driven from their homes a defending army of 35,000 Boers.

It is not so certain, however, that the little army of Boers has been defeated. To capture a people's capital may be very far from subduing the people. The Boers surrendered Johannesburg without a fight, after getting their guns and munitions and supplies safely away. They surrendered Pretoria after withdrawing as safely from that city their equipment, their army and their government, and not improbably their large "catch" of British prisoners as well. These places could not be defended against Lord Roberts's "enveloping" army; the Boer force was too small. But it could and did elude him, and now he must "trek" on to another Boer stronghold, lengthening and attenuating his line and exposing his isolated detachments to raids like those which resulted this week in the capture of a whole British regiment in the "pacified" Orange Free State.

The Boers say the war is not over and that the British troops have not yet encountered their worst experiences in South Africa. There is reason to believe that they are making no empty boast. The military situation is unchanged except that Lydenburg takes the place of Pretoria as the republican capital. Lord Roberts's objective stretches aggravatingly out ahead of him. Even if Lydenburg were taken that would not necessarily end the war. Independence would not yet be reduced to an impossible dream. The Boers justly point to Washington's apparently hopeless condition before the French intervened, to the utter subjugation of Mexico by the French in the sixties, and to their own Netherlands under the Spanish, as instances warranting their confidence that even though they be scattered into small bands by the overwhelming might of the invader they will be able nevertheless to wear the invader out and achieve anew for their country a place in the sisterhood of independent nations.

That was a very transparent political trick which the republicans played in congress with their trust amendment to the constitution. Their purpose was to put the democrats in the position of appearing to vote against trusts, when in fact they were voting against a proposition to give to congress general jurisdiction over business partnerships and corporations. It was precisely the amendment which the trust magnates have been clamoring for. So far from checking trusts, it would have served the purposes of trusts. It was really not a trust amendment, but an imperial amendment, under which the central government would have been strengthened and local government weakened. The most appropriate title for that amendment would have been "an amendment to confirm the jurisdiction of trust magnates over the federal government." If the republicans were sincere about suppressing trusts they could prove their sincerity much more easily and conclusively than by amending the constitution. All they need do is to repeal the tariff they themselves have imposed upon trustified goods. But that they have refused to do; and they will continue to refuse, for the very simple reason that it would disturb the trust schemes of their most prolific campaign contributors.

The only thing that gives any force whatever to the republican campaign trick described above is the fact that Mr. Bryan himself is demanding federal regulation of trusts. In an otherwise able and sound democratic article in the North American Review for June he deliberately repeats his proposition for an act of congress "making it necessary for a corporation organized in any state to take out a license from the federal government before doing business outside of that state," a plan which would no more check the development of evil trusts than a sparrow could check the progress of a locomotive. It is a mere makeshift, which is undemocratic in political principle, unsound in economics, of disputed constitutionality, and unwise in practical politics, and which can serve only to divert attention from the conditions that alone make trusts possible.

But Mr. Bryan, notwithstanding his weakness on the trust question, defines with absolute precision the essential issue of the approaching campaign. He says it is "between plutocracy and democracy," adding in explanation what is clearly true, that "all the questions under discussion will, in their last analysis, disclose the conflict between the dollar and the man." That is indeed the issue that underlies everything else. It is the real issue that divides the two great parties. No sincere and intelligent democrat seeks a political home any longer in the republican party; nor does any intelligent plutocrat, unless he intends to be treacherous, ally himself with the democratic party. And in these circumstances it would be impossible, all things considered, to choose better leaders than those who are acknowledged to be the leaders of either side—Hanna of the republicans and Bryan of the democrats.

In the contest now in progress in North Carolina between the populists and the republicans on one side and a party labeling itself "democratic" on the other, the sympathy of all true democrats of whatever party must be with the populists and republicans. The so-called democrats of North Carolina are only a survival of the slave-holding oligarchy of the era before the civil war. That is the real explanation of the effort they are now making to evade the fifteenth amendment and disfranchise negro voters. Their plan is to amend the state constitution so as to make education the nominal but race the real test of voting rights.

An astounding defense of this North Carolina plan for evading the fifteenth amendment and trampling upon democratic principles is made by the "democratic" candidate for governor. He says that the proposed

amendment of the state constitution—

> adopts the suggestion of Senator Cullom, and demands the existence of sufficient intelligence, "either by inheritance or education," as a necessary qualification for voting. It requires of the negro the qualification by education because he has it not by inheritance, and demands only of the white man that he possess it by inheritance.

Heredity with reference to mental and moral qualities is a fad that has been pretty badly overworked, but this spurious democrat of North Carolina has worked it to death. And in the end, if we mistake not, it will appear that he has at the same time also worked the state amendment to death. For if a state law which requires of negroes, as a condition of voting, that they shall derive their intelligence from education, while assuming that the white man acquires his from inheritance, does not conflict with the fifteenth amendment that amendment must be utterly without force. Think of it! The fifteenth amendment prohibits any denial of the voting right on account of race or color. This does not prevent a denial on educational grounds; but if a law denying the right to uneducated negroes, while granting it to uneducated whites, upon the theory that whites inherit voting intelligence while negroes do not, is not a denial on account of race or color, what would be?

In a recent decision the supreme court of Kansas nullifies an act of the legislature as obnoxious to the fourteenth amendment to the federal constitution. The objectionable act was intended to protect workingmen from the extortions of the truck store system by nullifying labor contracts not payable in money.. "It has been sought by some judges," reads the opinion in the case (state versus Haun) "to justify legislation of this kind upon the theory that, in the exercise of police power, a limitation necessary for the protection of one class of persons against the persecution of another class may be placed upon freedom of contract." To this proposition the Kansas court does not assent. "As between persons sui juris," it asks, "what right has the legislature to assume that one class has the need of protection against another?" Of the soundness of the conclusion indicated by this question there ought to be no doubt. The court was right in holding that paternal legislation in favor of wage workers is intolerable. But if that be true, what becomes of all the usury laws that grace the statute books of the several states. If a legislature cannot interfere with freedom of labor contracts in behalf of the laborer without running foul of the fourteenth amendment, by what right does it interfere with borrowing contracts in behalf of the borrower? There may be a distinguishable difference in legal principle, but if there is it must be an exceedingly nice one.

So conservative a man as Walter S. Logan, prominent at the New York city bar and but recently president of the New York State Bar association, is preaching a gospel of wealth limitation. He would start with a maximum of $10,000,000 and hold the possessions of individuals down to that amount by means of graduated income taxes and restrictions upon inheritances. The large public revenues resulting he would expend in the acquisition by the state of those franchises which, as he describes them, "have done so much to enrich its citizens at its expense." He suggests, for example, that New York state might buy and operate the New York Central railroad, while New York city might establish public ice plants and furnish ice to the people at nominal prices.

It is encouraging to find a man of Mr. Logan's professional, business and social environment exhibiting contempt for wealth accumulation and accumulators. But it is not so encouraging to find him so indifferent to the elementary principles of wealth distribution. If Mr. Logan were cross-examined upon his reasons for proposing the confiscation of fortunes in excess of $10,000,000, he would probably justify himself morally by insisting that no one can earn so much. Any other moral justification would be impossible. For if any man should earn more than $10,000,000 the state would have no more moral right to confiscate the excess than the whole. Earnings either are sacred to the last penny, or they are not sacred at all. The instant, therefore, that you empower the state to confiscate any excess of private earnings, that very instant you justify the state in making a total confiscation.

Yet Mr. Logan is right in supposing that no man earns $10,000,000. He would be right if he put it at $1,000,000. For it would take a five-dollar-a-day man some 650 years, without allowing him anything for expenses, to earn and save $1,000,000; and it is beyond the range of probability that any man, however gigantic his productive power, can productively earn and fairly save in a lifetime as much as a five-dollar-a-day man could earn in 650 years. But we are confronted with the fact that there are millionaires. It must be, then, that they get enormously more than they earn. How do they get it? If they do not earn it, but are honest, they must get it by means of legal privileges of some kind. The obvious method, then, for limiting unearned fortunes is to abolish legal privileges. It is the natural and just way, too. If that were done, fortunes would be limited as nature limits them—by the earnings of their owners.

The interestingly garrulous and often instructive "Spectator" who contributes to the Outlook, had some very sensible observations in that periodical of May 19, upon the provincial character of the New York press. He rather inclined to the view that New York papers are provincial. We are sure that he would be confirmed in this view by any newspaper reading New Yorker who has ever gone through the back door of the metrop-