

privileges to foreigners after five years' residence. This was a domestic question over which the Transvaal government was supreme. While these negotiations were in progress Great Britain was advancing troops toward the Boer frontiers and bringing extraordinary supplies of troops from India and England into South Africa. That was not a "threatening" or a "bullying." It was a distinctly evident preparation for invasion—one which, if not guarded against, would have put the Boers at a fatal disadvantage; and to meet these preparations, the Boers advanced troops towards the frontiers on their side. After several fruitless propositions in August, the Boers offered to concede all that Great Britain had specifically asked and to arbitrate all other disputes, provided this concession should not be taken as a precedent for further interference in the domestic affairs of the Transvaal and that a recently asserted British claim of suzerainty should be abandoned. The offer was declined. After it had been declined the Boers withdrew it, intimating that they had made it upon a semi-official notification that it would be accepted. This action on their part was followed by a warning from the British ministry that on this account Great Britain would now propose terms of her own for final acceptance. There was no other inference, under the circumstances, than that she intended to back up some as yet unrevealed demands with military force. That was about the 20th of September. Nothing further was heard from her until October 7—more than two weeks; and during all that time she kept pouring more troops into South Africa and up about the Boer frontiers, until her regular force was exhausted. Then, on the 7th of October, without having yet notified the Transvaal of the terms they intended to propose for final acceptance, the British ministers called out the army reserves and assembled parliament. What did it all mean, if not that Great Britain intended to invade the Transvaal with an over-

whelming force? The British press so understood it. The rest of the world so understood it. How could the Boers have regarded it otherwise? They could not and did not. But not until two days afterward, October 9th, did they issue the ultimatum, which Mr. Shearman describes as if it had been an unwarranted if not unprovoked demand. And when they did issue it, they did not confine it, as Mr. Shearman's analogy implies, to a demand upon Great Britain. They offered also to withdraw their own troops from the frontier, and to submit all questions to arbitration. These facts are derived not from Boer but from British sources. They are derived from official British sources. And since they are so derived we submit that Mr. Shearman's analogy, however fair he intended to make it—and of his just intentions we have no doubt—is in fact misleading.

Reports from China by way of London do not picture the Philippine situation in the agreeable colors that characterize Gen. Otis's dispatches. The Hong-Kong correspondent of the London Daily Mail, for example, asserts that the condition of affairs is far from satisfactory. With reference to commercial conditions he acknowledges the truth of Otis's reports that the ports are open for ships to come and go; but he says that no one can leave the towns to collect merchandise in the interior. For there the Filipinos are in power. Consequently, as soon as the stocks accumulated at seaports were exhausted, commerce at those ports practically ceased. He compares the situation in the interior to that in Acheen, which the Dutch have been trying to conquer for 100 years, but without securing a foothold further inland than the fringe of shore line. While this report is less satisfying than Gen. Otis's censored dispatches, it bears a deeper impress of truth. And it is sadly confirmed by the latest military reports which tell of the destruction of an American garrison, 20 out of 30 of them being killed.

Newspaper reports of public speeches are as a rule so untrustworthy that we hesitate to accept as true the one which tells of Senator Tillman's lecture at Ann Arbor on the 28th. Though quite prepared to believe that his sentiments were essentially undemocratic, since his subject was "The Race Question in the South," we are not prepared to believe, without better proof, that he deliberately insulted a negro gentleman in the audience. According to the news report—

The audience was composed of students. Directly in front and alone sat a colored student, and the senator looked at him in making his remarks. "You scratch one of these colored graduates under the skin," he said, "and you will find the savage. His education is like a coat of paint, like his skin."

That is something which no man, himself possessing the instincts of a gentleman, could possibly say, under the circumstances described, even though his race prejudices were never so bitter. And while Senator Tillman is notable for his scathing language, it is not to be believed without good authority that he would indulge that faculty in a manner so cruel and unprovoked.

The dubious report from which we quote goes on to describe what followed Senator Tillman's alleged assault upon the negro student. "There were hisses," it says, "from various parts of the house." Senator Tillman smiled and retorted:

You must excuse me for my frankness. There is nothing of hatred in my nature for the negroes. When that man who hissed gets ready to give his daughter in marriage to a negro, and proves by his action and not by his hisses that he means business, I will apologize, and not before.

Wholly aside from the question of whether Senator Tillman said this, the sentiment deserves a moment's consideration upon the theory that he did say it. In fact this is something which he might not improbably have said. For while he is a much better democrat in some important respects than many a man who professes a higher regard for the negro,

his sentiments respecting the negro race are decidedly undemocratic and antique. Take for example this expression about intermarriage. It is as old as slavery. When slavery flourished in this country, it was one of the most familiar arguments against abolishing it. There seemed to be a universal dread, so effective was this argument then, that if negroes were emancipated white men's daughters would surely want to marry them. But the modern mind, unless Senator Tillman's be an exception, has abandoned that argument. It really proves nothing. Suppose the unwisdom, or, if you please, the unrighteousness of intermarriage be conceded, what then? That does not prove that negroes ought to be slaves, or to be denied civil and political rights, or to be discouraged from acquiring an education, or to be excluded from any privilege whatever which you would accord to a white man to whom you were not ready to give your daughter in marriage.

Another of those idiotic misconceptions of Markham's famous poem, "The Man with the Hoe," is floating through the plutocratic press. This one tells of an intelligent looking, well-dressed, clean-shaven man who seemed quite at home amid the surroundings of a magnificent hotel. When interviewed by a reporter, he professed great anxiety to know whether he looked like a man with the emptiness of ages in his face, or seemed to be bearing on his back the burdens of the world, or was "dead to rapture or despair, a thing that grieves not and that never hopes," or showed a loosened and let down jaw, a brow slanted back, a darkened brain, or the mien of one stolid and stunned—a brother to the ox. He asked these questions, he said, because he wanted to learn if Markham knew what he was talking about when he wrote "The Man with the Hoe." For said this splendid American toiler—

I raised on my farm in Illinois last year 10,000 bushels of wheat, 12,000 bushels of oats, 40,000 bushels of corn and 1,000 head of cattle, to say nothing

of other stuff and stock, and I'm just back from a European trip.

He raised! Why he raised nothing. What he did was to let other men raise those things for him and to pay them a trifle out of the product for doing it; pretty much as the tramp offered to allow all comers to catch drift wood in the Mississippi on shares. This is not Markham's man with the hoe. This is only the kind that makes Markham's kind. And he would know it if his brow were not somewhat slanted and his brain a little darkened. He is the type of man upon whom Markham calls when he addresses the "masters, lords and rulers in all lands." To him the degraded man with the hoe stands in the relation of effect to cause; stands as the slave to the master, as the serf to the lord, as the robbed to the robber.

Ohio is going through the throes of a decennial valuation of real estate for purposes of taxation. The throes would not be severe if the assessors were disposed to obey the law as to valuations, which is not only plain but simple. It requires merely that property be assessed at its "true value in money." Such a requirement would cause no serious dispute, and none at all as to its interpretation, if the property were to be appraised for purposes of partition among heirs. But since it is for taxing purposes, all sorts of differences of opinion, prompted of course in great measure by personal interests, are reported. In Cleveland, for instance, the majority of the assessors, says the Cleveland Leader, "seemed to be in favor of deducting 40 per cent. from the market value!" Could anything be more absurd? What the law obviously means by "true value in money," is market value; yet these over astute assessors would arrive at that valuation by reducing it 40 per cent. Store goods are usually sold at their true value in money. Would a customer therefore expect to buy at 40 per cent. discount upon market value? The only sensible view of the duty of assessors under the Ohio law which the Leader reports is that of Peter Witt. He de-

clared, says the Leader, that "he would return the true value in money, and that value was fixed at the price the property would be sold at."

The death of Sidney A. Kent, a Chicago millionaire, has drawn from George A. Schilling a suggestion that the working people erect a modest stone over Mr. Kent's grave bearing this simple inscription:

Here lies the body of Sidney A. Kent, the millionaire packer of Chicago, who, in 1886, championed and conceded the eight-hour day to his employes. He believed its universal adoption would result in a broader intelligence and a higher standard of life for the masses and would insure the more peaceful progress of society.

Mr. Schilling's story of the incident that entitles Mr. Kent's memory to this mark of respect is very interesting. In consequence of his establishment of the eight-hour day in his business as a packer, the system was for a time adopted throughout the Union stockyards; and Mr. Kent's loyalty to the eight-hour principle remained unshaken even after his associates had forced back the old ten-hour system. And the confidence he had inspired continued. He was nominated in 1899 for United States senator, by R. M. Burke, a labor senator of the state of Illinois, who said in the nominating speech that he nominated Mr. Kent—
not because of his millions, but because his noble mind and heart shine through his wealth.

The modest tribute proposed by Mr. Schilling would honor those making it no less than him whose memory among workmen it was designed to perpetuate.

The English press is smarting under a recent judicial decision which holds that any publication calculated to bring a court or judge into contempt or to lower his authority, and consequently personal scurrilous abuse of a judge, is a contempt of court and may be summarily punished as such. Judges in this country have tried to establish the same principle. But they have not very generally succeeded. That publications calculated