

deceived by the traditions of Lincoln republicanism, may make it solid for the republicans. But there are plenty of genuine democrats in the south, and this change will make their democracy more than a tradition, a name and a label, and their influence, it is to be hoped, something formidable, to be reckoned with and worthy of being counted on.

In a dispatch to the Chicago Record of the 11th, Mr. L. G. Powers, the chief statistician of the agricultural division of the census bureau, made an interesting calculation regarding the distribution of farming classes—owners, tenants and hands. Following is the Record's summary of his calculations:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1890—Number of farms in United States..... | 4,564,691 |
| 1900 — Number of farms in United States..... | 5,700,000 |
| Percentage of farms operated by tenants: | |
| | Per cent. |
| 1880—North Atlantic states.... | 16.0 |
| 1890—North Atlantic states.... | 18.4 |
| 1900—North Atlantic states.... | 20.0 |
| 1880—South Atlantic states.... | 36.1 |
| 1890—South Atlantic states.... | 38.5 |
| 1900—South Atlantic states.... | 45.0 |
| 1880—North central states.... | 20.5 |
| 1890—North central states.... | 23.4 |
| 1900—North central states.... | 26.0 |
| 1880—South central states.... | 36.2 |
| 1890—South central states.... | 38.4 |
| 1900—South central states.... | 45.0 |
| 1880—Western states..... | 14.0 |
| 1890—Western states..... | 12.1 |
| 1900—Western states..... | 13 to 20 |

Referring to the figures from which this summary is made, Mr. Powers reaches the conclusion that—

of the 940,000 to 1,140,000 farms that were added in the last ten years, substantially one-half will be tenant operated. This will be an increase of from 40 to 45 per cent., or nearly twice the increase per cent. of the population of the nation, four times that of the purely agricultural population and twice that of the farms operated by their owners.

But this unprecedented increase, actual and relative, of tenant-operated farms, results, he explains, not from a degradation of owning farmers to tenantry, but from an "uplifting" of farm hands to the grade of tenants.

In support of that happy explana-

tion of a depressing exhibit, Mr. Powers deduces from the same data an indication that the number of farms operated by their owners has increased in greater degree than the increase of the agricultural population. Whereas the increase of farms operated by tenants is from 40 to 45 per cent., the increase of those operated by their owners is not less than from 15 to 18 per cent., and the increase of the agricultural population is not far from ten per cent.

Mr. Powers does not publish sufficient data to make a discussion of his conclusions profitable. When the census reports bearing upon the subject appear officially, his estimates will afford the basis for a useful inquiry. Meanwhile, it will not be out of place to express surprise at the possibility of a statistical showing so utterly at variance with the results of observation—namely, that the farm hand class is rushing on pell-mell through tenantry to proprietorship, and that along with an enormous increase of farm tenants there is an increase half as great of farm owners. It is not improbable, however, that a more cautious examination into the census returns, when completed, may suggest a state of affairs more in harmony with the manifest facts. When we come to consider farm owners who are mortgaged up to their eyes, and are therefore practically tenants or worse, the farm owning class may not appear to be growing so merrily, even by the statistical process. If those whose farms are mere patches from which they eke out their wages as hired men, and those whose farms are holdings far removed from market facilities, could be distinguished, this promising army of landed proprietors would doubtless shrink still further. And if the census data shall exhibit with reasonable clearness the condition of those wage workers who have experienced the "uplifting" process into tenantry, we shall probably have less reason than Mr. Powers supposes for rejoicing over the

headway farm hands have been making in the world during the decade.

Even upon the data that Mr. Powers puts forth, there is more than a possibility that he is mistaken in his conclusion that farm hands are being "uplifted" into tenantry. If the agricultural population were the only population, his reasoning would have the force of a mathematical demonstration. More owning farmers, more tenant farmers, and a smaller agricultural population certainly would argue that the owning and tenant classes are recruited from the farm hand class. But the agricultural population is not the whole population. There is the miscellaneous population to draw from. It may not be, of course, and yet it may be—and that is enough to discredit Mr. Powers's reasoning—that the owning farm class and the tenant farm class are recruited from outside, from other industrial classes and other countries, and that the aggregate of agricultural population has been reduced not by an "uplift" of the farm hand class, but by the forcing of agricultural classes into other and perhaps poorer occupations. The notorious reduction which agricultural machinery has made in the number of hands required for farming would give added force to this inference.

Our attention has been called to an entertaining speech delivered at the recent banquet in New York of the American Protective Tariff league, by Charles A. Moore, president of the league. Mr. Moore is a member of a firm of machinery dealers in New York, who, with his firm, owns stock in several other manufacturing enterprises. To appreciate his speech it must be remembered that the prime object of the league of which he is president is to prevent the importation of goods from abroad. At the very banquet at which he spoke, foreign products were religiously excluded. Yet all unmindful of the absurd inconsistency of his position, Mr. Moore urged the establishment of a system of international