

sionaries the local authorities forced them to leave the town, and then wired the governor that everything was peaceable! The North Carolina outrage occurred in Cherokee county, the victims being a congregation of sanctificationists of some sort. Their church was burned to the ground by a mob, while the Rev. Gay Bryant, a Methodist preacher, egged the mob on with what the dispatches call a sermon. Six people out of 116 who were called out to perpetrate this outrage proved to be good men in Sodom. They refused to act, insisting that everyone had a right to worship according to his own conscience. Outrages like these are so manifestly criminal that no law-abiding person can hesitate to denounce them. The fact that they are supported by local public opinion makes their criminality all the worse. It is not a question of whether the religion of the victims is good or bad. It is a question of the right of each man to choose his religion for himself, and of the duty of everybody else to let him alone.

It is reported of the emperor of Germany that upon addressing a German military force as it left Berlin for China last week he used this language:

If you close with the enemy remember this: Spare nobody. Make no prisoners. Use your weapons so that for a thousand years hence no Chinaman will dare look askance at any German. Open the way for civilization once for all.

Since it is denied that these words were used, and as they do not appear in the official report of the speech, we prefer to believe that they were never uttered. But they do express the strenuous idea of civilization almost with Rooseveltian elegance.

Mr. J. W. Bengough, the well-known Canadian illustrator and caricaturist, puts to us the following question concerning the sacredness of national independence for which we contend:

As an abstract proposition, I am disposed to accept your contention that no nation has or can have the right to deprive another nation of its independence. Applying this principle

to the case of the South African Republic (and waving the question as to whether or not the Transvaal is in the full sense an independent state—let us presume it to be so), I wish to ask for your opinion upon the very practical point which has arisen in this instance, and may arise in many others, viz.: Must we regard such national independence as involving absolute home rule? In other words, must each government be permitted to do what it pleases within its own political borders; treat its citizens or its residents with any measure and degree of cruelty, injustice or oppression it may see fit to inflict, and no outside power have the right under any circumstances to interfere? If we are to accept the doctrine of the sacredness of national independence absolutely, it simply means that if people do not like their treatment in any given country, they can get out, leaving their property, if they have any, behind them. British uitlanders in the Transvaal and American residents in China must simply grin and bear the treatment meted out to them, or leave. No appeal to their home governments is permissible. Perhaps you are not prepared to go quite so far as this. You would still retain the right of every nation to protect its citizens living under foreign governments. Then, just here arises the practical point I refer to. How far shall such protection extend? In the British-Boer case its first stage was friendly appeal on the part of Britain. This proving ineffectual, diplomatic conference was next tried, with no better result; at last armed intervention had to be resorted to. I assume that this meets your approval up to this point. You will say a nation has the right to protect its citizens to the extent of even "licking" their oppressors, but it must not, under any circumstances, divest said oppressors of their national independence. But what if, notwithstanding the "licking," the oppression is likely to be continued as before? What if there is no guarantee of reform in the matter? In view of the notorious character of Kruger and his allies, and the past history of their promise-breaking and compact-ignoring tendencies, no sane man or nation would be disposed to rely upon their word. What, then, is to be done—what could be done in any similar case?—for I am using the Transvaal only as an illustration. Does not the doctrine of national independence, I repeat, involve the abolition of the hitherto admitted right of a nation to protect its citizens abroad?

Since the principle for which we contend is accepted by Mr. Bengough as an abstract proposition, it is incumbent upon him to present an actual

case in which either the rights of foreign residents must be left unprotected or the independence of the nation where they reside must be abolished. This he must do before he can ask if the doctrine of national independence does not involve the abolition of the hitherto admitted right of a nation to protect its citizens abroad. Recognizing that he must do so, he brings up the Transvaal case. But that case has never involved Mr. Bengough's alternative. Whatever the grievances of British subjects in the Transvaal may have been, the Boer government was always ready to submit them to arbitration. Armed intervention on the part of Great Britain was never necessary. It came because Great Britain would not arbitrate. Moreover, the British government assured the Boers of its belief that these grievances could be effectually cured without in any wise jeopardizing Transvaal independence, by simply giving full voting rights to foreigners and allowing them a minority representation of about one-fifth in the law-making body. Grievances so easily cured could not have been sore enough to justify abolition of Transvaal independence, even if the alternative had been presented and it were conceded that such a penalty, so dangerous to all small nations, and so menacing in its possibilities to the peace of the world, could be justified by any personal grievances whatever. We note what Mr. Bengough says about the untrustworthiness of Oom Paul and his allies—that no sane nation would be disposed to rely upon their word. A Boer might take the same position with reference to Mr. Chamberlain. But in fact Great Britain, whether sane or not, professed to be willing at the Bloemfontein conference of June, 1899, to rely upon the word of the Transvaal, provided the Transvaal would promise what she demanded. Yet the bad faith of the Transvaal, if there was any, ante-dated that conference. How, then, can Great Britain now insist upon destroying Transvaal independence because no sane nation

can rely upon the Transvaal word? If the Boers could be trusted then they can be trusted now. Nothing has happened since to discredit their good faith. The Transvaal case does not challenge the abstract proposition. Whether some case in the future might challenge it, it can hardly be profitable to discuss. There is no case in modern history yet which has fairly done so.

Recurring then to the abstract proposition, the danger regarding the abrogation of a nation's independence by force from without is that it places weaker nations at the mercy of stronger ones with which they may quarrel, and makes the question of independence not a matter of peace and order but of conquest and rapine. Once admit the right, and international comity breaks down. The world would soon become a vast centralized and despotic empire.

Some weeks ago the New York Journal of Commerce called Mr. Bryan to account, with a supercilious sneer, for pointing to the increase of farm tenancy in the west as evidence of economic decadence. It admitted the fact, but disputed the inference. Since then it has been bombarded, apparently, with remonstrances upon the subject, to which it replies in the same arrogant spirit in which it criticized Mr. Bryan, and with evident marks of high bred irritation. Its view of the question may be gathered from this extract: "The increase of tenant farming is not due to the impoverishment of farmers, but to the increasing value of farm land." Reducing these two assertions to one by eliminating the least important, we have this result: "The increase of tenant farming is due to the increasing value of farm land." That assertion, whether true or not as an inclusive statement, is true as far as it goes. The increasing value of farm lands does cause increase of tenant farming. But what causes the increasing value of farm

lands? According to the editor of the Journal of Commerce it is greater productivity. He argues, therefore, that higher values are evidence of the prosperity of the tenant as well as of the landlord. That is to say, the landlord could not get higher rent if it was not worth while for the tenant to pay it. Right here the Journal of Commerce does what it arrogantly and with the light touch of a consciously superior pen charges upon its critics. It neglects to distinguish and reflect. To assert that the tenant would refuse to pay higher rent if it were not worth his while is to leave the assertion incomplete. The full statement is that he would not pay it if it were not worth his while under the circumstances. And the circumstances are that the land of the country is so completely monopolized as to create fictitious land values. Tenants must pay rent for land out of proportion to its productiveness because land is made abnormally scarce by monopolization. It is not, therefore, land that makes higher values, but its greater scarcity. Greater productivity there may be; but the greater productivity does not equal the higher rents. Scarcity is the principal factor. It is the only one. Without scarcity of such land, greater productivity would not increase rents at all. But scarcity has the effect of taking the benefit of greater productivity from the user and giving it to the landlord. And when scarcity is complete, as it almost is in the west—that is, when there is no free, or virtually free, land within reasonably convenient access to markets,—rack-renting sets in. That process has well begun in the west. Owing to the great market-scarcity of land, rent absorbs so much of the product that tenants have little chance to accumulate capital. Increasing tenancy in the west means increasing dependency of the tenant class upon the landowning class; and the Journal of Commerce is entitled to all the credit of discovering that this condition is significant of prosperity.

RECIPROCIITY A TENDER TO PROTECTION.

Statistics of our trade with Brazil have been recently quoted in support of an assertion that it has suffered a great decrease. The falling off thus indicated is attributed to the repeal, during Cleveland's administration of the reciprocity treaty with that country. But the figures quoted forcibly illustrate a danger ever lurking in statistics, and the necessity, if we desire to arrive at true conclusions, of considering every factor of the problem.

In comparing the imports from Brazil, the writer referred to—William E. Curtis, in the Chicago Record—fails to consider the fact that coffee, which constituted nearly 80 per cent. of our imports from that country in 1895, the year following the passage of the Wilson bill, has declined in price over 60 per cent. Consequently, though our imports of this article, measured in dollars, declined over 41 per cent., the number of pounds imported increased over 44 per cent.

Our imports of coffee, as reported by the bureau of statistics were as follows:

	1895.	1899.
Pounds .....	435,871,706	628,417,812
Dollars .....	\$60,316,677	\$35,253,010

The figures are for the fiscal year ending June 30.

Thus we have a great increase in the quantity of coffee received, at a greatly reduced cost, requiring a much smaller export of our own products to pay for it. This, to a person of ordinary intelligence, would seem an advantage to our country, though to persons of the extraordinary intelligence required to comprehend the beneficence of protection and the emasculated species of free trade for which Mr. Blaine designed to safeguard that policy, it is doubtless different. To be thus flooded with the cheap goods of other countries is, according to their profound philosophy, a calamity to be guarded against.

Coffee, together with India rubber, sugar and cocoa, constituted over 97 per cent. in value of our imports from Brazil in 1895, and over 96 per cent. in 1899. Excepting sugar, all of these articles were on the free list