

is local self-government," these resolutions demand that "every county or town and every city be granted the right to regulate the assessment and taxation of property at its discretion, provided any increase or reduction of assessment must be uniform throughout such county, town or city, and not made on the ground of ownership." The meaning of the last clause is not very clear. But, taken as a whole, the resolution is an unqualified endorsement of the beneficent principle of home rule in taxation, which the legislatures of several states have for a few years past been considering. It will doubtless receive most emphatic, and it is to be hoped favorable attention, this year from the legislature of Colorado, on the proposal of the Bucklin tax commission to empower cities and counties to adopt the Australasian land value tax. Another good point about the resolution of the league is a demand that "so much state revenue as may be required in excess of that derived from specific taxes should be apportioned to and paid by the counties or towns in proportion to county or town revenue." This would make the state board of equalization a mere clerical body, with no judicial powers. Its duty would begin and end with a simple computation, upon the basis of local expenditures, of the proportion which each locality should contribute to state expenses. As the local expenditures of a county for the previous year were to the local expenditures of all the counties of the state,

In a quotation from a congressional report, which appeared last week in the article on "The Washington Centennial," page 567, we made an error in copying which needs correction. Instead of quoting the report as saying that under certain circumstances the tax rate of the city of Washington would be "60 cents on the dollar—a lower rate than that of any large city in the country," we should have quoted "60 cents on the \$100." So far from being a low rate, 60 cents on the dollar would be enormously high. This must be so obvious to the reader that the correction is quite unnecessary except for the purpose of supplying the true figures.

so would the state taxes of that county for the present year be to the total of state taxation. This method would divest the state board of equalization of the mischievous power it now exercises, and taken together with the system of home rule in taxation would tend to work substantial justice.

#### THE LARGER PATRIOTISM.

Lust of empire, which has brought out all that is worst in the British character and lured Americans from their republican ideals, puts patriotism upon trial; for in this mania for conquest it is to the patriotic instinct of the people that imperial appeals are made, and upon their patriotic aspirations that imperial hopes are borne. What is patriotism, that it can be thus enlisted in aggressive warfare? Is that a virtue which lends its influence so readily to national wickedness?

To say that patriotism is love of country gives no light. Love of country must itself be explained. It cannot mean love of a country's soil, of its trees and hills and rocks and rills. If that were its meaning a large proportion of the inhabitants of every nation would be without love of country, for not a rood of old mother earth belongs to them, nor can they use any of it without paying toll. Love of country, then, must be nothing less than love of one's neighbors within a nation's boundaries. And in the narrower sense this truly is patriotism.

But love of neighbors means more than a sentimental emotion of affection for what one may call his own—as his wife, his family, his friends, his neighbors, his house, his horse, his cattle. Such love is only one of the forms of selfishness, more subtle but not less vicious when the object of it is one's neighbor than when it is one's own person or his own property. The maxim of this spurious love of country, "my country right or wrong," is the same in essence as "myself right or wrong." Love of one's neighbors within the boundaries of his nation—love, that is, of one's countrymen—if it be love of them in very truth, must consist in devotion to the ideals and institutions of the country which

guarantee equal rights to all one's countrymen.

If that be patriotism, however, then is there a larger patriotism, a patriotism which embraces the world and is the political expression of the golden rule. In the jurisdiction of this larger patriotism it is treason to make war save for the preservation of equal rights. It is treason as well as criminal aggression to pursue a policy of forcible annexation. For he who truly loves his neighbors within his own country, who loves them to the extent of cherishing their rights equally with his own, cannot draw the line at his own country. He must abhor any invasion by his countrymen of the country of others, which he would repel if his own were the country invaded.

This larger patriotism is the antithesis of that spirit of imperialism which, appealing to spurious patriotism, condemns all opposition as treason. Imperialism would subjugate inferior peoples on pretense of elevating them; the larger patriotism would encourage all peoples to elevate themselves. Imperialism is the national pharisee, who thanks God that he is better than other men; the larger patriotism is the national apostle spreading by practice as well as precept the civilizing principle of him who rebuked the pharisee and taught men that principle of love which is justice and that rule of righteousness which directs each to do to others as he would have others do to him.

#### NEWS

A brilliant Boer victory has suddenly revived general interest in the military situation in South Africa. The fight in which this victory was won occurred at Nooitgedacht, in the Magalies mountains, about 22 miles west of Pretoria. Gen. Clements occupied the district with British troops. The Boers in the region were under the command of Gen. Delary, whose force was supposed to consist of 1,000 men. Unknown to Clements, so the British story runs, Delary was suddenly reinforced by 3,000 men under Commandant Bovers, and at day-break on the 13th the Boer attack was made. A furious battle followed. It was hottest during the morning

hours, but lasted until four o'clock in the afternoon, when Gen. Clements retreated to Reitfontein. He arrived there early in the morning of the following day, having fought a rear-guard action all the way. Lord Kitchener reports that four companies of the Northumberland fusiliers surrendered a commanding position in the battle, after holding out while their ammunition lasted. Five British officers and nine men, at least, were killed, besides 18 officers and 555 men who were missing. After the battle the Boers released their prisoners—five officers and 316 men. They then separated in two bodies, one of which moved west and the other north.

What is equivalent to another Boer victory is the escape, now conceded, of Gen. DeWet from Gen. Knox. He had crossed the Caledon last week, as told on page 569, but Gen. Knox was then pursuing him northward, and a running fight was in progress. Later reports indicate that DeWet, while pursued by Knox, confronted the British line in the region of Ladybrand and Thabanchu, which extends from Blomfontein to the Basutoland border, and was thus once more surrounded. He made several attempts to get through the British line, and on the 14th had succeeded and was again free to continue his northward march. Gen. Knox was obliged to abandon pursuit, in order to defend Cape Colony from the invasion noted below.

Other fights besides those of Delary and DeWet are reported by Lord Kitchener. He tells of engagements at Lichtenburg, at Bethlehem, at Vrede, and at Vryheid, in all of which the Boers attacked and were repulsed. Also of one near Zastron, in the southeasterly part of the Orange Free State, in which the Boers surrounded a party of Brabant's horse and captured 107, after killing four and wounding 16. To offset this disaster, Gen. Methuen is credited with the capture of a Boer "lager" consisting of 15 wagons, 15,000 rounds of ammunition, 4,600 cattle and 2,000 sheep. From other sources there is a report that Boers have crossed the Orange river and raided Cape Colony at two separate points 100 miles apart. One raid was upon Philipstown, between Colesburg and Kimberley, and the other upon Kaapdal, near Aliwani North. The latter raid is reported to

have driven back a British force sent to meet it; but there are no particulars. The former is fully verified. A Boer force estimated at 3,000 has crossed the river and penetrated as far as Philipstrom, 40 miles south. The raiders are encouraged by the Dutch population, and the situation is so serious that Gen. Knox has been recalled from his pursuit of DeWet to give his attention to the defense of Cape Colony.

This news from South Africa has had a dispiriting effect upon the British public, which had so recently been assured by the ministry that the war was virtually at an end. Even Lord Salisbury in his speech on the 18th at the annual conference of the National Union of conservative associations was decidedly pessimistic. And although Lord Kitchener now has 210,000 troops in the field, more are being sent. The colonial office announces its decision also to enlist 5,000 men in South Africa for a constabulary force. Lord Kitchener has requested and the New Zealand government has consented that the New Zealand troops remain until the war is over. Kitchener is reported also to have demanded that the imperial government send him immediately every available mounted man; and the queen has appealed to the militia, yeomanry and colonial troops to continue in the field. The proposed thanksgiving services in honor of Lord Roberts' return have been abandoned. In parliament the news from South Africa has furnished ammunition to the opposition. Lloyd-George, one of the liberal members, created a sensation on the 15th by declaring in a speech upon the floor that—

DeWet is making England the laughing stock of the world. We have 210,000 men in the field, yet we are unable to protect ourselves from disaster at the hands of small commandos drawn from a pastoral population.

Parliament took a recess on the 15th until the middle of February. The session closed with the reading of the queen's speech as follows:

My lords and gentlemen: I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the expenses incurred by the operations of my armies in South Africa and China.

In the American congress two important decisions have been made, one by the lower house and the other

by the senate. On the 15th the lower house passed the bill reducing war taxes. The only test vote was on the question of making a revenue reduction of \$40,000,000 or of \$70,000,000, the republicans supporting the smaller and the democrats the larger reduction. When the democratic proposition came to a vote it was defeated by 155 to 131. It was upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty (see page 568) that the senate took decisive action. This was with reference to "the Davis amendment," which was reported last spring by the committee on foreign relations. It is as follows:

It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order.

The senate had divided over the treaty into three factions. The first, led by Senator Morgan, favored the treaty as originally drawn. The second, led by Lodge, favored the Davis amendment; believing that the United States ought to reserve the right to protect the canal in time of war. The third favored the retention by the United States of the right to erect fortifications on the canal. On the 13th the vote on the Davis amendment was taken. It was supported by the first and the third factions and received 65 votes. There were only 17 votes against it. Subsequently the senate fixed the 20th for a final vote upon all pending amendments and the treaty itself.

To understand the conflict over the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it is necessary to recall the origin and one of the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Prior to 1850 Great Britain established a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians along the north coast of Nicaragua, and in doing so took possession of San Juan del Norte, now Greytown, the natural eastern terminus of any Nicaraguan canal that might be built. Against this act the United States protested, and the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of April 19, 1850, resulted. One of the provisions of that treaty forbids either country to obtain control over or special commercial advantages in any ship canal between the two oceans. This provision is held by Great Britain to be still in force. By some American statesmen it is regarded as obsolete.