

bermen, and I will venture to say that before another year passes over us every acre that it is possible to get of timber lands will be controlled directly or indirectly by American capitalists. There are many timber land men in Wisconsin who have invested upwards of \$100,000 each in Philippine timber lands, and these investments have increased threefold in value in the past three years. You can just bet your very last bottom dollar that the United States is not going to abandon the property of Americans to a lot of semi-civilized savages and their government, if they ever have any. No; this talk is all froth, pure and simple. Americans have put their money in there into lands from which the timber can only be removed under strict forestry laws, but their holdings will have to be protected and the risk of leaving them to ladrones will never be considered. These investments have been made very quietly at a time when it was supposed that land could not be sold in the Philippines, hence, the general public knows nothing whatever about it."

Anonymous though this is, there is an air of probability about it; and the Administration—especially Secretary Taft—is fairly put upon the defense by it. There are occasions when even anonymous accusations, when not denied, may be taken as true. They arise when the accused is exclusively in control of the facts, the facts being such as the public is entitled to know, and the accusation is plausible and incriminatory of public officials. This is such an instance.

Mr. Balfour, the British prime minister, tells the British Association for the Advancement of Science, of which he is president, that he—

cannot see any escape for the rather melancholy conclusion that everything which opens up every career to a poor child of ability tends somewhat in the existing social conditions in the direction of deterioration of the race.

Mr. Balfour is doubtless right. This is the undeniable tendency. And his allusion to "existing social conditions" has within it all the potentialities of a full explanation. The opening of careers to the poor are deteriorating because they lead on to enervating luxury. There is nothing new about it. It is the old, old story which the wise Agur understood when he prayed:

"Give me neither poverty nor riches." Either is deteriorating. If we would avoid deterioration as a race we must seek that social condition in which none are despoiled and there is consequently no career which leads on to spoils and the luxurious habits of the non-earning rich. College professors who teach that civilization depends upon a leisure class, for whose support some form of slavery is necessary, promote the condition that Mr. Balfour deplors. They are among the worst of public enemies, and the only palliation for their crime is the fact that they are fools—educated fools, but fools.

It has been frequently urged that the stories of Negro assaults upon white women in the South have their counterparts in equally true stories of similar assaults by white men upon Negro women. But evidence of violence is usually lacking. Whether lacking because it does not exist, or because the channels of publication are closed to Negroes so abused by whites, while thrown wide open when the victim is white and the criminal a Negro, is not certain. All that can be asserted is that evidence of violence is usually lacking in the cases of Negro women. But now comes an apparently well-authenticated story of this class from Portland, Ark. We find it in the Little Rock Reporter, a Negro paper. The details need not be described. It is enough to say that they are quite as shocking as they could be were the relation of the races reversed. The victim was one of two women in a party of four Negroes who had been in attendance upon a Baptist Sunday school convention at Portland and were at the railroad station on their way home. The party consisted of two clergymen, a young woman student at the Alabama Baptist college, and this young woman's sister. They were first arrested by white men, at the point of a pistol, and with no pretense of an accusation, and then separated. It is reported that efforts are being made to bring the perpetrators of this crime to justice; but we have yet to hear of any

indignant uprising among the whites of Arkansas.

With reference to the recent brutal lynching of Negroes at the South, there seems to be an insistence by their apologists that condemnation of these lynchings is peculiarly a condemnation of the South, and that it is accompanied by an implication that the North would treat the Negro better. This insistence is mistaken. Those who say that Northern feeling toward the Negro is as hostile as that of the South are substantially right. But that is not to the point. The crime is the thing, whether committed at the North or at the South; and "You're another!" is no defense to either section. The question is not one of North or South; it is one of human rights. If human rights are invaded at the South, and the South neglects to give protection because the victims are Negroes, the South must bear the odium, whether the North would justly incur the same odium under the same circumstances or not.

He who tries to make a sectional question of this simple man-question is a dangerous person in proportion to his influence. No better is he, whether of the North or of the South, who asks that any part of this country, be it North, East, South or West, shall be allowed to settle its man-questions in its own way without interference. The citizens of this country are entitled to the equal protection of the laws in every part of it. The Negro is a citizen of this country, just as truly and just as fully as is the Saxon. His rights under the laws are equal to those of the whitest, just as the rights of the poor are equal to those of the richest. If there is a problem that concerns him, it is also a problem in the solution of which he has as much right as anyone else to participate. And if he is denied these equal rights, this equal protection of the laws, whether he be denied them by local statute or by local mobs to which the local administrators of the law see fit to pander, and whether it be in the South or

in the North, in Georgia or Ohio, in Louisiana or New England, it is the solemn duty of the national authorities to respond to his appeal and to conserve his rights of American citizenship.

Japan's defense of the seizure of an armed Russian vessel in a neutral Chinese port is as a matter of reasoning without a flaw. She argues that China's position in this war is unique. China is a neutral power, yet not wholly neutral. The war is waged on some of her territory, outside of which both combatants have agreed to respect her neutrality. The port in question is outside the belligerent area and therefore to be regarded under ordinary circumstances as neutral. But when Russia's armed ship is forced by the Japanese out of the belligerent area, and takes refuge in the neutral port, that port is in virtue of that fact to be at once included in the area of belligerency. No answer has been made to this contention; and how any logical answer can be made it is difficult to see.

If Japan had driven the Russian land forces from their base in the belligerent area of China, and instead of surrendering they had retreated to the neutral area of China, all armed and ready to return when opportunity offered, could it be reasonably asserted that the Japanese must not follow them into that neutral area? Would not the neutral territory instantly become belligerent territory when the armed Russians retreated into it to escape pursuing Japanese? Surely it cannot be seriously urged that the Japanese should stop at the line of belligerency and helplessly see their routed enemy reorganize and reform over on neutral ground? But if the Japanese army would have the right to follow a fleeing Russian army from the belligerent land area of China, why may not a Japanese warship follow a fleeing Russian warship from the belligerent Chinese port, from which she escapes, into the neutral Chinese port where she seeks refuge? Why

does not every Chinese port become, as the Japanese argue, a part of the belligerent area of China the moment the Russians utilize it to escape from their victorious foe?

#### ANOTHER IMPORTANT REFERENDUM IN ILLINOIS.

For the fourth time a petition is before the voters of Illinois for an advisory referendum under the Foote-Crafts "public policy" law. Three questions are proposed. They relate (1) to direct popular primaries as a substitute for conventions for nominating candidates for office; (2) to popular referendum vetoes of objectionable local legislation; and (3) to the regulation of local taxation. In full, these questions are as follows:

(1) Shall the State legislature amend the primary election law so as to provide for party primaries at which the voter will vote under the Australian ballot directly for the candidate whom he wishes nominated by his party, instead of voting for delegates to convention or caucus; the primaries, throughout the entire district affected by the offices for which nominations are to be made, to be held by all the parties conjointly at the same time and polling places. This law not to prevent the nomination of candidates by petition as now provided.

(2) Shall the State legislature pass a law enabling the voters of any county, city, village or township, by majority vote, to veto any undesirable action of their respective law-making bodies (except emergency measures) whenever five per cent. of the voters petition to have such action referred to popular vote. This law to apply only to such localities as may adopt the same.

(3) Shall the State legislature submit to the voters of the State of Illinois at the next following State election an amendment to the State constitution, which will enable the voters of any county, city, village or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine.

The fact is now pretty generally known that the "public policy" law of Illinois provides for popular voting on any question of State or local policy. The law is unique. Its author, Mr. Allen Ripley Foote,

and its sponsor in the legislature which enacted it four years ago, the Hon. Clayton E. Crafts, probably had no higher expectations regarding it than that it might occasionally serve as a wholesome admonition to the State legislature and to city councils of the trend of public sentiment; while the majority of the legislators who voted for its enactment doubtless believed that in consequence of their amendment requiring an enormous petition to give it effect, it would be a dead letter on the statute books. But it is not a dead letter; and that it is more binding than its author and its sponsor expected is probable. Two Chicago petitions and one State petition have been voted upon and with good effect; and competent lawyers in increasing numbers are coming over to the opinion that popular verdicts rendered under this law are not merely suggestions, but are legally mandatory, with somewhat of the force of a constitutional provision. Their view of the mandatory character of the law will probably be presented to the courts at an early day. Should the city council of Chicago attempt to pass a compromise franchise ordinance (p. 305) in the face of the "public policy" vote of last Spring against all franchises and in favor of police-power licenses pending the final adjustment of legal complications, legal proceedings on the basis of the "public policy" law will doubtless be instituted.

The first vote under this law was taken in Chicago at the Spring election of 1902, with reference only to local questions, and with this result (vol. iv, p. 821):

(1) Ownership by the city of Chicago of all street railroads within the corporate limits was demanded by a vote of 124,594 to 25,987—a majority of 98,607.

(2) Ownership by the city of Chicago of the gas and electric lighting plants (the same to furnish all heat and power for public and private use) was demanded by a vote of 124,190 to 19,447—a majority of 104,743.

(3) Nominations of all candidates for city offices by direct vote of the voters at primary elections to be held for the purpose was demanded by 125,082 to 15,861—a majority of 109,221.

At the Fall elections of the same year, the second experiment under the "public policy" law was made, the result being that the voters