

shifted their active operations from Port Arthur to the region of Liaoyang in the north. It was reported on the 27th that the direct attack upon Liaoyang had then begun; and on the 28th that Gen. Kouropatkin had been driven back into Liaoyang, where he was making desperate resistance to the advances of the Japanese under Kuroki from the east, Oku from the south and Nodzu from the west. The fighting is described as furious, with some 300,000 Japanese against 200,000 Russians. At latest reports the engagement had become general and the battle was still being fought.

Port Arthur was undergoing attack (p. 327) on the 26th, according to official reports, notwithstanding the circumstances which had shifted the center of interest from Port Arthur to the larger operations in the north. The condition of the Russians at Port Arthur was reported on the 28th as desperate. Since that date no news of these operations, at all trustworthy, has been received.

Besides the international incident at Chefoo (pp. 309, 324), somewhat similar complications have arisen at Shanghai. The Russian cruiser Askold, and their torpedo boat destroyer, the Grozovoi, took refuge in Shanghai for the purpose of undergoing repairs. But they did not disarm, as the Japanese discovered upon sending a warship into the harbor to investigate. The Japanese, therefore, threatened, if they persisted in refusing to disarm, to capture them in the port. Thereupon the European powers interfered, and in their behalf an American man-of-war anchored between the Russian and the Japanese ships. After much international agitation on the subject the Czar, on the 25th, ordered his vessels to disarm, and they accordingly did so.

The civil war in the South American republic of Paraguay (p. 327), has not subsided, although the bombardment of Asuncion has been abandoned. In explanation a Paraguayan representative of the revolutionary party states that the government had taken cannon from the city's fortifications and lodged them in front of the private houses of revolution-

ary sympathizers, so as to force the insurgents to fire in that direction. The same representative asserts that the object of the insurrection is to overthrow a minority government which is corrupt. The insurrection is under the leadership of Gen. Ferreira, who declares that he will accept a provisional presidency only, and that on the complete extinction of the present government the insurrectionists will elect a non-partisan government. The conflicting parties are known as "coloradoes" or "reds," and "liberals." The "coloradoes" have been in power since 1873, and are charged with extreme partisanship.

In Uruguay a revolutionary war between conflicting parties, "coloradoes" or "reds," and "blancos" or "whites" has been in progress for six or seven months. The causes are much the same as those that have produced the insurrection in Paraguay, the "colorado" party in Uruguay having been in power since 1865. News of an important and probably decisive battle between the government forces of Uruguay and the Uruguayan insurrectionists was expected at Buenos Ayres on the 25th, but no such news is yet at hand. On the 28th, however, in Argentina waters, the government forces attacked an insurrectionary force on a steamer, capturing the vessel and killing and scattering the troops. Because this was in Argentina waters, the Argentine government has protested and its diplomatic relations with Uruguay are strained.

The political situation in the United States has been disturbed during the week only by the withdrawal from politics of ex-Senator David B. Hill, of New York. On the eve of his 61st birthday, the 28th, Mr. Hill published from Albany an announcement that on Jan. 1, 1905, he would retire from politics; that he never would run for an elective office again; that if the Democracy is successful in the State of New York and the nation he will accept no appointment at the hands of the President or Governor, and that he will relinquish the leadership of his party in his State.

G. Milburn, of Buffalo, Judge Parker explains that part of his acceptance speech (pp. 289, 295) in which he discussed the Philippine question. Mr. Milburn had called attention to criticisms of Judge Parker's use of the word "self government" instead of "independence," and in his reply Judge Parker says:

You are entirely right in assuming that as I employed the phrase "self government" it was intended to be identical with independence, political and territorial. After noting the criticism referred to by you, I am still unable to understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government while another nation may in any degree whatever control their actions. But to take away all possible opportunity for conjecture, it shall be made clear in the letter of acceptance that I am in hearty accord with that plank in the Democratic platform which advocates treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans, and I also favor making the promise to them now to take such action as soon as it can prudently be done.

Wm. J. Bryan made his first political speech of the campaign at Nevada, Mo., on the 30th, at a gathering of 6,000 persons. In the discussion of national issues he stated that his plan is to appeal to the Democrats who believe as he does on public questions to support the national ticket this year, in order to remove the issues that stand in the way of the consideration of economic questions, these issues being imperialism, militarism and the race question. He argued that those issues, brought into the political arena since 1896, have interfered with the calm consideration of domestic problems. Referring to the personality of the candidates he exclaimed: "Give me a President who stands for peace in preference to a President who stands for war."

An attempt by workmen to organize a new Democratic party at a national convention called to meet in Chicago on the 29th (p. 279) was not successful in point of numbers. The informal convention was presided over by T. C. Wilson, of the laundry workers' union; and the platform proposed by T. C. Quinn and adopted by the convention, was as follows:

The wealth producers of the United States of America regard the Declara-

In a letter of the 24th to John

tion of American Independence as the great charter of human liberty and its author as the greatest philosopher and most constructive statesman of any age or time. In convention assembled we pledge ourselves to carry forward in letter and spirit both the Declaration and the political philosophy of its author, and to this end we protest against either of the two old political parties being given power over the American people. Both parties are but the mere hirelings of plutocracy and the instruments by which the fundamental democracy of our country is being assassinated and the masses of our people reduced to a condition of serfdom. Recognizing the impracticability of launching a new political party this year, first, owing to the shortness of time, and, second, to the presence in the canvass of two candidates representing the highest type of personal integrity, intellectuality and progress, Thomas E. Watson, candidate of the People's party, and Eugene V. Debs, candidate of the Social Democratic party, we at present deem it best to confine ourselves to the work of organization on the lines laid down by the Chicago organization, with the addition that said organization will be conducted on the principle: (1) that labor produces all wealth, (2) that all wealth belongs to those who produce it, (3) that every law enacted in support of the institution diverting wealth from its natural owners into the pockets of parasites should be immediately repealed, (4) that the emancipation of wealth producers must come as Jefferson would have it, through increased liberty, not as any of our present political parties wish it, through the enactment of more laws, which must lead to a greater paternalism and a recurrence of the present or worse condition.

The name of the projected party is the Jeffersonian Democracy.

Another third party, the Constitutional (p. 279) was organized at Chicago on the 31st, with Gen. Charles H. Howard, of Illinois, for President and George H. Shibley, of Washington, D. C., for Vice President. Its platform declares in favor of reciprocity, the government issuance of money, government ownership of railways, the right of labor to organize, an eight-hour day, a direct primary election law, the election of Presidential electors by Congressional districts instead of by States, an income tax, and a ten per cent. tax on vacant ground.

State conventions of the People's party were held on the 31st in Illinois and Indiana. The for-

mer nominated James Hogan for governor of Illinois and the latter Leroy Templeton for governor of Indiana.

An answer to Mayor Harrison's proclamation calling upon opponents of the proposed compromise ordinance extending traction franchises in Chicago to get up a petition against the ordinance or be regarded as approving it (p. 305), was made on the 26th by the Referendum League, as the representative of those voters who last Spring sustained the public policy petition it had submitted against extending traction franchises. The document is dignified and impersonal, and makes the following points of objection to the Mayor's proposition:

1. The question could not be submitted at the approaching Fall election because the full quota of questions will be on the ballot at that time under petitions already nearly complete.
2. A petition for the Fall election could not be used at the Spring election, and would therefore be valueless for that purpose.
3. Petitions procured now would be subject to attack if verbal changes were meantime made in the proposed ordinance.
4. The time allowed would be too short to procure a petition of 100,000 signatures. Furthermore, "it is unreasonable and unfair to demand that those who approve of an existing and constitutionally expressed public policy shall get up a monster petition to sustain it every time some official assumes it ought to be changed or would like to take some action contrary to it. Yet this is the position of the Mayor on the question at issue. The reasonable and fair course would be to refuse any franchise grant unless and until the traction companies or those who favor a franchise file a petition placing the question on the ballot and show that the people are willing to reverse their former position. In other words, the expense of a petition (at least several thousand dollars) and all the labor of circulating it should be borne by the people who want to see the franchise granted, and not by those who are opposed to it and have already been put to this expense and secured the present public policy vote against it." Reference is made also to the Mayor's pledge, when a candidate for reelection, in which he made the following declaration inconsistent with his present policy:

As Mayor of this city, I do not regard the signing of pledges to separate bodies as exactly a dignified proceeding, and for that

reason must decline to affix my name to the pledge you sent me. I can say this, however, that in every speech I am making in the present campaign I am calling attention to the necessity of the referendum on all proposed franchise extension ordinances, and am giving my pledge to the people direct to withhold my approval from any ordinance which does not give to the people a right they expect and demand, viz.: A referendum vote on all franchise extension ordinances passed by the City Council.

In conclusion the League's protest is as follows: "In conclusion we submit that the Mayor's proclamation is in direct conflict with the position of more than a majority of the members of the City Council, who have in writing pledged themselves as follows: 'I hereby pledge myself to be governed in all my official actions by the will of the people, as expressed by the majority of those voting the 'Little Ballot'; therefore, I will oppose the passage of any ordinance for the settlement of the traction question unless the same shall have been submitted to the voters of Chicago and shall have been approved by a majority of those voting thereon.'"

Mayor Harrison has made no formal response to this protest, but through an interview on the 28th, in the Record-Herald, which supports him in his policy of enacting the proposed ordinance without a referendum on it, and may therefore be presumed to have reported him fairly, he said:

At the last election the "little ballot" proposition of immediate municipal control had 121,957 votes for and 50,807 against. At the same time there were four candidates, and, in general, two opposing platforms. Mr. Cruice was the acknowledged champion of the immediate municipal control idea, and the people favored him with less than 10,000 votes. Then there was a gentleman on the Socialist ticket, a dyed-in-the-wool blown-in-the-bottle advocate of immediate municipal control. He got about 10,000 votes. Graeme Stewart was a settlement man, and he received 138,000 votes. I also was running on another settlement platform, and I was given 146,000 votes. In other words, the candidates who favored a settlement of some sort or other received 284,000 votes, while the immediate control candidates received about 20,000 votes. The settlement candidates polled 284,000 votes, while the "little ballot" proposition for immediate municipal control received only 120,000 favorable votes. In selecting me for Mayor; did the voters repudiate my platform? They knew my views, expressed, as they had been, in half a dozen annual messages and in hundreds of campaign speeches. Did they elect me to carry out the promises I had made, the policy I had