

mittees are expected to do. There was no necessity for reconcentrado camps at all (and it is admitted that our army established them), except to drive the inhabitants into them and devastate the country so that the enemy would have no place to draw supplies from. Is it not probable, then, that the people were driven in on pain of death and their homes destroyed? At any rate the question is whether the American reconcentrado policy has been what our correspondent describes or not. If it has not been, why not open the doors to testimony? Why suppress the facts? If it has been, why prate about "the honor of the army?" Why not either excuse the barbarity bluntly, as our correspondent does, or frankly admit, what all authorities on civilized warfare teach, that it is atrocious?

Meantime let us not be diverted from the main issue, which is colonialism, imperialism, un-Americanism, and not specific questions of cruelty. Cruelty is a nominal concomitant of colonialism. If the latter is just and wise and beneficent, the former must be patiently endured. Though it is right to expose the incidental cruelties for the purpose of illustrating the wickedness of the colonial policy, it is after all not particular outrages but the general policy that is at issue. The Springfield, O., Democrat, although it rather unjustly criticizes the Democratic senators for too much discussion of individual outrages and failing to center their fire upon the colonial question—unjustly because much attention was given to colonialism in those speeches—is nevertheless right in its main contention when it crisply says of the Philippine civil government bill:

It will rest with the saner Democratic press and speakers during the campaign of the Summer and Fall to enlighten the people upon the iniquities of this colonial scheme. The measure will have become operative meanwhile, but that will be no reason why its unconstitutional and un-American character should not be made known to the great masses of our patriotic people. The encroach-

ments of imperial power upon popular prerogatives throughout history have almost always begun in far-off provinces and, insidiously and unseen, crept like slow poison to the center of national vitality. The Democracy is the only herald left in the field to warn the people and arouse them to resist this liberty engulfing policy.

Mr. Mitchell's address to the public in behalf of the striking anthracite miners is an important document in more ways than one. It is important in the first place as a frank presentation of the case for the striking miners, and in the second for its exposure in detail of the cold-blooded policy of the coal trust. But one of its most important features is the proof it offers of the fact that our much vaunted prosperity, which Republican leaders have exploited for obvious party purposes and certain labor leaders have confirmed for purposes not so obvious, is a delusion.

It is shown by Mr. Mitchell that the average earnings of the anthracite miners is less than \$300 a year; and that while a 10 per cent. increase was granted to save the election in 1900, most of that was afterwards extorted by the trust as the price of abolishing an old powder grievance, and the remainder and more has been swept away by higher living expenses. The "purchasing power of a miner's earnings is less now," says Mr. Mitchell, "than before the strike of 1900," which Mr. Hanna settled so snugly on the eve of the presidential election. Nor is that all. Although wages have been raised only nominally, and their purchasing power has diminished, so that the miners are getting less than in 1890, their productive power has increased. The daily product per employee in 1890 was only 2.16 tons, whereas in 1901 it was 2.36 tons. And as to value of product the showing is similar. For the eleven years preceding 1901 the average selling value of coal loaded on the cars at the mines was \$1.48 per ton; whereas in 1901 the average price was \$1.87. That makes an increase of 39 cents in the value of the

product, while the operators themselves claim an increase in cost of production of only 13 cents, leaving a net gain for the trust of 26 cents. Here, then, is a sample of our boasted "prosperity." The trusts get an increase in product and values, while the workmen produce more but get less. This is the kind of prosperity which Senator Hanna regards as so good that it should be "let alone."

Mark Bangs, the Chicago lawyer who died this week at the advanced age of nearly 81 years, deserves to be remembered for more than his accidental fame as one of the oldest citizens, or his well earned reputation as a lawyer. He was a democrat—one of those democrats who retained their democracy through all the shifting positions of political parties, from his youth to the very latest years of his life. It was as a democrat that he became one of the founders of the Republican party, then the only party of real democracy; and as a democrat that he saw with sorrow this party of his young manhood turn from its ideals and become to the generation of to-day what the degenerate Democratic party of Pierce and Buchanan was to the generation of more than half a century ago. As Mark Bangs had been an anti-slavery man, so he continued. His abolition was not limited by the social crime of another section of the country than his own. It was a living and universal principle, which made him welcome the leadership of Henry George as that of a later prophet in a newer abolition for the destruction of a more subtle slavery.

THE LIMITATIONS OF EXPERTS.

It is a remarkable and very significant fact that experts are seldom pioneers. When Sir Isaac Newton has been named, the list of men who have ranked high as experts in any calling, yet who have led in the development of its great primary truths, is almost exhausted.

To be sure there are many who come to rank high after the truths they disclose have been generally ac-

cepted. Edison might be named as one. He is now recognized as a mechanical and electrical expert, but his reputation came after his extraordinary inventions had been proved. He was not a recognized expert making radical inventions, but a radical inventor forcing recognition as an expert. The same thing in the military field is true of Napoleon, and in the naval service of Nelson. Neither was a recognized expert until he had put the experts of his time to rout.

The usefulness of experts seems to be closely limited to the field of the old and conventional. As a rule they are incapable as to the new and radical in every department of human progress.

In the military department, for instance, to which we have already referred, Napoleon, the military upstart, revolutionized tactics to the amusement at first but to the discomfiture, until they had learned from him, of the great military experts of Europe. Nelson, who saved the naval battle of St. Vincent, and laid the foundations of his fame as a naval expert, by what was derisively called his "patent bridge"—whereby he prevented the two wings of the enemy from coming together—was denied even so much as honorable mention in the dispatches by the expert admiral in command, who mistakenly regarded Nelson's "patent bridge" as folly.

Coming down to later times and our own country, but still with reference to the military art, examples are numerous. John Brisben Walker has collected the data regarding several which he published a few years ago in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*. From this data it appears that there were excellent breech loading rifles as early as the period of the Mexican war, but the weapon was so discouraged by the experts that it did not come into army use to any extent until the civil war. The ironclad principle was exemplified by Stevens, an engineering but not a military expert, at great private expense; but the expert naval officers appointed to report upon his work, were almost contemptuous about it. Ericsson's "Monitor" (Ericsson was also an engineering but not a military expert) was still unaccepted by the government when the operations of the "Merrimac" threw the country into a panic and the "Monitor" was permitted by the experts, as a desperate chance, to fight her. The kind of powder

which makes possible the triumphs of modern ordnance, was long denied recognition by the military experts. And finally the experts rejected the submarine boat, so that it could not be used in the Spanish-American war, although its feasibility had been demonstrated five or six years before.

Mr. Walker saw no general lesson in the military data he had collected. To him it appeared only that "long training in this art seems to have the effect of bringing the average ordnance officer to the mental attitude of regarding anything he does not know as not worth knowing." But Mr. Walker would have stated the case better had he said that long training in the accepted canons of any art, seems to have the effect of bringing the average man to the mental attitude of regarding anything that he has not been taught as not worth knowing.

The principle does not apply alone to ordnance officers; its application is universal. Everybody remembers how a copy of the elaborate demonstration of the navigation expert of London that no steamship could cross the ocean, was brought from London to New York in the hold of the first steamship that came over the Atlantic. It is also common knowledge that Morse, the inventor of the electric telegraph was not an expert scientist but a portrait painter, and that the scientific experts ridiculed him and his invention. Possibly it may not be so generally known that Rowland Hill secured cheap postage for England against the protests of the expert postmaster general, who declared it to be impossible financially; nor that Fulton with his steamboat was hindered more by the obstructive wisdom of the scientists than by the ignorant incredulity of the populace.

Passing into the other but less materialistic spheres of human progress, we find the same general principle at work. Everywhere the expert seems so tied to old discoveries, and confined to old paths, that he has no energy or inclination for the new. It was not Edward Everett, the most expert orator of his time and the orator of the day at Gettysburg, who made the oration that has lived; but Abraham Lincoln, the prairie lawyer, who was at Gettysburg officially as President and "spoke a few words." It is not expert college professors and statesmen who see primary truths in economics when they unfold, and write living books about them, but men of the people like Henry George,

at whom expert college professors sneer. It is not the expert theologians, with dead or dying creeds in the head, but "infidels," with the love of man and God in the heart, who have always made for progress in religion. It is not expert "patriots" like George III., but bold "traitors" like George Washington, that lead along new paths of patriotism. It is not expert publicists like Hobbes or Hamilton, but democrats like Jefferson, to whom the primary truths of government are visible.

Yet there is a powerful impulse at the present time to turn over everything to experts. Some socialists would put even government into the hands of experts. Other socialists abhor this, but what they themselves advocate would lead on to it just the same. And then there are others, who think they are not socialists, if they ever think at all, to whom the idea of having the government managed by experts is very attractive.

This idea is really the core of that philosophy of government which scouts the democratic principle of "government of the people, for the people and by the people." Whoever denies the principle that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," will discover, if he proves his philosophy, that he is advocating government by experts. There is no other alternative. Government must either be by the governed, democratic in essence, or it must be by experts or those claiming to be experts in government, which is monarchical in essence.

For if the people cannot govern themselves, who can govern them, if anybody? Evidently persons who know more about governing than the people do, not only its history but its possibilities, and how to make it not strong alone but good as well; and if there are such persons they are experts in government. This drives the adversaries of popular government to the alternative of government by experts. And that is the kind of government that kings administer. The king is the expert in government par excellence.

But here again we find an illustration of the inability of the expert to follow new paths. To paraphrase Mr. Walker's comment upon ordnance officers, quoted above, "long training in this art seems to have the effect of bringing the average expert in government to the mental attitude of regarding anything that he does not

know as not worth knowing." So long as beaten paths are patiently accepted the government expert does well enough. But when new paths are to be struck out, a different order of mind is needed. Knowledge of the dead or dying past is then much less important than that truly religious faith which consists not in superstitious credulity as to what is improbable, but in absolute confidence in the practicability of what is right.

The expert really has no advantage over the non-expert, other faculties being the same, than his special knowledge of certain facts already established or supposed to be. And his minute and precise knowledge of these facts is not infrequently acquired at the expense of deadening his sensibilities to the larger and commoner facts. He cannot decide upon what is wanted any better than the next man, and maybe not so well; but the purpose being decided upon, he may execute it better if he devotes his special knowledge and skill to furthering instead of obstructing the purpose.

The trouble with the expert, however, is that he ties his common sense to the dead body of his science as it has been taught. Consequently though he may progress along old lines, he is unfitted for pioneering. This is the reason that upstart Napoleons and Nelsons upset military experts, that artists instead of scientists make electricity carry messages, that printers confound economic professors in their speciality, that "infidels" leave theologians behind in religion, that "traitors" become the greatest patriots, and that inspired democrats map out popular governments which learned publicists condemn but of which experience approves.

Because that is so the function of the expert is more properly one of subordinate execution than of superior leadership. In matters of government, at any rate, while experts may be necessary to execute commands, the commands must come from the people or the government will deteriorate. As Buckle says, "No country can long remain either prosperous or safe, in which the people are not gradually extending their power, enlarging their privileges, and, so to say, incorporating themselves with the functions of the state."

What government of the people by

the people means, what is meant by the doctrine that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed is not that the people must execute the powers; but that the common sense of the people is a better monitor than experts as to what government should or should not do, and as to the general direction in which it should advance. Knowledge and skill are requisite for doing things; but common sense is the prerequisite. It is the sense which determines upon what shall be done.

In public affairs this common sense is monopolized by no expert, by no king, by no oligarchy of learning; it is the attribute of the people as a whole. They cannot afford to divest themselves of it. They cannot afford to place in the hands of experts the directing power which belongs primarily to themselves. Though experts are repositories of accumulated knowledge, the future has been hidden from them to be revealed unto babes in knowledge and skill—unto the common people.

Experts have their uses and their limitations. When special facts and peculiar skill are needed, the expert should be in demand; but when it is common sense, the expert is no better equipped than the untutored man, and in some respects not so well.

The absurdity of placing experts in supreme authority is illustrated by this story of a physician. In bandaging the leg of an Irishman, who had learned to respect the superior knowledge and confide in the comprehensive authority of experts, the physician noticed that one of the pins went in with great difficulty. Upon removing the bandage afterward the difficulty was explained, for the pin had gone through the skin and into the flesh. "Why, Pat," said the physician, "didn't you know that that pin was sticking into you?" "To be sure I did," said Pat, "but I thought you knew your business, so I held me tongue."

In criminal law courts, we employ legal experts to expound the law and summon scientific experts to reveal the facts of their particular trades and offer their opinions; but for a decision upon the law and the facts we submit to the common sense of a jury of ordinary men. In this custom there is a suggestion which may be considered to advantage in connection especially with all the larger questions of government. Even as to experts in general, the old adage

about fire would be a good one to apply. They make good servants, but bad masters.

NEWS

The British coronation festivities (vol. iii., pp. 657, 663, 664, 680, 695, and vol. iv., pp. 25, 218, 554, 641, 651, 659) were suddenly suspended on the 24th, under circumstances which admit of little room to hope for their renewal. The suspension was caused by the probably fatal illness of the king himself.

Rumors that the king was seriously ill gained currency on the 14th, when one of the royal physicians was summoned from London to Aldershot to attend him, and in consequence he canceled all his engagements for the 15th. The Court Circular which appeared in the evening of the 15th announced that he was unable to leave his room and attributed his indisposition to an attack of lumbago. Two days later these rumors of illness were superseded by hysterical reports of the discovery by the Scotland Yard police of a plot to assassinate the king, which was given as the explanation of his withdrawal from public activities. The authorities at Scotland Yard refused either to deny or confirm these reports. He drove out on the 17th in a closed carriage and official reports of the 21st were designed to be reassuring. But thousands of pounds were then wagered that the coronation would never take place, the betting at Lloyds in London on that day being £3 to £100 that the king would not live till coronation day. Not until the 24th was any authentic news of the king's condition given out. It was then announced officially that the coronation had been postponed indefinitely because the king was suffering from perityphlitis and was undergoing a surgical operation.

His condition had been so satisfactory on the 21st that it was believed he would be able to go through the coronation ceremonies; but on the 23d in the evening he had grown so much worse that the surgical operation became necessary. Perityphlitis, the king's disease, is described by Dr. John B. Murphy, of Chicago, one of the great surgeons of the United States, as the ancient name for appendicitis, but now the term applied