

report of the case of the Rev. E. G. Tewksbury, an American missionary. According to the press dispatches from Washington, Gen. Chaffee appends to his report original correspondence, which, together with the report itself, confirmed by the correspondence, exhibits the following state of facts: Mr. Tewksbury asked for a detachment of American troops to accompany him upon an expedition to exact money and lands from Chinese for damages sustained by native Christian converts during the Boxer revolt. The American minister, Mr. Conger, approved this request, and Gen. Chaffee complied with it, though in doing so he expressed his doubt of "the propriety of Mr. Tewksbury's entering upon the settlement of any claim for damages, whether of Chinese Christians or any other persons." A guard was accordingly furnished Mr. Tewksbury, under the command of Lieut. Guiney. So equipped this militant missionary visited four towns where mission property and property of native Christians had been destroyed, messages having been first forwarded demanding—

a money indemnity for the property of the native Christians destroyed; land for a cemetery; church location; and six acres of land to support the minister.

Lieut. Guiney's report of the expedition should make the blood of American Christians tingle with shame. He writes:

The whereabouts of most of the Christians to whom this property belonged is unknown. Mr. Tewksbury says the money is to be used to support refugees. It was reported to me that at Fu Hao two or three times the amount asked for was collected. The difference was probably kept by the chief men of the village, who had charge of the collection. This money was collected by the men who did the damage, from inhabitants who are now and always have been peaceful. Large amounts were sent into Tung Chow, and a considerable sum was collected in Tung Chow itself. I know of this indirectly, and Mr. Tewksbury promised to give a complete account of it to the American minister in Peking. I requested Mr. Tewksbury to give me the name of every person making a claim for damages, amount of damage claimed and character of settlement made. He

replied that he did not know the men whose property was destroyed nor their whereabouts, but he thought he could get the names from some of the native members of his church who were assisting him in collecting money.

In this high handed, lawless, immoral and eminently un-Christian manner Mr. Tewksbury collected as indemnity for alleged losses (most of which he knew nothing about), through Chinese officials who had caused the losses and from Chinamen who had not, the sum of nearly \$12,000 in money. In addition he acquired deeds to 96 acres of land for missionary purposes. Mark Twain's excoriation of the looting missionaries makes more interesting reading than Chaffee's report, but it is no whit more damning.

It would be altogether unfair to bunch all Christian missionaries in with the Tewksbury class. The race of devoted missionaries has not quite run out. There are men in the missionary field to-day as faithful as those of the earlier days of Christianity. But in these sordid times, when the measure of all merit has the dollar for its unit, and the needle's eye has been enlarged for the accommodation not only of camels but of elephants, the faithful missionary who best exemplifies his Master's message is not so familiar a type of his order as those who play the game of cent per cent. with loaded guns, and play to win. All the more honor for that very reason to the missionaries who still keep the golden rule right side up.

When Sir Claude Macdonald, the British minister to Japan, and during the Chinese troubles the British minister at Peking, passed through Chicago on his way home for a brief vacation, he paid an unwitting compliment to the civilization of the Chinese. Explaining to a newspaper man the military weakness of China, he mentioned as one factor that prevents China from becoming a military power the fact that—

the Chinese soldier is regarded as at the bottom of the social scale. In

Japan the soldier, as in Germany, is a social factor, and the merchant, while respected, is not accorded so high a position in the national society. In China the reverse is the case.

Which, say you, good Christian friend, is the higher civilization, other things being equal, that which consigns the man butcher to the lowest plane of respectability, or that which puts him at the top?

A sad wail now goes up from the democratic press of the species Bourbon. To get rid of Bryan it has been urging "reorganization," with the bolting leaders on top. But now that Bryan declares himself out of the race for the presidential nomination, the Bourbons begin to realize that what has stood in their way is not Bryan, but an overwhelming democratic sentiment in the party, which Bryan represents; and they berate him for not taking off his coat and magnanimously leading the masses of the party over to the support of Bourbonism. Notwithstanding all their jibes and jeers at Bryan, they have at last discovered him to be a political force of the first order, which they need, but cannot control. Hence their wails. But Mr. Bryan's position is a very simple, a very honorable, and a very wise one. While declaring that he is not a candidate for the nomination, that he has no choice among candidates—has neither friends to reward nor enemies to punish,—that he will not oppose even men who supported the republican candidate in 1896 and 1900 if they sincerely repent, yet he asserts his unalterable purpose to do everything in his power to prevent the saddling upon the democratic party of leaders and doctrines that remain hostile to the departure from Bourbonism which it made in 1896 and confirmed in 1900. In other words, Mr. Bryan will neither participate in nor encourage, either actively or passively, a reorganization of the democratic party along virtually republican lines or under virtually republican leadership. "The identity of the democratic candidate for

president in 1904," he writes in the Commoner, "is not yet known, but it is known that whoever he is he will not be a democrat nominated by republicans for republican purposes only." For this stand Mr. Bryan has placed the democrats of the party under renewed obligations to him; and if the Bourbons were able to forget some things and to learn others, they would realize that in the fidelity of which that is a sample lies the secret of Bryan's persistence as a force in American politics.

A misleading news dispatch from the Virginia constitutional convention at Richmond was the occasion of a mistaken comment in these columns two weeks ago, at page 161. The dispatch commented upon reported that the convention had voted against incorporating into the oath of office of the delegates a pledge to support the constitution of the United States. It appears that the convention voted nothing of the kind. What it did vote in this connection was to take no oath at all to support any constitution whatever. And in so doing it made no departure from long established precedent in the state. It followed the example of every constitutional convention ever assembled in Virginia, including the reconstruction convention held under the shadow of the American war department. The theory of this practice seems to be that a constitutional convention is a meeting of the people, assembled to change their organic law, and that as such no oaths to support constitutions are necessary or appropriate. It is bound, of course, by constitutions superior to the state. If, for instance, the Virginia constitutional convention were to adopt an organic law for the state in conflict in any particular with the federal constitution, its action would to that extent—a majority of one or more of the supreme court so holding—be inoperative, oath or no oath. A still broader theory than that mentioned might be referred to. Oaths of office are useless survivals

of a superstitious era. Time was when they doubtless did operate upon the consciences of officials. Time was, also, when they were the technical evidence of the assumption of official obligations. But they serve neither purpose any longer. An official who had not taken an oath of office might be indicted or impeached for malfeasance; and no one imagines that superstitious reverence for an oath is any longer a guarantee of official fidelity.

In the British colonies, as well as in Colorado and Ohio, not to mention British cities and towns by the score, and American localities from which no data is yet obtainable, Henry George's principle of undermining privilege by taxing land values instead of labor values, is manifestly making gratifying headway. Within the past 18 months, the number of taxing districts in New Zealand which have adopted the single tax for local purposes, has increased from 14 to 60. As these additional districts had had the advantage of observing the operation and effect of the system in the 14 that adopted it first, their action is a pronounced tribute; and as most of them are farming communities, it very distinctly discredits the notion that farmers would be injured by the single tax.

Another British colony, far removed from New Zealand, in which the single tax idea has definitely indicated its popularity, is Natal, South Africa—in the very heart of the colony at that. By the death of Sir John Robinson, a vacancy occurred in the Natal parliament, Robinson having represented the city of Durban. Mr. J. E. Maydon was asked to take the vacancy, and consented to do so, supposing that there would be no opposition. This situation tempted the Durban single taxers to put forward Mr. Henry Ancketill, one of their number, to contest the election. A sharp campaign followed. Mr. Ancketill is an Englishman who had lived in the United States and been a friend and personal pupil of Henry George,

but he was not well known in Durban. Still, his character was irreproachable, and the contest was waged without personalities. It turned upon the direct and specific question of taxing land values instead of improvements and personal property. Mr. Ancketill declared:

I am more concerned to get my views before the electorate than in getting myself into parliament. I don't care how men vote; I do care how they think. If a man thinks right he will vote right; and if you alter the trend of political thought, you will not lack able men to send to parliament to represent you.

In that spirit and without political strength other than his opinions commanded, Mr. Ancketill contested the election as the representative of the single tax. Said the local paper that supported his adversary, referring to Mr. Ancketill:

He came forward as a comparatively unknown man, backed by no powerful interest, and relying solely on his opinions for his support. The result of the poll has amply justified his candidature.

Though Mr. Ancketill was not elected, and the single tax was therefore not endorsed, yet his vote ran up to 942 in a total of 2,036, his adversary being elected by a majority of only 152. The single tax sentiment in Durban must be strong to have yielded that result in a straight out fight for it. It doubtless is strong. And Durban is not the only place of which that can be said. Neither are the single tax districts of New Zealand. Although the single tax movement makes less commotion than it did when, in its earlier stages, it was a movement of speechmaking and mass meeting applause, it is everywhere making vastly greater headway in popular thought and legislative action.

Many comparisons have been made of free trade New South Wales with protection Victoria, the two great neighboring states of the Commonwealth of Australia. As a rule, these comparisons have been industrial in character; and they have always told emphatically in favor of the free trade