

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 con-

stitutionality, 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