

accusatory document of 1776. Though our country does imitate the crown policy of England, it should at least do so without hypocrisy.

Think of the reading of the American declaration of independence without modification at a public demonstration in Manila. What mockery could possibly equal that mockery?

The declaration declares in its outline of general principles, that it is self-evident that "all men are created equal;" but this principle is interpreted by our government in the Philippines to mean all men except Filipinos. The declaration asserts that all men are endowed with unalienable rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" but our government interprets this to the Filipinos to mean that Filipinos are entitled to such rights only as Spain or Spain's assignee may accord them at its own good pleasure upon its own arbitrary terms, and in the exercise of its own imperial power. According to the declaration of independence, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; but we have taught the Filipino people, by means of impressive lessons in military dynamics, that Filipino government derives its just powers from the consent of a foreigner of the name of William McKinley. With reference to these so-called "glittering generalities," the policy of the United States authorities in the Philippines is totally at variance with the terms of the declaration of independence.

It is equally at variance with some of the "glittering" specifications of the same document. The declaration charges George III. with creating a multitude of new offices and sending hither "swarms of officers to harass our people." The Filipinos could as truthfully make the same complaint of William McKinley. "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislatures," is another complaint of the declaration against King George. Substantially the same complaint, only of worse behavior, could be made by the Filipinos against Mr. McKinley; for when the Filipino government was peaceable and prosperous, as our own officials testify, Mr. Mc-

Kinley threw a foreign standing army into their midst and ordered it to subjugate them. Another American objection to King George was that he "affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power" in America. Precisely what Mr. McKinley has done in the Philippines. One offense charged in the declaration of independence by the Americans against King George might be repeated, not only in substance, but in terms, by the Filipinos against William McKinley, namely: "He has combined, with others, to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our own constitution and unacknowledged by our laws." And what should we be able to say in answer if the Filipinos were to charge us as our forefathers charged George III., with "having large bodies of armed troops among us;" with "protecting them by a mock trial, from punishment, for any murder which they should commit upon the inhabitants;" with "cutting off our trade with all parts of the world;" with "imposing laws on us without our consent;" with depriving us "of the benefits of trial by jury;" with "suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever;" with "waging war against us;" with burning our towns and destroying the lives of our people;" and with having "excited domestic insurrection amongst us"? What should we say if told that these offenses of Great Britain against the American colonies in the eighteenth century were being repeated by the American nation against the Philippines in the nineteenth and twentieth? What could we say?

If ever a people drew a damaging indictment against themselves, our people do so when they celebrate the Fourth of July by reading the American declaration of independence in the Philippines. By all means let it be suitably modified for future celebrations of American independence in American crown colonies.

NEWS

A strike of the organized iron and steel workers of the United States against the gigantic steel trust, supplements the machinists' strike (pp.

90, 105), which is still unsettled. The iron and steel workers are not striking for higher wages or shorter hours, but for the union scale in all shops, those that are not organized as well as those that are. Negotiations preliminary to the strike were conducted, in behalf of the strikers, by a committee of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, appointed by that body at Milwaukee on the 8th of June. This committee was instructed to ask President Schwab, of the steel trust, to sign the new wages scale, upon the expiration of the old one on June 30, for all the mills controlled by the trust, whether union or nonunion. Many conferences between this committee and the trust were held, but they proved fruitless, and on the 29th the president of the Amalgamated association issued telegraphic orders to all union men in the sheet mills to strike at midnight on the 30th. To this notice 35,000 men responded on the 1st. Since then 15,000 more have gone out of the steel hoop mills. About 200,000 are involved. Officers of the Amalgamated association say of the strike that it will be a battle for supremacy, which will either bring the trust to the terms of the workers or break the backbone of the Amalgamated association.

Inspired by the hope of improving or abolishing the social conditions that foster these labor troubles, reformers of many different shades of opinion or schools of thought have been holding a national social and political conference at Detroit. It is the second conference, the first having been held two years ago at Buffalo (No. 65, p. 10; and No. 66, pp. 3, 8). This second National Social and Political conference opened at Detroit on the 28th, being called to order by Eltweed Pomeroy, president of the Direct Legislation league. Mr. Pomeroy characterized the conference as in certain ways absolutely unique, men and women having—

gathered from all over the United States and Canada with no organization to send them, only the merest shell of an organization to invite them, each one paying his own expenses, and with almost no personal motive behind their coming. We have members, but no delegates. We are not bound by a prearranged partisan feeling, religious belief, personal profit or class interest. No one's expenses are paid here, and that subtle but strong tie of money paid does not fetter a single mouth in this hall. We are not drawn from one class in

the community, but from all classes. We do not belong to one political party, but to all parties. We are not of one religious belief, but of all. We do not belong to one business interest, but to all. We have both proletarians and capitalists in our midst. We are not limited by sex, but place men on the same plane as women. Lastly, I doubt if there is, or will be, in this hall a single person who comes here for his or her personal profit or preferment. We all come here for the acquaintance and social life that this conference is sure to generate. There is no movement back of this conference to launch a political party, though it is possible that attempts may be made. But such is not the purpose of this conference. Certainly we will indorse no religious denomination; and, though perhaps some educational organization may be indorsed, such is not the aim of the conference.

After outlining the programme, Mr. Pomeroy introduced Mayor Maybury, of Detroit, who welcomed the assemblage, and then Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, who presided. Discussion of the first subject on the programme: "The Function of the Church in Furthering Equality," was opened by the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati. He was followed by the Rev. Alexander Kent, of Washington; Mrs. Corinne Brown, and Walter Thomas Mills, of Chicago, and Thomas Bawden, of Detroit. James E. Scripps and Willis J. Abbot were the principal speakers on the uses of the press. In the evening George Fred Williams, of Massachusetts, presided, and on the 29th Mayor Jones, of Cleveland, occupied the chair. Among the other participants of prominence were F. F. Ingram, of Detroit; John J. Lentz, of Columbus; Edward W. Bemis, of New York; Lee Meriwether, of St. Louis; Frank Parsons, of Boston; Franklin H. Wentworth, Margaret Haley, Marie C. Brehm, Seymour Stedman and Edwin Burritt Smith, of Chicago; George McA. Miller and Thomas E. Will, of Ruskin college, Missouri; Marion Todd, of California; Robert Pyne, of Hartford; Joseph Labadie, of Detroit; W. A. Douglass, of Toronto, and Frank L. Monett, of Columbus, ex-attorney general of Ohio.

One of the strong papers read at the Detroit conference was that on American colonies, by Edwin Burritt Smith, of Chicago. The subject was vigorously discussed by other

speakers, but only one appeared to oppose Mr. Smith's hostile attitude toward the adoption of the crown colony system.

Only a few hours after that discussion, the American volunteer army, which has assisted in putting down independent government in the Philippine colonies, was disbanded. This army had been recruited under the act of congress of March 1, 1899 (No. 48, p. 9; No. 49, p. 10), which provides for its disbandment on July 1, 1901. Many of the officers have been provided with places in the Philippines under the colonial government.

The latest report of the American fatalities in the Philippines, computed at the adjutant general's office down to June 1, foots up as follows:

Officers (regulars).....	42
Officers (volunteers).....	33- 75
Enlisted men (regulars).....	1,292
Enlisted men (volunteers).....	1,217-2,509
Total deaths	2,584

While American subjugation of the Filipinos comes thus to a successful end, British subjugation of the Boers grows more desperate. The situation of the British in South Africa is evidently much worse than appears upon the surface of the very meager reports that drift past the watchful British censor. This is indicated by two facts of the current week. One is an account of a battle in Cape Colony; the other is an episode in the British parliament. The battle was fought on the 25th, at Richmond, a town some 25 or 30 miles east of the Cape Town railroad, and more than 100 miles south of the Orange Free State border. A force of Boers, reported to number 3,000 men under Malan and Smit, had invaded Cape Colony and advanced as far as Richmond. They attacked the town, but after fighting 12 hours withdrew upon learning that British reinforcements were coming. This battle, so far to the south, strongly suggests that the invading Boers are heartily encouraged and strongly supported by inhabitants of Cape Colony. The suggestion is confirmed by the parliamentary episode already alluded to. John Morley questioned the government in parliament on the 1st with reference to the expenditure of public money in Cape Colony by the governor without the sanction of the colonial parliament, and Mr. Chamberlain in reply admitted this unconstitutional proceeding, but defended it upon grounds of emer-

gency. The inference is, and it derives further color from the free use of the term "rebels" in the Cape Town dispatches, that the war has actually spread, not merely as an invasion but also as a revolt, far into British territory, and that this revolt is so general and threatening as to render the local parliament an unsafe custodian of British interests and to make arbitrary measures necessary.

Besides being confronted by this apparent revival of Boer strength, the war party of Great Britain is embarrassed by the magnitude of the expense of maintaining its South African policy. We were misled last week by a misprint in the daily paper from which we took the figures of the cost of the war, to put it at £250,000 weekly. The true amount is much larger. As reported in parliament by the ministry it is £1,500,000, or \$7,500,000 a week,—about \$390,000,000 a year.

NEWS NOTES.

—Joseph Ladue, founder of Dawson City, in the Klondike, died at Schuyler Falls, N. Y., on the 26th.

—The United States court at Honolulu has refused to naturalize a native of the island of Guam.

—An embassy from the Llama of mysterious Thibet is on the way to St. Petersburg seeking an audience with the tsar.

—Gen. Maximo Gomez, whose departure from Havana was noted last week, arrived in New York on the 29th and was in Washington on the 2d.

—The completion of a trust organized to control the lead fields of southern Missouri was authoritatively announced at New York on the 1st. Its capitalization is \$20,000,000.

—Gen. Shafter, of Santiago fame, went upon the retired list of the United States army on the 29th. His successor in command of the department of California is Maj. Gen. S. M. B. Young.

—There are unconfirmed reports of the formation of a trust to control the output of bituminous coal. All the large bituminous producers will, it is said, be consolidated into one concern by the 1st of September.

—William A. Woods, United States circuit judge, especially noted for having issued the Debs injunction and for his conduct regarding the "blocks of five" election frauds in Indiana in 1880, died at Indianapolis on the 29th.

—Austria-Hungary has sent Count Gilbert Hohenwort von Gelachstein as minister to Mexico, thus resuming diplomatic relations which had been