these relationships were disclosed.

He saw that with the growth of population land grows in value, and the men who work it must pay for the privilege. He saw more. Not only does land value grow with population; which, as all economists recognize, increases productive power. It grows also with the growth of any other productive energy—labor saving invention for example. Nor does land value grow alone with growth of population and growth of invention, but it grows also with the expectation of these, so that in progressive communities land value is an exorbitant pecuniary premium upon the possibilities of improvement

in advance of the realization of improvement. Consequently the labor that uses land (and no labor is possible without it), must directly or indirectly—in higher rent or lower wages—pay for the privilege a price which keeps pace with, and often rises far above the value of the use. Thus in the long run labor loses and land monopoly secures the pecuniary advantages of material progress.

George turned back from his ride with a new thought, a radical and revolutionary thought. He had seen Paul's cross in the sky.

It was now clear to Henry George not only why poverty persists in spite of industrial advance, but why democracy fails. And the more he studied and observed and reflected, the clearer he saw that the truth he had brought back from that horseback ride harmonizes with every other truth—material, political, moral.

Although reared at a time when the epithet "abolitionist" was somewhat more offensive than "anarchist" is to-day, and under influences that were not hostile to the institution of slavery, he was nevertheless even in his youth instinctively an abolitionist. In obedience to a bent of mind that always characterized him, he refused to put policy before principle. The slaves either had the same right to freedom as other men, or they had not. If they had, freedom was their instant due. That was the principle, and in his judgment the policy that ran counter to it must of necessity be bad policy. This characteristic devotion to principle determined his future from the instant that the explanation of poverty in spite of progress flashed upon him.

Since the pecuniary benefits of advancing civilization are sucked away from the industrious, ultimately by land monopoly no matter how many minor monopolies may intervene, the question of right immediately arose. Between nonproducing land monopoly and all-producing labor, the claims of land monopoly could have no standing in the forum of conscience. Believing that all men have by nature an equal right to natural bounties, it followed with him that in natural justice no one can have a superior

right to the ownership of land. Equal rights to land, then, and therefore to land values as distinguished from labor values, became the objective of the crusade upon which George was about to enter.

The principle settled, nothing remained but method. And this was found in a system of taxation that harmonizes with the best fiscal principles—the abolition of all taxes upon industry, and the raising of common revenues from what in justice is a common fund, namely, land values. Not only would government be thereby supported without burdening production, but speculative investments in land would be so completely discouraged that the monopolization of vacant land in expectation of rising values, now so universal, would cease. Unused land would consequently be thrown open to free use. The industrious would thus be encouraged to produce, with a guaranty of security in the enjoyment of the full value of their work; while leisure classes, whether poor or rich, would find their only possibility of sustenance in resorting to honest work.

In such a state of society, and only in such, can democracy flourish.

V.

In elaboration and illustration of this political and economic philosophy, Henry George wrote several books. His first was "Our Land and Land Policy," a pamphlet published in 1871, and now out of print. The next was his master book upon the subject, "Progress and Poverty," published in 1879, which has been translated into every civilized tongue, and has had an immense circulation. After that came "The Land Question," originally "The Irish Land Question," and then "Social Problems," a series of brief essays on social subjects of common and perennial interest. The fifth book was "Protection or Free Trade," in which George drove the principle of free trade directly to its logical conclusion, proposing to set trade free not only from so-called protective tariff duties, but from all duties and taxes which in any way or to any degree hamper exchange. This book was followed by "The Condition of Labor," an open letter to the pope in reply to his encyclical. It deals elementarily with the general subject,

and especially with its ethical aspects. Next came "The Perplexed Philosopher," a cutting criticism of Herbert Spencer as a lost leader in the agitation for equal rights to the use of the earth. Finally, in "The Science of Political Economy," an unfinished but powerful work, published after the author's death and just as he had left the manuscript, the whole structure of economic teaching is overhauled and the foundations of a true natural science of political economy, as George saw it, are laid.

VI.

In all of George's books the depth, the purity, the universality and the practicability of his democracy are the notable qualities. In the story of his life, also, they stand out in bold relief. These qualities eminently distinguish the man, the thinker, the writer, the agitator, the politician, the orator and the statesman—for statesman he was, and of a high order, though he never held either a legislative or an executive office.

Democracy was to him not a label, but a life. And as important to him as the ideal was the rational method of realizing it. He knew that political democracy cannot flourish while economic aristocracy remains; and seeing that land monopoly—at all times, under all circumstances, and regardless of the disguises of changing industrial methods—is the fundamental cause of economic aristocracy, he sought its destruction. He was a democrat who knew how, and how alone, democracy can be firmly planted and effectively fostered; and this knowledge, together with his work in popularizing it and his example of devotion to ideals, is his bequest to mankind.

Henry George could not found libraries, nor colleges, nor hospitals with the earnings of other men's toil. But he did better. He planted in the minds and hearts of his generation the seed of a gloriously beneficent truth, in the fruition of which all need for paternal endowments will pass away. He left to the race a legacy of practicable democracy.

Speaking of Platt and Croker, it doesn't make the average voter feel any more comfortable to catch the devil and the deep sea winking at each other over his head.—Puck.

NEWS

President Kruger's reception in France was unexpectedly enthusiastic. He arrived at Marseilles on the 22d, on board the Dutch warship Gelderland. There he was welcomed by a great outpouring of the people, who made their sympathy unmistakably manifest. At a formal reception, committees from both Paris and Marseilles presented him with addresses. Replying to these, he thanked the people and the government of France, and said that the English people, had they been better informed, would never have consented to the Transvaal war. For himself, he assured the committees and his immense audience that ever since Jameson had tried to seize the two South African republics he had never ceased to demand a tribunal of arbitration. But the British government had persistently refused to join in this peaceable method of settlement. He then charged the British government with inhumanity, saying:

During my life I have had to fight many times the savages of the tribes of Africa, but the barbarians we have to fight now are worse than the others. They even urge the Kaffirs against us. They burn the farms we worked so hard to construct and they drive out our women and children, whose husbands and brothers they have killed or taken prisoners, leaving them unprotected and roofless and often without bread to eat.

He declared, however, that whatever the British might do, the Boers would never surrender. "I assure you," he said, "that if the Transvaal and the Orange Free State must lose their independence, it will be because all the Boer people have been destroyed, with their women and children."

From Marseilles Kruger went directly to Paris. At every stop of his train great crowds gave him hearty welcome. "The French presidential and ministerial tours," cables one correspondent, "sink into absolute insignificance when compared with the triumphal march of President Kruger." The sentiment in favor of intervention was so pronounced that President Loubet forced the ministry, against the inclinations of a majority, which included the premier, to consent to receive Kruger officially as a foreign sovereign. This decision was secured because England had not notified the powers of the annexation of the Transvaal. It was therefore con-

sidered that Kruger could be recognized officially by France without offense to England. Accordingly, when Kruger arrived in Paris on the 24th, where for 12 hours the people who came to greet him thronged the boulevards in a solid mass of humanity for a space of three miles, and overflowed into the side streets, he was given military honors and conducted in state to the Elysee palace for a call upon the president of France. The call was returned in state by President Loubet within an hour, when an appointment was made for a diplomatic interview with the French foreign minister with reference to the object of Kruger's visit. The interview took place on the 26th, Dr. Leyds, representing the Transvaal and submitting to the French foreign minister, M. Delcasse, the draft of a preliminary proposition prepared under the direction of Kruger.

From South Africa the news that escapes the British censor is exceedingly disquieting in London. It is now feared that Kitchener will have to reconquer the Orange Free State before he can begin the Weylerization of the Transvaal. Botha and De Wet appear to have joined forces near Bloemfontein; and the British under French have been pursued from Middleburg, which is on the Lorenzo Marques railroad a few miles east of Pretoria in the Transvaal, down as far as Standerton, which is on the Lady-smith road near the Orange Free State border. Kitchener's plan of operations is described by the Pietermaritzburg correspondent of the London Daily Mail, who says that the Transvaal and the Orange Free State are to be divided into circumscribed areas, with a mobile British force apportioned to each area, and that all Boers and neutrals are to be taken to the coast and kept there until the country is cleared. These plans are now being carried out, and to facilitate Kitchener's operations, he has been recommended to the queen by the British ministry for appointment as lieutenant general, an appointment which will give him supreme command in South Africa as soon as Gen. Roberts leaves the country.

Fighting in the Philippines continues without abatement. Numerous small engagements have occurred during the past week. The most important took place on the 22d, within 35 miles of Manila, where 1,000