

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume IX

Number 428

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1906.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

The Bryan Band Wagon	241
Bryan's Response to the Bryan Boom.....	242
The Bryan Wave in Local Politics.....	242
Progress in the Chicago Traction Question.....	243
The Filthy Food-Factories.....	243
Restriction of Immigration.....	244
Race Inferiority	244
The People's Mines.....	245
Mr. Rockefeller and His Press Agent.....	245
The Superstition of Authority (Miller).....	245

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Bryan Boom.....	247
Hearst's Relation to the Bryan Boom.....	248
Bryan's Relation to the Bryan Boom.....	248
Mr. Bryan in St. Petersburg.....	249
The Russian Douma.....	249
Renewal of Russian Uprising.....	249
Russian Agitation in America.....	250
Chicago Traction Adjustments.....	250
The Packinghouse Investigations.....	250
The Railroad Exposures.....	251
News Notes	252
Press Opinions	252
In Congress	253

RELATED THINGS:

Mirage (verse)	254
The Civilized Pig.....	254
A Negro's Reply to a White Man.....	254
Flesh Eating (Bigelow).....	255
Municipal Finance in Germany (Dreler).....	255
The Russian Land Question.....	256
The Town Meeting in New England (Fitts-Jones).....	256
The Busy Child (verse).....	257

BOOKS:

History of a Crime (Crosby).....	258
Americanizing the Philippines.....	262
Periodicals	263

CARTOON—The Jungle (Bengough).....	262
------------------------------------	-----

EDITORIAL

The Bryan Band Wagon.

It would require a volume to classify the varying motives for the rush for the Bryan band wagon, with accounts of which and wonderings thereon the newspapers have for a week been full.

+

By far the greater part of this rush is not a band wagon rush at all. It is simply an expression of a common impulse, which had its rise in

1896 and has ever since been gathering force in public opinion. That "Bryan is growing" has become a more and more familiar formula; and it is true, for Bryan has been growing. But properly interpreted, the expression implies not so much that Bryan has been growing as that public opinion has been growing.

+

Public opinion has been growing toward Bryan for a multiplicity of reasons, chief among which is the increasing realization that he is a man of ideals, with both the courage and the stamina of his convictions. It is this that has not only confirmed his leadership in the minds of that great mass of Americans who began to look to him for leadership before he had been tried, but which has brought to him the additional following from the ranks of his former adversaries which narrow-visioned political observers are now contemplating with amazement.

+

Most of this new accession of strength consists of sincere democrats—democrats in the broad, not the party sense—who opposed Bryan because they doubted and now accept him because they believe. But so great a tide could not run toward him without carrying upon its surface a collection of moral and political riff-raff. That is so with all political tides. To return to the original metaphor, band wagon recruits are tumbling into that vehicle with an eagerness that testifies eloquently to the fact, which indeed needs no such testimony, that neither the band nor the band wagon is of their making.

+

That Bryan's old friends should shrink with disgust and suspicion from these unsavory recruits is natural. That they should wish Bryan to promptly repudiate them is perhaps natural also; but it is not sensible. Why, for instance, should Mr. Bryan be in any greater hurry to order away from him Hopkins and Sullivan, those political train robbers of Illinois, as he has called them, than Mr. Hearst was when he and they were cooperating for the latter's nomination? The man who in 1900 refused the Presidential nomination unless upon a candid platform representing his convictions, may be safely trusted in 1908 to give his convictions first place even if the riff-raff of his party do make themselves conspicuous by

turning their open enmity into pretended friendship.

+

The baneful influence of the political highwaymen who are coming over to Bryan is not to be met by sulkily abandoning Bryan as they come impudently and jubilantly to his side. The way to meet it is as the democratic Democrats of Cincinnati are doing. They are organizing themselves into a Bryan Democratic Club, and through the principal organizer, Daniel Kiefer, have struck a note that only Democrats of the democratic variety can rise to. Mr. Kiefer rightly believes that—

In the Democratic party to-day, the element of which Belmont, Ryan, Cleveland, McLean, Parker and others are types, occupies a position corresponding to that of the pro-slavery faction of the old Whig party. Bryan is the typical representative of the element which corresponds to the faction opposed to the slave power. It still remains to be seen whether history will repeat itself by recording another foolish attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. There is no better way to accomplish this than to nominate Bryan. No one is so prominently identified with the cause of the people as he. He has been the leader in two fights, and his worthiness has been amply demonstrated. That his efforts did not result in victory was solely due to the failure of many to realize that the democracy of Bryan is something entirely different from what the Cleveland-Belmont crowd understands by that term. The issue will be clearly defined. There will be no question that one party has been thoroughly committed to plutocracy and the other to the cause of the people. There should be no question as to the result. Let all who cherish democracy work for the nomination of William J. Bryan.

This does not exclude Democrats who have been against Bryan but are now with him and opposed to plutocracy. But it is an assertion which ought everywhere to be made by democratic Democrats, that Bryan's popularity shall not be used to divert the course of the fundamental democracy of which Bryan is the greatest living leader in American politics.

+ +

Bryan's Response to the Bryan Boom.

When the newspapers interrupted Mr. Bryan in his travels, with news of his Presidential boom and solicitations for an interview, they got the answer that his friends would have expected,—in substance the same as that of a few weeks ago in these columns (p. 145). While appreciative of the compliment involved in the action of the State conventions (pp. 218, 227), he declared: "It is too early for me either to make or discuss political plans for 1908." But he brushed aside all the

chaff about his having changed his principles, by saying: "My political career discloses no instance where I have abandoned any principle formerly espoused. So far as silver is concerned, I can only say that events have fully vindicated the position of the bimetalists." All this is absolutely true. Yet in their disinclination to accept these statements, sincere democrats who have heretofore misunderstood Bryan are entitled to fair consideration. It doubtless seems to them that he has changed rather than they. This is characteristic of the human mind. It is probable, also, that neither he nor they have changed in fundamental political principle. More likely they have come to feel that even if they have differed from him as to specific issues in the past, they have not differed as to political principle, and that he is on the whole in high degree a worthy representative of the essentials of democracy to which they are attached.

+ +

The Bryan Wave in Local Politics.

Doubtless politicians are making much use of Bryan's popularity to affect local politics; and of this phase of the subject, Chicago furnishes an interesting example. Ex-Mayor Harrison is in a precarious political situation, and to strengthen himself he has promptly become a Bryan man—the first time in his life, except as he has perfunctorily supported Bryan as a party nominee. Now, Harrison's local adversaries in the party include Ex-Mayor Hopkins and Roger C. Sullivan (chairman of the national committee), who represent the Chicago gas interests and were pictured by Bryan at the St. Louis convention symbolically as train robbers. These two men co-operated two years ago with Mr. Hearst to secure a delegation for him to the St. Louis convention. Outraged by their conduct in shackling the State convention, Mr. Bryan made a bold and strong stand against them in the national convention. As they were opposed to Harrison, this seemed to ally Bryan with Harrison; and as they were co-operating with Hearst, it seemed to array him against Hearst. Soon afterward Dunne was elected Mayor. He has not identified himself with Presidential aspirations, but the issues on which he was elected and his fidelity to his pledges have put him in opposition to both the Harrison and the Hopkins-Sullivan combinations. Meanwhile the democratic Democrats of Chicago are divided between Hearst and Bryan. No concerted movement in behalf of Bryan has been made by anybody here, however, although active efforts are making by the Hearst managers to secure a Hearst delegation. Until re-

cently it was understood that Hopkins and Sullivan would again co-operate with Hearst for that purpose. But the national Bryan boom seems very greatly to have disturbed such arrangements as there may have been of that kind; for Hopkins and Sullivan as well as Harrison are tumbling into the Bryan band wagon. At the coming primaries this situation may seriously affect the democratic Democrats and conveniently serve the interests of the Democratic machines. For both machines are likely to go into the primaries waving the Bryan flag, and thereby confusing issues and dividing and conquering the genuine democratic vote. This is naturally not agreeable, except to its shrewd promoters. Yet it is not unlikely to prove a winning game to them, so far as Chicago and places similarly situated are concerned, unless democratic Democrats adopt Bryan's policy of giving their attention to making the Democratic party democratic instead of "plugging" for delegations for particular candidates.

* *

Progress in the Chicago Traction Question.

In harmony with Mayor Dunne's ultimatum to the Chicago traction companies (pp. 205, 228), his traction counsel, Mr. Fisher, has prepared an ordinance which, if adopted by the City Council and accepted by the companies, would complete the settlement of the traction question along the lines laid down by the Mayor. Under this ordinance the companies would rehabilitate the lines, continuing to operate under revocable license, and the city would be empowered to take over at any time on six months' notice and payment of actual value as previously determined, part of the income going meanwhile into a sinking fund for purchase. As the companies have already assured the city of their ability and willingness to accept those terms, it is not to be presumed that they will trifle with the matter when the time for formal and final acquiescence arrives. They are said to object to one of the clauses of the proposed ordinance, which would allow the city to transfer to another licensee upon the same terms as it reserves for taking over itself. This is a reasonable objection and should be conceded. But the indications here and there of a possible disposition to materially alter the ordinance in so far as it makes the operating license revocable, should be frowned upon without hesitation. Revocable license and sinking fund are indispensable conditions. Some influential citizens are coming to the support of this adjustment on the theory, as they express it, that the referendums for municipal ownership were in

fact mere protests against bad service, and that when good service is given the public ownership sentiment will disappear. They are not good judges of public sentiment. Yet if this little self-deception makes Dunne's victory more endurable to them by all means let them indulge in it. The fact remains that the people have authorized Mueller certificates for the construction of the traction system, that this ordinance would secure its construction subject to taking over by the city upon payment for the property, that a sinking fund for purchase would accumulate meanwhile, and that the people would be at liberty to operate their system whenever they wished to. No one wants it done any sooner.

* *

The Filthy Food-Factories.

The further the probing goes the clearer one may see, not only that the Chicago packing houses have been so managed (pp. 218, 224) as to justify the present world-wide suspicion of their products, but that their managers have left nothing undone to conceal guilt while doing nothing to improve methods. They have been indifferent alike to the comfort of their employees, the rights of consumers, and the integrity of officials. That they tried to influence Mr. Neill he asserts, and proves his assertion black upon white. That they have tried to silence the Chicago papers is evident from their full-page advertisements. That they have some sort of hold upon the majority of the Congressional committee which is nominally examining into the matter, is fairly evident from the behavior of the majority members. In examining witnesses these members act more like attorneys for the packers than officials ferreting out the truth. They refused to examine Upton Sinclair, the author of "The Jungle," although he offered to submit to examination, and his examination would afford the best and widest opening for discovering the uttermost facts if his disclosures are true, and for condemning his disclosures if they are false. One of the reasons urged as legitimate for suppressing the horrible facts is that the cattle industry would suffer. But if the cattle industry depends upon concealing filthy adulterations of food it ought to suffer. Chicago business men also are solicitous lest these exposures injure Chicago business interests. But if Chicago business interests depend upon concealing such infamous frauds upon the food-consuming world they, too, ought to suffer. So of all other interests that look to suppression of facts instead of purification of conditions, for immunity from the natural effects of

afterwards forced by popular demand to help in destroying, seems an insignificant figure in comparison to the man who championed the cause of the oppressed against the dictum of the frowning authorities of his time.

+

Even in the freest country this tyranny of authority may exist. Terribly oppressive, though unrecognized, may be the silent force of political or economic dogma which men dare not question save in secret. Absolute though unsuspected may be the constraining force of ruling caste opinion, that on a variety of subjects may tend to the most autocratic subjection of independence. Under the freest forms of government a body of opinion may exercise the constraining force of positive laws over the art, literature and politics of a people.

It is the tyranny of authority that keeps the Arab sheik of to-day like the sheik of Abraham's day; that has petrified Chinese civilization; that in the middle ages desolated western Asia from the Bosphorus to Jerusalem. The Dark Ages were the years of undisputed authority, to a degree unknown before or since. It was only due to the timid defiance of authority that civilization was preserved at all through the shrinking temerity of cloistered monks whose souls if not their speech cherished the saving spirit of revolt in the secrecy of their cells. It was authority—government and the mob—that persecuted the philosophers of ancient Greece, that sent Socrates to his death and drove Aristotle from the city. It was authority that in the person of a vacuous member of Parliament to the argument of Romilly for the abolition of hanging as the penalty for innumerable small offenses mumbled the sole monotonous retort: "I am for hanging." Authority always says, "I am for hanging." It was authority that hissed "Jacobin" to every proposition for social reform as now it shrieks "anarchist." It is great in the matter of epithet.

Look at the absurdities of which this same authority is forever guilty. In Egypt it enthroned the cat and made sacrosanct the crocodile. It has been polygamist, monogamist, polyandrist, as suited its purpose. It put kings on white elephants and clothed them in mail of precious stones. It encouraged whole communities to submit to the depredations of beasts of prey, since their destruction would offend the foolish deities they called on men to worship. In the name of the authority of faith men have lacerated themselves, stood for days and nights upon pillars, walked upon sharp stones. It has

invented all kinds of evil spirits from Belzebub to Hobomoko for men to bow before—and industriously have they made obeisance. They have yielded to authority as did men in fabled Athens to the bed of Procrustes, to which they have accommodated the proportions of such independent judgments as they were capable of forming.

+

Thought forever outstrips the slow pace of authority in its progress toward truth. Thus today the culture of the world has travelled far beyond the established creeds and institutions of the time. But the palsy influence of authority has outlasted the conviction of belief in its reasonableness. It lays its numbing touch even upon Truth become axiomatic. It is the Dead Hand of the world.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, June 13.

The Bryan Boom.

At the Indiana State convention on the 7th, the lead of Missouri (p. 227), Arkansas and South Dakota (p. 228) in spontaneously naming William J. Bryan as the Democratic candidate for President in 1908, was enthusiastically followed.

+

The press dispatches are unanimous in ascribing spontaneity, harmony and enthusiasm to the Bryan sentiment both on the eve of the convention at the mass meeting addressed by Champ Clark of Missouri, and in the convention proceedings of the following day. In the course of his speech of the 6th, Congressman Clark said of the two political parties:

Among other things we differ widely on the tariff. The dominant idea among Democrats touching the tariff is revenue; the dominant idea among Republicans on that subject has come to be protection. I think this an absolutely fair and accurate statement of the battle lines on which this campaign is to be waged so far as the tariff is concerned.

His mention of Bryan's name evoked a great outburst of applause.

+

At the convention, the distinctive feature is described in the dispatches to have been the Bryan

endorsement. According to the Chicago Record-Herald dispatch—

The convention, the ticket and the enthusiasm bore the Bryan stamp. It was most significant that among the delegates who cheered the declaration for the Nebraskan, among the leaders who had inserted it in the platform and among the political powers who demanded it were more than 100 men who fought Bryan in 1896 and who supported him in 1900 with apologies for their action. Such a condition never before was witnessed in Indiana. It required no trick of the party leaders, no planning of surprises, to bring out expressions of enthusiasm when Bryan's name was mentioned. The applause that met the chairman's address was loudest and most prolonged when he spoke of the Nebraskan. The most intense moment of the convention was when the plank in the platform that gave the Nebraskan the party's indorsement was reached, and when an oil painting of Bryan, which had been concealed behind the draperies of the stage, was lowered into full view, men and women seemed suddenly to have gone wild. The delegates on the floor and the men and women in the balconies rose to their feet, waved their hats, handkerchiefs and fans and for more than five minutes filled the immense hall with an incessant chorus of cheers. . . . The good feeling was shown later in the day in manner that has few precedents. Early this morning there were two or three candidates for some of the places on the ticket, but when nominations were made there was only one for each office. The candidates had talked over the situation and the result was the final withdrawal of all but one candidate for each place and the nominations were made by acclamation.

+

Ex-Congressman B. F. Shively, who was chairman of the convention, charged the Republic party in his speech with "farming out government powers," and attributed to this policy the graft which has been uncovered in the national government and in commercial and insurance circles. When he mentioned Bryan, he said:

That which is to-day eulogized and approved as broad statesmanship and enlightened patriotism in Theodore Roosevelt, was only a few years ago denounced as reactionary, revolutionary, and unpatriotic in William Jennings Bryan. The aftersight of the one is almost equal to the foresight of the other.

To this Mr. Shively added:

Withdraw privilege, and the temptation to the corruption which it engenders will disappear. Let all men and all interests stand equal before the law.

+

After endorsing Bryan the platform declares:

For nearly ten years the Republican party has been in absolute control in all departments in the national government, with power to change unjust conditions and to rectify evils. Yet during that time colossal combinations of capital have dominated the people and illegal perversions of corporate law have stifled competition and unfairly limited the opportunity of the individual citizen. Wealth thereby illegally obtained has been unsparingly used to control legislation and corrupt elections. The unfair, tyrannical features of the so-called "protective tariff" have made these things possible, and no permanent relief can be secured until its obnoxious features are removed. We demand that this be done by a tariff for revenue only. The growth of the trusts and other inordinate and dangerous combinations of capital, the tremendous and rapidly increasing absorption and centralization of the wealth of the country in the hands of a chosen few, all due to premeditated and systematic legislation in behalf of special interests by the Republican party, demand a change in the policies imposed upon the country by that party and make the passage of restrictive laws an imperative necessity. We reaffirm our faith in the time-honored Democratic doctrine of the right of a people to local and self-government.

The specific demands of the platform include a declaration in favor of a 2-cent railroad fare law, with a pledge to enact one if the party comes into power in the legislature. There also was an indorsement of a law for public depositories for money coming into the hands of State, county and township officers.

In its indorsement of Bryan the platform reads as follows:

The Democracy of Indiana in convention assembled . . . sends greetings across the sea to that wise and conservative statesman, unfaltering patriot, and superb leader, William Jennings Bryan, and pledges its vote in convention and the electoral vote of Indiana to him for President in 1908.

+ +

Hearst's Relation to the Bryan Boom.

One feature of the dispatches relative to these enthusiastic demands for Bryan's nomination, more especially of the Washington correspondents' gossip on the subject, has been the relation to or its effect upon the movement for the nomination of William Randolph Hearst, which has been revived since the St. Louis convention of 1904, and which it is expected would culminate in his nomination should he be nominated and elected for governor of New York. Relative to this matter the Indianapolis Star telegraphed Mr. Hearst on the 7th for his opinion of the Bryan endorsements. Mr. Hearst's reply, as published in his own as well as in other papers, was as follows:

I have been for many years a sincere friend and earnest supporter of Mr. Bryan. I rejoice in his achievements and successes, and I approve of every honest indorsement of him. Personally, I would never welcome into the company of loyal friends of Bryan and sincere advocates of good government any such men as Tom Taggart, gambling-house keeper, or Tim Sullivan, keeper of dives and brothels, lord protector of crooks and criminals; nor would I ever welcome such men as Pat McCarren, election thug, or George McClellan, election thief; nor such Captain Kidds of industry as Belmont and Morgan and Dave Francis, all of whom, with their mercenaries, were last mustered under the stained and dragged banners of Cleveland and the corporations. I am confident that Mr. Bryan will repudiate utterly these men and their professions of friendship, realizing that they are not honestly in favor of any man or any measure that will protect the interests of the plain people of this country.

+ +

Bryan's Relation to the Bryan Boom.

News of his endorsements for the Presidential nomination of his party reached William J. Bryan at Berlin on the 11th, soon after his arrival there from Vienna. "This is the first announcement of this news to me," he said, in answer to questions; "I have been off the main caravan route for some time and have been absorbed in what I have been seeing and doing." He then refused to discuss the subject of nominations, on the ground that it is too early to consider the question of a Presidential candidate for 1908. On the subject of political issues, however, he said:

Before leaving home I tried to distinguish between democracy and what can properly be called socialism. Democracy recognizes competition as legitimate and tries to protect the competitive principle from attack. Socialism sees competition as an evil to be eliminated by public ownership and operation of all means of production and distribution. While this distinction between democracy and socialism should not be overlooked, the Democratic platform must be one of progress and reform and

not merely of opposition to Republican policies or socialistic ideas. In our fight for the absolute elimination of private monopolies and for the regulation of corporations in general, it is necessary that the party shall be free from any suspicion of alliance with the corporate interests that have been dominating American politics. To this end campaign contributions must be limited to those who have the public interest to advance. I trust that public sentiment will require all parties to keep their books open so that hereafter no party will be under private obligations to shield corporate offenders. . . . The beef trust is not different in character and methods from other trusts. The inevitable tendency of a private monopoly is to increase the price of a product and to lower its quality. Why should any one expect anything else from a trust than the lowering of quality when a monopoly is established? Observe, I have used the words private monopoly, not public. In a private monopoly a private interest is set up against the interests of the whole people. Quite a different principle comes into operation when the interest of all is alone in view.

+ +

Mr. Bryan in St. Petersburg.

After a visit to St. Petersburg, Mr. Bryan will go through Sweden and Norway, and arrive in London in time to speak there at the Fourth of July banquet of the American Society. From London he will go to Switzerland, Italy and Spain; and, sailing from Gibraltar on board the steamship Princess Irene, on the 22d of August, he will reach New York about the 29th of that month. He left Berlin for St. Petersburg on the 11th.

+ +

The Russian Douma.

No decisive action has yet been taken either by the Douma or the Czar's ministry (p. 228), but the Douma debates continue and the cable dispatches indicate the possible nearness of another crisis. One dispatch, from what appears to be a trustworthy source, is to the effect that the Czar realizes that the country and the dynasty can be saved only by yielding to the Douma, and he therefore is disposed to consent to a majority ministry responsible to Parliament, to the reform of the Council of the Empire, and even to the principle of forced expropriation of land; but he objects to the granting of amnesty to bomb throwers and to the Douma's domineering tone. The court party and the feudal nobility, however, supported by Emperor William of Germany, so the report reads, firmly oppose the Czar's policy because forced expropriation would leave the nobles penniless, their estates in many cases being mortgaged to the nobility bank for double their value, while administration of the affairs of the country by the majority in Parliament would deprive numerous members of the bureaucracy of their power and emoluments. The Kaiser, it is further said, fears the influence of such an example in Prussia, where the bureaucracy is more honest and capable, but is equally irresponsible to the Reichsrath and hence is reactionary and imperialistic. Moreover, the German barons in the Baltic provinces and the German subjects on Russian estates are affected by the agrarian projects. "Thus the Czar," continues this report, "confronted on the one side by the people and on the other by the court, the Kaiser, the bureaucracy and the nobles, wants to meet the cadet leaders and elaborate with them a programme whereon they would accept office without hurting other class interests."

This information having been given to Mr. Petrunkevitch and Prof. Milyoukov they made the following statement:

We cannot beg for an audience, exposing ourselves to a refusal and to attacks from radicals and socialists, nor can we accept the general aide-de-camp as an intermediary, but we shall consider it a duty and an honor to answer the monarch's call. We are also ready to accept the offices of Count Heiden as an intermediary, though he does not belong to our party. We do not insist that the Czar shall accept our platform, because the Douma, elected as a protest, may perhaps be unable to pass practicable laws; but the demands for a majority ministry, parliamentary control, liberties, and the principle of forced expropriation are absolutely irreducible.

Another dispatch of about the same date describes the issue between Czar and Douma as having been clearly drawn over the question of dismissal of the ministry. According to this report the Constitutional Democrats are being forced by the tide of popular sentiment to assume a more aggressive attitude. Concurrently the possibility of a Centrist party is also reported. It is described by the dispatches as intended to stand midway between the Octoberists and the Constitutional Democrats. The leader is Mr. Yermoloff, formerly minister of agriculture, now a member of the Council of the Empire. He expects the party to have a clear majority in the Council, and to co-operate with Count Heiden, Michael Stakovich and other conservatives in the lower house. That a popular storm is gathering again is also noted by the Associated Press, which intimates that the Czar is preparing to make further concessions.

+ +

Renewal of Russian Uprising.

Evidences of this gathering storm appear in desultory reports of what seems to be widespread disorder. A dispatch of the 7th from St. Petersburg reported that dispatches from several provinces, especially in the northwest, represented the peasant revolt as rapidly spreading. Peasants were said to be burning the property of land owners and resisting the police and soldiery. There was also a systematic refusal to pay rent or taxes or furnish recruits for the army. Specific accounts of strikes in Odessa, Kieff and Moscow were reported. Mutiny among the troops at Odessa was reported on the 9th, and reports of rioting in Warsaw reached St. Petersburg on the 10th. A mutiny among the troops at Poltava, in South Russia, was reported on the 11th to be beyond the control of the few loyal Cossacks and the police. These military uprisings are attributed to the terrorism of the authorities, regarding which an Associated Press dispatch from Poltava reads: "Of eight persons recently condemned to death, six proved an alibi. Their innocence was confirmed by witnesses. The whole inquiry is based on a systematic violation of the law, as torture is the chief agent by which weak minded persons have been brought to falsely accuse innocent persons. The tortures inflicted include floggings, rubbing salt into wounds, and the use of electricity. At the present time thirty-six persons are being tried on different counts." From Moscow there are reports of renewals of revolutionary activity. According to one Associated Press dispatch "it is evident that the leaders are preparing to take advantage of the first opportunity to start an armed uprising. The workmen of the factories and mills are being armed with Mauser