

method of answering inquiries—to the arguments now and then heard in defense of the proposition that slave-owners ought to have been compensated for their slaves, we commend the following brief letter from M. J. Foyer to the Cleveland Chronicle:

You say, in comparing the right of property in land with the right of property in slaves, "it would have been just and proper to make compensation for the capital destroyed by abolition" of slavery. In this connection I should like to inquire if you would be in favor of arresting a runaway slave on the charge of grand larceny on the theory that in running away from his "master" without first compensating him for the property involved he was guilty of robbery?

A PARALLEL IN BARBARISM.

Hardly a year has gone by since innocent Republicans were protesting against having the McKinley colonial policy described as a policy of imperialism. But events are now taking place which give to those protests an emphatic negative. If the American government we are developing in the Philippines is not the government of an empire, then it is a nondescript. It is not a republican government. It is not a military government. It is not free enough for a limited monarchy. It is the most absolute government, professing civilization, on the face of the earth. It is more absolute than the Russian government. For autocratic authority it is without a parallel outside the British military lines in South Africa.

It has forced the people of the island of Samar to leave their homes and to congregate in the towns. This is the infamous "reconcentrado" device of Gen. Weyler in Cuba. Partly because he drove the Cubans into the towns, we went to war with Spain, President McKinley declaring that this "reconcentrado" was—

not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave.

Yet, in less than four years after those words were written, the McKinley colonial policy has led us on to doing in the Philippines what President McKinley so vigorously condemned Spain for doing in Cuba.

Nor is that the worst. The later dispatches from Manila tell of a

policy of oppression in the Philippines which goes beyond the drastic laws of the Spanish, when they, as our predecessors, ruled with imperial sway over those unhappy islands. This extreme and unprecedented policy consists in making treason punishable with death, and in defining it with such grim absurdity that the people who are fighting for the liberation of their own country may be executed as traitors by us who confront them as foreign invaders.

Treason! Is it treason? Treason against what? Not against the United States, for under our constitution only citizens can be traitors. These people are not citizens. It cannot be treason against the United States. What then? There is no answer that meets the requirements of public law. They are to be shot as traitors merely because they are in arms against the American army of invasion. It is a war measure. This may possibly be an effective way of carrying on a war of conquest, but it is new to modern warfare, strange to the principles of public law, and abhorrent to all our own traditions. Even in our efforts to subdue the American Indians, barbarous as our methods often were, we never went the length of executing hostile Indians as traitors.

For precedents for this new method of conquering our "pacified" Philippine subjects, we are confined to Great Britain in her war in South Africa. We have left even the Spaniard behind. But with Great Britain we swap precedents. Mr. Chamberlain refers for precedents for his South African outrages to our exploits in the Philippines; and we in turn may cite in support of our Philippine aggressions the exploits of Kitchener in South Africa. Between us we may yet build up a body of precedents for the imperial conquerors of weaker peoples that would make the rough and ready codes of the barbarous conquerors of ancient times seem by comparison like advanced lessons in moral philosophy.

If it were not for their own reverence to barbarism in the Philippines, the American people could contemplate only with horror the kind of warfare which the British are carry-

ing on in South Africa. As with us in the Philippines, their government reaches no farther than their rifles can carry—hardly so far, if recent events are any indication. Yet they, like us, have presumed to declare themselves conquerors. They are there, and they intend to stay, as the American vice-governor of the Philippines says of us with reference to that archipelago. They, too, have adopted the Weyler invention of "reconcentrado." They, too, are killing for treason. But as yet they are a little behind us in that respect. They do not make traitors of the enemy, as we propose to do, but confine their treason killing to inhabitants of Cape Colony. With our Philippine precedent to go by, however, the British also may adopt the handy expedient of proclaiming the enemy as traitors.

And why are the British maintaining this war of extermination in South Africa at enormous cost to themselves? Is it to settle a dispute impossible of settlement otherwise? Not at all. The Boers long ago offered to close the war by arbitration. Indeed, they offered arbitration before the war began. They have even offered to close it upon Great Britain's own terms, provided only that the independence of the two republics be continued. But the British ministry has declined every offer. They demand unconditional surrender. It is for that and that alone, for conquest and nothing else, that they now carry on this terribly disastrous war.

Disastrous is a mild term to apply to a mode of warfare such as that which the British have in their desperation adopted to conquer the Boers. In the matter of "reconcentrado" alone, the facts are appalling. The figures as reported by the British press for the period beginning with June and ending with September are as follows:

	Total number in camps.	Deaths.	Rate per year per 1,000
June	85,410	777	109
July	93,940	1,412	150
August	106,347	1,878	214
September	109,418	2,411	264

It will be observed not only that the number of deaths has increased month by month, but that the rate per thousand per annum has likewise increased. The rate for September,

264, is more than ten times a normal death rate. It is higher than the rate in the midst of a plague. What may be the death rate we have imposed upon our Philippine subjects may never be known. For we have gone beyond the British in this species of inhumanity. Not only do we drive the noncombatant population into towns, as the British do, but we have blockaded the island of Leyte, preventing the importation even of food, and the inhabitants are upon the verge of starvation. We are actually starving women and children because their husbands and fathers refuse to surrender their guns to our invading troops.

At first the British spoke of their "reconcentrado" device as philanthropic. They said it was for the purpose of protecting the Boer women, children and noncombatants from the ravages of war. But now Lord Milner, in a letter through his private secretary, published in the London Leader of October 7, admits that this inhuman device was—

adopted purely on military grounds, as a means for hastening the end of the war, which is, after all, the first interest of the refugees themselves.

The military purpose served by the "reconcentrado" is to make the Boers realize that unless they stop fighting their families will be put into plague camps to die off at an enormous rate! It is the same motive that we have in starving the women and children of Leyte. If war is hell, what English word remains to describe this kind of war?

NEWS

Although this year is in most of the states what the politicians call an "off year" in politics, only a few general elections being held and they as a rule being unimportant, yet one of these general elections, that of Ohio, and one of the municipal elections, the Shepard-Low contest in New York, were of widespread interest and not without general importance.

The New York election has attracted most attention outside. As is well known, the Tammany Hall organization, which controls the Democratic

party in New York city, has long been regarded as disgracefully corrupt. To drive it out of power, a Citizens' Union was recently organized, upon a non-partisan basis, and this Union entered into a fusion with the Republican party of the city. The fusion was perfected through the nomination of a local ticket by the Citizens' Union, and its indorsement by the Republican convention. Before that action, however, conferences between the Citizens' Union and Republican leaders had resulted in an agreement as to the ticket to be so nominated and indorsed. In the course of these negotiations the Republican leaders proposed as candidates for mayor Democrats whom the Citizens' Union could not nominate, at the same time advising the Citizens' Union that the Republican convention would refuse to indorse any Democrat who had supported Bryan for president. Out of this situation came the nomination of Seth Low, then president of Columbia university. Mr. Low is a Republican. He was once mayor of Brooklyn, and had been defeated for mayor of New York in 1897, when an independent candidate with the Tammany candidate, a Republican candidate and Henry George in the field against him. Other candidates on the fusion ticket were from both parties, the majority being Democrats. One of the Democrats was William Travers Jerome, the fusion candidate for district attorney of New York county. After the fusion nominations, Tammany Hall, as the regular Democratic organization, put forth a ticket with Edward M. Shepard as the candidate for mayor. Mr. Shepard had made a reputation as a vigorous opponent of Tammany methods in politics, and had supported Low in 1897. In accepting the Tammany nomination he formally declared that he retracted nothing. He had opposed Bryan in 1896 but supported him prominently and actively in 1900, and is on the whole as radical a democrat as would be available for high office in a city which is so largely affected in its politics by conservative interests as is New York. The remainder of the Tammany ticket was with few exceptions made up of typical Tammany candidates. After a short but exciting campaign, in which the ordinary political alignments broke bewilderingly, the election came off on the 5th. Low received 296,206 votes and Shepard 265,403, a plurality of 30,803 for Low. The remainder of Low's ticket

in New York county was elected, Jerome getting a plurality of 17,132.

Ohio comes next to New York city in point of general interest in the elections. In that state the principal office to be filled was the governorship. Gov. George K. Nash was the Republican candidate for reelection. His Democratic opponent was James Kilbourne. Both are residents of Columbus, Franklin county. The Republican campaign had been made under the leadership of Senator Hanna, upon the issue of confirming the policies of the late President McKinley and "letting well enough alone;" and in the election of legislative candidates a United States senatorship was involved, the term of Senator Foraker being about to expire. At the election on the 5th Gov. Nash was re-elected by a plurality of 68,145 with one county yet to hear from. This unexpectedly high plurality is about 19,000 higher than his plurality two years ago, and about the same as McKinley's of last year, which is attributed to defections of Bryan men from Kilbourne in resentment for what was widely advertised as a slur cast upon Bryan by the Democratic state convention. In Franklin county, where both candidates live, Mr. Kilbourne's plurality is 2,500, an increase of 800 over the Democratic plurality in 1899. But in Hamilton, the Cincinnati county, where John R. McLean resides, the Democratic plurality of 1,000 two years ago for McLean, has disappeared and Nash carries the county by about 4,000. The legislative delegation from that county is also all Republican, whereas two years ago but two Republicans were elected. Not only is Gov. Nash re-elected by an increased plurality, but the Republicans have carried the legislature by a large majority. About the only encouragement for Democrats which the Ohio election has to offer, besides the gratifying vote for Kilbourne in his own county, comes from Cleveland.

Cuyahoga is the Cleveland county. The situation there has been unique since Tom L. Johnson's election as mayor, on the Democratic ticket, by 6,000 plurality, where the usual majority is well up in the thousands the other way. Mayor Johnson confined the campaign to questions of equitable taxation; and the Democratic candidates for the legislature were pledged to devote themselves to this reform. The