

"bankers, merchants, lawyers and doctors" (nor even for preachers), who defy it when they are in "sore need of coal;" but only for the "lower classes," when they are in sore enough need to forget that even though "self-preservation is the first law of nature," "peace and order" is the first law of society."

There is a thing or two about this Arcola incident, however, that should be highly satisfactory to the much-abused anarchist. In the first place, a mob of respectable "archists," as anarchists would call them, have turned anarchists in the opprobrious sense of that term. That is, they have kicked over the laws of property just the same as if they drank beer for a living and carried dynamite bombs for amusement. In the second place, having set government aside, they have done precisely as professed anarchists say men would naturally do if there were no government. They proceeded, that is to say, in a perfectly orderly and honest manner to do the fairest thing under the circumstances. A committee was appointed for the emergency. The confiscated coal was fairly distributed among those who needed it. Accounts were kept, and a fund was voluntarily raised to indemnify the owners. On the whole, these Arcola anarchists show off to much better advantage than do the "law-abiding" Baers and Morgans who have produced the terrible coal famine from which the people of the country are suffering. The strongest indictment against them, perhaps, is not that they became anarchists, but that they somewhat hypocritically insisted all the time that they were law-abiding people.

It is altogether probable that the rebate of the tariff on coal, to continue a year, will have little or no effect upon prices. When importers must advance the duty before they can get the rebate, and know that the rebate will be allowed only for a few months, they are not likely to make great efforts to establish lines for

importing coal. The temporary nature of the relief is a menace to every business man who may think of importing foreign coal to compete with the trust.

And yet, this little measure of relief may be immense in its effects. The point of impact is often more important with a blow than its force. So a reduction of 67 cents a ton on the cost of getting foreign coal into the American market may break the extortionate prices of the trust. It is asked, for instance, how a tariff of only 67 cents can keep foreign bituminous coal out of the Chicago market, when, as now, domestic bituminous, usually worth about three dollars a ton, sells at six dollars or more. The answer is that such a tariff could not keep out the foreign product if the domestic high prices were more than a temporary spurt. By a 67 cent tariff regular shipments of foreign coal are shut out. Consequently, if the domestic article is cornered its price can be run up for a time far above the tariff difference. The conditions are not favorable to a quick increase in importations of foreign coal to compete, as they would be if there were no tariff to prevent the establishment of regular shipments. If the present high prices were to continue long enough to make it reasonably certain that they would not flatten out before foreign shipments could be brought here, an increasing stream of coal imports would set in and not abate until prices had been reduced to the point at which the 67-cent tariff becomes prohibitory. It should always be remembered that natural trade laws are laws of tendencies, and that a tariff which disturbs a trade tendency at all may disturb it out of all proportion to the amount of the tariff. As a pebble dropped in a favorable place may divert the course of what becomes a great river, so a small tariff put on or taken off at the advantageous point may change the direction of vast volumes of trade. It must not be forgotten, nevertheless, that the tariff on coal is a small matter as compared with the tariffs imposed for similar

reasons and in the same general pecuniary interests, by railroad combinations.

The message of the first single tax governor, Garvin, of Rhode Island, is attracting attention for the rational view of public affairs which it presents to the people of the State and indeed of the country. While conservative yet far-reaching methods for redressing grievances are proposed, the sentiment of the message is pitched in a radical key. When Gov. Garvin declares in this message, referring to popular discontent, that it is due to "privations which are artificial and unnecessary," the truth being that "the enormous amount of wealth produced is unequally distributed—unequally because of interference with the natural laws of distribution by unwise and unjust legislation," he recognizes a fact that most public officials prefer to blink, and leaves no room for mistaking either the nature of his convictions or his courage regarding them. Among the specific facts to which he invites the attention of the legislature is the importance of a constitutional initiative under which a reasonable number of voters may at any election propose constitutional amendments to be submitted directly to popular vote.

Rhode Island has a source of income resembling in principle that which advocates of the single tax insist is virtually the sole legitimate source for all incomes. It is the oyster planting rights in Narragansett bay. Land under the waters of this bay belongs to the State, and in 1864 the practice of ground renting it for oyster culture began. The ground rent for the year was \$61. But it has increased until in 1902 it amounted to \$35,000. As the expense of surveying, administration, etc., was only \$8,000, the net income from that source was, therefore, \$27,000. It is expected that in 1903 the net income will be as high as \$42,000. This land under water might be turned over to individuals as private

property, in which case the owners would pocket a public income. But that is not done, and the State gets the annual value, consequently, of the very valuable privilege of using the land under the waters of the bay. Suppose those waters should recede, leaving the bottom permanently dry and increasing opportunities for production from one industry to many, would it then be wise to divide the bottom of the bay among private owners? If so, what explanation is there for thus preserving common rights to land under water while turning over the dry land to private persons? How do the superincumbent waters make any difference?

Gen. Chaffee takes advantage of the facilities offered by newspaper interviewing to deny Maj. Glenn's contention at his trial that he ordered Glenn to resort to cruelties in order to extort information from native Filipinos. But this is not enough to exempt Chaffee or the war department from suspicions of having authorized the systematic atrocities which it is now demonstrated were perpetrated by the army in the Philippines. Maj. Glenn charges that such orders were given by Gen. Chaffee and were understood by his subordinates generally in the barbarous way in which Maj. Glenn understood and executed them. In view of this statement, and of Glenn's further statement that such orders have been abstracted from the official files, together with the fact that Secretary Root and Senator Lodge, one at the head of the war department and the other at the head of the Senate committee of investigation, have been caught in the act of suppressing inculpatory facts, Gen. Chaffee should be ordered to go upon the witness stand and submit to cross-examination. An irresponsible newspaper interview is not satisfactory.

In the course of his interview Gen. Chaffee makes a lame attempt to explain the written order Maj. Glenn has unearthed, in which he required

of his subordinates that certain information be obtained of the inhabitants, "no matter what measures may have to be adopted." Now, when subordinates are commanded to procure information, "no matter what measures may have to be adopted," they may be regarded as having been allowed a pretty free hand. If John Mitchell, for illustration, could be shown to have given written orders to local leaders in the anthracite strike to prevent the operation of the mines, "no matter what measures may have to be adopted," his responsibility for the boycotting of "scabs" and the dynamiting of their houses would be regarded as proved. No explanation from him, made in a newspaper interview, he refusing to go upon the witness stand and submit to cross-examination, would be accepted as satisfactory if he had no more to offer than that in saying "no matter what measures," he meant lawful measures only. Why, then, should Gen. Chaffee's gauzy explanation be accepted as final? That he used in his order to get information the unqualified language that it must be done, "no matter what measures may have to be adopted," is both proved and conceded. That the "water cure" was extensively resorted to by his subordinates in order to extort information has been proved in several cases, and admitted, case by case, as the proof has come out. What other inference is possible, then, than that Gen. Chaffee is responsible for the cruelties, unless he is to be regarded as so angelic that his bare word, unverified by cross-examination, and given without responsibility to an irresponsible reporter to be published in an irresponsible newspaper, must be accepted without further question? Has not the work of officially whitewashing these army atrocities in the Philippines gone far enough? Is it not time for a complete exposure? The atrocities were committed. Of that there is no longer any doubt or excuse for question. Then why not fearlessly and fairly trace the responsibility to its source?

We know a man who is renowned as a universal faultfinder, a chronic "knocker," a "kicker" always ready to "take a fall" out of anything. Venturing once to ask him why he indulges his propensity so immoderately, what was our surprise to have him instantly deny the propensity. "I am no 'kicker,'" he retorted. "I am no 'knocker,' no faultfinder." He actually tried to convince us that in spite of his reputation it was his weakness, if he had a weakness, to be favorable to good things—even unduly so, perhaps. So far from being a "knocker," he confided to us that he prides himself upon being a "booster."

"Now, there was the Cuban question," said he; "didn't I plead, in season and out of season, for Cuban independence during all the time when American 'knockers' were trying to make a colonial possession of that country? And wasn't I persistent in encouraging the Filipinos to fight for their country against the invader who finally conquered them? And didn't you find me trying to 'boost' the cause of the Boers when British 'knockers' overran their land, and that of the coal strikers and the coal consumers when the trust threatened them? But those are only the more prominent instances," he went on. "When I was but a boy I tried, in my weak way, to help the Negro slave to his freedom, and to-day I espouse the cause of both Negroes and white men who are denied their natural rights. So I espouse that of the millions of all races who are victimized by tariff robbery, and trust robbery, and robbery even of their God-given birthright to a place upon the earth. I stand for the Declaration of Independence at all times and under all circumstances. No matter where you look into my record, you will find that I am never a faultfinder but always a helper, never a 'knocker' but always a 'booster.'"

We could not controvert our friend. Still, there was his reputation, and we pushed the probe farther in. "Why