

(p. 486), with the addition noted above, is as follows:

	Total prisoners.	Deaths.	Rate per year per 1000.
June	85,410	777	109
July	93,940	1,412	180
Aug	106,347	1,878	214
Sept	109,418	2,411	284
Oct	111,879	3,156	336
Nov	118,255	2,807	276

The suspicions heretofore noted that the October report was being held back because it probably showed an increase in the number of deaths is fairly confirmed.

JOHN SWINTON.

With the death of John Swinton—conventional journalist but unconventional agitator—there passes away another pioneer of the modern American labor movement.

Swinton stood for no particular phase of labor agitation, but for labor agitation in general. Though he sympathized with trade unionists, he was not wedded to trade unionism. Though he had much in common with socialists, he was not a socialist. Though he sympathized with anarchists, he cared nothing for the philosophy of anarchism. He welcomed Henry George's teachings, but he did not espouse them—he did not even grasp them and probably never tried to. He neither had nor wanted a reform programme. So far as his mind was affirmative at all, it was so only poetically. Robust fighter though he was, as well as poetical in temperament, he fought as an iconoclast, trusting with the confidence of the poet that when the bad has been torn away something good will spring up in its place. But while he pushed every programme aside, he encouraged the makers and promoters of all programmes. Belonging to no school of labor agitation, he gave Godspeed to every school. "Stern old iconoclast" that he was, it appeared to make little difference to him how the existing industrial order might be got rid of, or what order might replace it. Since nothing could be worse, as he viewed the matter, the first thing to do was simply to get rid of it.

A strenuous rebel against the existing order, he was always ready to volunteer in a fight with any other rebel for its overthrow. The same spirit had animated him in that ear-

lier form of the American labor struggle known as the anti-slavery conflict, from which he and the late James Redpath and also Wendell Phillips—so unlike personally but so like in humanitarian impulse and rugged crudeness of method—emerged into the modern labor movement. Slavery was to him the sum of all iniquities, and his ideal of an anti-slavery leader was John Brown, of Ossawatimie. But Swinton's all-round hero was Victor Hugo. This great poet and agitator of France was his model if he had a model. Had his environment been similar to Hugo's, his career would doubtless have resembled the Frenchman's. If, like Hugo, he had no programme as an agitator, like Hugo he had convictions; and his convictions, like Hugo's, were on the humanitarian side. Vague though they were in outline, in character they were intense.

A life-long friend of Charles A. Dana, yet Swinton never swapped the impulses of his earlier manhood for gilded flesh pots, as Dana did; and Dana's loyal friendship for Swinton, which ended only with his own death, testifies to his lingering love for the democratic aspirations to which, in common with Swinton, he had once been devoted.

As a rebel waging guerrilla warfare upon hoary wrongs, Swinton's service was doubtless valuable. If he did no more, at any rate he helped stir up stagnant respectability. Better appreciated twenty years ago than now, he may be still better appreciated in the future. Though his usefulness was limited by the negative character of his crusading, he leaves behind him nevertheless a record for moral courage which is badly needed in these days when records of brute bravery are held up to young men as worthy examples.

NEWS

The verdict in the naval court of inquiry, organized in August last to report upon the conduct of Rear Admiral (then Commodore) Schley in Cuban waters during the Spanish war, has been rendered. Upon several questions at issue the court is divided. Admiral Dewey, the president, having made special findings at variance with

some of the findings of the official verdict.

This court was appointed at the request of Rear Admiral Schley himself (p. 250), his conduct having been, as he asserted in a letter of July 22 to the navy department, scurrilously impugned by the recently issued third volume of Maclay's history of the navy, the first two volumes of which were then used as a text book at the naval academy. As at first announced, the court consisted of Admiral Dewey, president, Rear Admiral Lewis A. Kimberly and Rear Admiral E. K. Benham (p. 265); but Admiral Kimberly having asked to be excused, Rear Admiral Henry L. Howison was appointed in his stead (p. 280); and Admiral Howison being deposed for his bias (372), the final appointment (pp. 375-76) was of Rear Admiral Francis M. Ramsay. The court as organized consisted, therefore, of Dewey, Benham and Ramsay. Its verdict, accompanied by Admiral Dewey's dissenting report, was made public on the 13th.

A comparison of these two documents with the official directions of the department (p. 265), under which the court acted, yields the following result as to eight of the inquiries propounded, namely (1) Schley's conduct in the Santiago campaign; (2) his movements off Cienfuegos; (3) the reasons for his going from there to Santiago; (4) the movements of the flying squadron off Santiago; (5) Schley's disobedience of department orders; (6) the question of coaling the flying squadron; (7) the question of destroying the Spanish cruiser Colon at the entrance to Santiago harbor in May, 1898; (8) and the question of withdrawing the flying squadron from Santiago harbor to a distance at sea at night:

Regarding the second inquiry, Schley did not proceed with the utmost dispatch to Cienfuegos and blockade that port as close as possible, as he should have done. And no efforts were made by him "to communicate with the insurgents to discover whether the Spanish squadron was in the harbor of Cienfuegos, prior to the morning of May 24," although he should have endeavored to do so on May 23 "at the place designated" in the memorandum delivered to him at 8:15 a. m. of that date.

Regarding the first, fourth, fifth and sixth inquiries, that he did not proceed from Cienfuegos to Santiago

with all dispatch, nor dispose his vessels with a view to intercepting the enemy in any attempt to pass him, as he should have done; but that he reduced his speed to allow a disabled vessel of his squadron to remain with it. That upon arriving at a point 22 miles south of Santiago, he changed his course to the westward for Key West; and that upon receiving orders 14 hours later to ascertain whether the Spanish fleet was in Santiago harbor (the department having been informed that it was), and if so to see that it did not leave without a decisive action, he disobeyed the order for alleged lack of coal, although at that time his squadron was abundantly supplied with coal and the sea was in such condition as to enable him to take on coal from his collier. That he made no effort to ascertain whether the Spanish squadron was in the harbor of Santiago, but left the harbor entirely unguarded from May 26 at five p. m. until May 28 at about six p. m.

Regarding the first and seventh inquiries, that he established a blockade of Santiago harbor at six p. m. on the 28th. But that he made no attempt on May 29 and 30 to capture or destroy the Spanish vessels at anchor near the exit from the harbor, as he should have done; nor did he do his utmost to capture or destroy Spanish vessels which he attacked on the 31st.

And regarding the first and eighth inquiries that he did not during the blockade withdraw at night from the entrance to Santiago to a distance at sea. But that his conduct in connection with the events of the Santiago campaign prior to June 1, 1898, was characterized by vacillation, dilatoriness and lack of enterprise, and that his official reports regarding the coal supply and the coaling facilities of the flying squadron were inaccurate and misleading, although his conduct during the battle of July 3 was self-possessed and he encouraged, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously.

On the foregoing points Admiral Dewey dissents in some particulars, though not in all. He reports as his opinion in opposition to the official verdict—

Regarding the second inquiry, that Schley's passage from Key West to Cienfuegos was made "with all possible dispatch, Commodore Schley having in view the importance of arriving off Cienfuegos with as much coal as possible in the ships' bunkers;" and that "the blockade of Cienfuegos was effective." Also that "in permitting the (British) steamer Adula to enter the port of Cienfuegos" Schley "expected to obtain information concerning the Spanish squadron from her when she came out."

Regarding the first and fourth inquiries, that the passage from Cienfue-

gos to a point about 22 miles south of Santiago was made with as much dispatch as was possible while keeping the squadron a unit; that the blockade of Santiago was effective; and that "Commodore Schley was the senior officer of our squadron off Santiago when the Spanish squadron attempted to escape on the morning of July 3, 1898," and being in absolute command "is entitled to the credit due to such commanding officer for the glorious victory which resulted in the total destruction of the Spanish ships."

As to (9) Schley's turning movement during the naval battle of July 3, 1898; and (10) the propriety of his conduct in connection with a controversy with Lieut. Commander Hodgson, navigator of the Brooklyn, the official verdict finds:

Regarding the ninth inquiry, that "by commencing the engagement on July 3 with the port battery and turning the Brooklyn around with port helm, Commodore Schley caused her to lose distance and position with the Spanish vessels—especially with the Viscaya and Colon; and that the turn of the Brooklyn to starboard, made to avoid getting her into dangerous proximity to the Spanish vessels, toward the Texas caused that vessel to stop and back her engines to avoid possible collision.

And regarding the tenth inquiry, that he did injustice to Lieut. Commander Hodgson in publishing only a portion of the correspondence which passed between them.

No dissent is made by Admiral Dewey to these findings, except as dissent may be inferred from his opinion as quoted in the preceding paragraph.

The result of the inquiry may, therefore be fairly summed up as follows:

1. That Schley was dilatory in proceeding to Cienfuegos, is found by Benham and Ramsay and not by Dewey.

2. That he neglected to endeavor to communicate with the insurgents at Cienfuegos until the 24th of May, although advised to do so by orders received early on the 23d, is sustained unanimously.

3. That he did not proceed with dispatch to Santiago is sustained unanimously; except that Dewey credits him with as much dispatch as was consistent with keeping his squadron a unit until he reached a point 22 miles south of Santiago.

4. That he disobeyed department orders in refusing promptly to reverse his home voyage and reconnoitre Santiago harbor, is found unanimously.

5. That he left Santiago harbor unguarded from May 26, when ordered to invest it, until May 28th, is found unanimously; except that Admiral Dewey credits him with making the blockade effective when begun, and this the official verdict does not dispute.

6. That he was derelict with reference to the Spanish vessels on May 29th, 30th and 31st is found unanimously.

7. That in general he was vacillating, dilatory and lacking in enterprise is found by Ramsay and Benham, and inferentially not agreed to by Dewey.

8. That his coal reports were inaccurate and misleading is found unanimously.

9. That his conduct in the naval battle of July 3 was self-possessed and courageous and encouraging to his subordinates is found unanimously.

10. That he made a tactical error in opening the battle and in turning from the enemy toward the Texas during the battle, is found unanimously.

11. That he was unjust to Lieut. Commander Hodgson is found unanimously.

12. That he is entitled to the credit of the victory off Santiago is not found by Ramsay and Benham, but is found by Dewey.

At the request of Admiral Schley, Secretary Long has suspended action on the findings of the court until objections filed on the 18th can be considered. These objections are 31 in number. Those which are directly relevant to the verdict are substantially as follows:

(1) Evidence as to proceeding with dispatch to Cienfuegos was restricted by the court, and the only evidence allowed was contrary to the finding; (2) no place for communicating with the insurgents was designated in the memorandum received May 23; (3) the aforesaid memorandum was sent with reference to an entirely different purpose; (4) a close blockade of Cienfuegos was proved to have been maintained; (5) it was positively proved that the Adula was allowed to enter upon promise to come out within 24 hours with information as to presence of Spanish fleet; (6) it was proved that Schley's squadron was ordered to remain off Cienfuegos, whether Spanish fleet was there or not; (11, 14 and 15) proof as to coaling possibilities overwhelmingly contradicts the verdict; (12) verdict ignores the overwhelming proof that Capt. Sigsbee reported to Schley that the Spanish fleet was not in Santiago harbor; (16 and 18) in condemning Schley with reference to his attacks on Spanish vessels in Santiago harbor on May 29, 30 and 31, the verdict ignores the proven fact that he was only reconnoitering and that his

orders forbade an attack which might expose him dangerously to land batteries; (17) the verdict disregards the inquiry as to the character of the Santiago blockade; (19) verdict does not state whether the loop movement at the battle was from personal cowardice or wise naval discretion; (20) the verdict as to error of opening the battle with the port battery, ignores the proven fact that nothing else could be done without turning from the enemy, and in holding that it caused the Brooklyn to lose distance and position it disregards all the evidence in behalf of Schley; (21) the verdict does not show whether the alleged danger to the Texas of collision with the Brooklyn in the loop movement was real or imaginary, and the overwhelming testimony shows that there was no actual danger; (24) the general finding of vacillation, etc., could have been arrived at only by ignoring all the testimony on both sides which was favorable to Schley; (26) the verdict does not determine, as the first inquiry required, who was in command at the battle; (29) "the majority of the court, in the opinion and report of facts rendered, have selected the testimony of a few hostile witnesses, and upon that testimony have based the said opinion and report of facts, discarding all the other testimony in the case, without making the slightest reference to it."

The most important proceeding of the week in the lower house of congress is its action with reference to a tariff system for the Philippine islands. This subject was mentioned last week (p. 568), a measure having then been adopted by the Republican majority of the committee of ways and means. The Democratic minority of the committee subsequently came in with a minority report denouncing the bill as having been prepared by the secretary of war and as another step in the policy of imperial colonialism. The debate in committee of the whole began on the 17th and continued until the 18th, when the committee rose, pursuant to the special rule adopted for the occasion, and reported the bill to the house with a recommendation that it pass. By the same special rule the previous question was considered as having been moved and adopted, and the bill was forthwith passed without debate or amendment by the vote of 163 to 128. Two Republicans — Littlefield of Maine and McCall of Massachusetts — voted with the Democrats against the bill; and three Democrats voted for it with the Republicans, namely, Davey, Broussard and Robinson of Louisiana.

Otherwise the vote was divided by party lines.

In the senate on the day preceding the beginning of the Philippine debate in the lower house, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty (p. 567) was acted upon and ratified by the vote of 72 to 6.

Outside of congress a prominent item of news relates to a movement from which its promoters expect an end to the "conflict between labor and capital." The movement was started by the National Civic Federation, of which Ralph M. Easley is secretary. This body called a conference for consultation for the purpose of devising means to solve the labor problem as between organized laborers and their employers. The conference met at New York on the 17th, and after an interchange of opinions appointed a court or board of arbitration, to be composed of three groups representative respectively of "capital," "labor" and the "public." It is to be a permanent board or court, and to have authority by mutual consent to settle labor disputes of national importance. The names of the persons selected as the first members of this board are as follows:

To Represent Capital.—Marcus A. Hanna, United States senator; Charles M. Schwab, president of the United States Steel corporation; S. R. Calloway, president of the American Locomotive company; Charles A. Moore, president of the American Tool company; John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Standard Oil company; H. H. Vreeland, president of the Metropolitan street railway; Lewis Nixon, owner of the Crescent shipyard, Elizabethport, N. J.; James A. Chambers, president of the American Glass company, Pittsburg; William H. Pfahler, president of the National Stove Manufacturers' association, Philadelphia; Julius Kruttschnitt, assistant to the president of the Southern Pacific railroad; E. P. Ripley, president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe railroad, and Marcus M. Marks, president of the National Association of Clothing Manufacturers.

To Represent Labor.—Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; John Mitchell, president of the United Mine Workers of America; Frank P. Sargent, grand master of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen; Theodore P. Shaffer, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers; James J. Duncan, first vice president of the American Federation of Labor; Daniel J. Keefe, president of the International Associa-

tion of Longshoremen; Martin Fox, president of the Iron Molders of America; James E. Lynch, president of the International Typographical union; E. E. Clark, grand conductor of the Association of Railway Conductors; Henry White, secretary of the Garment Workers of America; Walter MacArthur, editor of the Coast Seamen's Journal of San Francisco, and James O'Connell, president of the International Association of Machinists.

To Represent the Public.—Grover Cleveland, former president of the United States; Cornelius N. Bliss, former secretary of the interior; Charles Francis Adams, president of the Union Pacific railroad; Bishop Henry C. Potter, of New York; Archbishop John Ireland, of St. Paul; Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard university; Franklin MacVeagh, wholesale grocer, of Chicago; James H. Eckels, bank president, Chicago; John J. McCook, lawyer; John G. Milburn, lawyer, of Buffalo; Charles J. Bonaparte, of Baltimore, and Oscar Straus, merchant and former minister to Turkey. Secretary of the commission, Ralph M. Easley, of the National Civic Federation.

At a secret meeting of this board on the 18th Senator Hanna was chosen chairman, and a plan of organization for the committee was formulated. The board is to be known as "The Industrial Department of the National Civic Federation," and is in general to act as a pacificator in labor conflicts, but is not to consider abstract industrial problems.

More promising of permanent usefulness, however, is the success of an experiment which demonstrates the possibility of wireless telegraphy across the ocean. The experiment was made by Marconi, the inventor of wireless telegraphy. Raising a kite and standing by an instrument on Signal Hill, near St. Johns, Newfoundland, on the 11th, Marconi received what he asserts to be a telegraphic signal agreed upon between himself and his assistants in England, and made at Poldhu, Cornwall, England, 1,800 miles away. It was repeated on the 12th. Each day the signals were received only when the kite was at a great height. Subsequent experiments in Newfoundland have been prevented by legal proceedings. The Anglo-American Telegraph company has notified Marconi that it possesses the exclusive monopoly of the telegraph business in Newfoundland, and that he must cease his experiments and remove his appa-