them commits a crime; every state's attorney who encourages them commits another; and every judge and grand jury that ignore these violations of law are derelict. It is a poor excuse to argue that only criminals are put into the "sweat box." In the first place, it is not true. In the second, security for the innocent always depends upon conserving the rights of the guilty. When the rights of criminals are outraged by officers of the law, the rights of all are in jeopardy.

Secretary Hay has asked Congress to amend the passport law so as to provide for passports to "loyal residents of our insular possessions traveling or sojourning abroad." At present the law restricts the issue of passports to persons who are "citizens of the United States." The proposed amendment would restrict it to persons "owing allegiance, whether citizens or not, to the United States." This would clearly be a congressional recognition of persons who owe allegiance, but are not citizens. Now, what are persons who owe allegiance to a government, but are not citizens of it? There is only one word to describe them. They are subjects. Of what are they subjects? Of a republic? That would be a contradiction in terms. Then it must be of an empire. Yet it is less than two years ago when the Republicans were assuring the American voter that the Philippine conquest did not involve the turning of the republic into an empire.

The Chinese are said to be the most imitative race in the world, and it seems to be true. No sooner had they learned of Gen. Smith's devastation order in the Philippines than they set about imitaing this noble example of American civilization. A colonel and 50 men of the Chinese imperial troops had been cut to pieces by rebels in the Wei-psien region, whereupon the imperial government sent 1,000 regular troops into that region, with orders, says the Peking dispatches—

> to use the most extreme measures and to burn everything and behead all rebels until the uprising had been eradicated.

That order might almost have been copied literally from Gen. Smith's, though the Chinese seem to have balked at specifically including children of ten within its sanguinary provisions. However, civilization proceeds slowly with Orientals.

"BENEVOLENT FEUDALISM."

Only once in a great while does a magazine article appear which can long outlive its first reading. Most of them are manufactured to excite or to gratify a momentary interest, which is impatient of anything that exacts other than the laziest thought. Like a plucked rose, even the best of them usually give out but a passing fragrance and then wither away. The popular demand is for ephemeral subjects, for a fatuous optimism, and for the light literary touch. Such, at any rate, is the prevailing opinion of many magazine editors, and they ought to know. They doubtless do know, for it is by guaging the popular tastes aright that they make their living. But now and again, something finds its way into the magazine pages which, while meeting, in most respects, the frivolous popular demand as to form, possesses also serious qualities and invites profound and frequently recurring reflection.

These are articles of which it may be said, as the Independent of April 3, 1902, said editorially, and said truly, of a contribution to that issue of the same magazine, from the pen of W. J. Ghent:

> Every American who can read anything will read Mr. Ghent's article on the coming "Benevolent Feudalism." Not everybody will read it in the next ten days, but everybody will read it some time. Not everybody will read it in Mr. Ghent's own words, as printed in our columns; but everybody will read it in substance, as it goes from journal to journal and from mouth to mouth. For this is one of the articles that, once published, live. Like all great work, in science or in art, it is essentially a report, a description, a picture of a situation, made by one of those men who have the power to see what other men look at without seeing, and, by a few strong, clean strokes, to make other men instantly see.

There is no overpraise in that commendation. Mr. Ghent's article is in truth a vivid picture of a social condition which is much nearer at hand than he implies, if, indeed, in its essentials, it does not already exist. He treats it as "the next distinct stage in the socio-economic evolution of America," and characterizes it as "a benevolent feudalism."

Although Mr. Ghent has met the usual magazine requirements of a light touch as to composition and a bubbly manner of thought, and has done this so well that his article is light enough to be read after dinner without disturbing digestion, and although he has succeeded in giving to a profound treatment of a profound subject so charming an air of superficiality and ephemerality as to secure some degree of attention from even the most frivolous victims of the reading disease, he has not been able altogether to conceal a flavor of what is commonly called "pessimism."

It is not a disturbing pessimism, to be sure. He has avoided giving offense in that way. For, while he foretells a condition in which the many will again be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the few, he seems to see it through rosy-hued spectacles. The benevolence of the few more than compensates for the dependence of the many. Mr. Ghent himself probably does not think this a rosy view, but he wisely avoids hurting the sensibilities of those who do by refraining from painting it in dark colors.

His postulate is the probable persistence of the now familiar phenomena of the concentration of capital and the increase of individual holdings of wealth, in support of which he summons Prof. John B. Clark, one of the most noted of orthodox economists, from whom he quotes this testimony, extremely significant when the affiliations of the writer are considered, which Prof. Clark had already given in the Independent:

> . . . The world of the near future . . . will present a condition of vast and ever-growing inequality . . . The rich will continually grow richer, and the multimillionaires will approach the billion-dollar standard.

That there are facts at variance with that conclusion, such as a marked

persistence of "small-unit farming" and "small-shop production and distribution," Mr. Ghent concedes; but he does not regard this tendency as indicative of economic independence. On the contrary, he urges that—

it is attended by a constant pressure and constraint. The more the great combinations increase their power, the greater is the subordination of the small concerns. They may, for one reason or another, find it possible, and even fairly profitable, to continue; but they will be more and more confined to particular activities, and in time to particular methods, all dictated and enforced by the pressure of the larger concerns. The petty tradesmen and producers are thus an economically dependent class; and their dependence increases with the years. In a like position, also, are the owners of small and moderate holdings in the trusts. The larger holdings—often the single largest holding—determine the rules of the game; the smaller ones are either acquiescent, or if recalcitrant, are powerless to enforce their will.

In this dependence of the individual producer, supplemented by the already dependent condition of laborers and mechanics, clerks and helpers, and of the more or less and constantly increasing deference to the very wealthy of preachers, teachers, editors, legislators and judges, Mr. Ghent foresees "a socio-economic status that contains all the essentials of a renascent feudalism."

He does not expect, of course, that history will repeat itself in form. The personal fidelity, for instance, which the old feudalism exacted from vassal to lord, is not likely to revive; but "group fidelity, founded upon the conscious dependence of a class, is already observable, and it grows apace." It is manifested in the deference we yield and the homage we pay, "not as individuals but as units of a class," to men of wealth. Though we do not know them personally, and have no sense of personal attachment, yet in most things we grant them priority."

In another and more important particular the new feudalism is to differ in form from the old. Democracy will tend to restrain it and ethics to moralize it.

Ethical influences will qualify it by "a growing and diffusive sense of responsibility and kinship." This is already indicated by the flourishing growth "in the erstwhile barren soil of mammonism" of the principle of "the trusteeship of great wealth."

Democracy will hold it in check, because democracy endures; like death, it gives back nothing.

Something of its substance it gives back, it must be confessed; for it permits the most serious encroachments upon its rights; but of its outer form it yields nothing, and thus it retains the potentiality of exerting its will in whatever direction it may see fit. And this fact, though now but feebly recognized by the feudal barons, will be better understood by them as time runs on, and they will bear in mind the limit of popular patience. It is an elastic limit, of a truth; for the mass of mankind, as both Hamlet and Thomas Jefferson observed, are more ready to endure known ills than to fly to others that they know not. It is a limit which, to be heeded, needs only to be carefully studied. Macaulay's famous dictum, that the privileged classes, when their rule is threatened, always bring about their own ruin by making further exactions, is likely, in this case, to prove untrue. A wiser forethought begins to prevail among the autocrats of to-day—a forethought destined to grow and expand and to prove of inestimable value when bequeathed to their successors. Our nobility will thus temper their exactions to an endurable limit; and they will distribute benefits to a degree that makes a tolerant, if not a satisfied people. They may even make a working principle of Bentham's maxim, and after, of course, appropriating the first and choicest fruits of industry to themselves, may seek to promote the "greatest happiness of the greatest number." For therein will lie their greater security.

So the new feudalism is to be benevolent.

Having broadly outlined this drift toward benevolent feudalism, Mr. Ghent essays the more difficult task of filling in the details and drawing specific parallels with the barbarous feudalism from which we have emerged.

As "bondage to the land was the basis of villeinage in the old regime, bondage to the job will be the basis of villeinage in the new." The secured job will be the laborer's fortress, which he will hardly dare to evacuate. Prudence will, therefore, restrain him from surrendering one job with the hope of getting a better, or of otherwise improving his condition. When he revolts it will not be as an individual but in conjunction with great masses of his fellows, and even this he will do more and more reluctantly as he is conscious of recurring failures, and feels the force of the blacklist. Consequently classes will become more stable, show more distinct differences, and tend to the formal institution of graded caste. At the top will be a class corresponding to the barons of the old feudalism, who will be graded by their wealth. Then will come the courtiers. After them the professions—scientists, artists, physicians—patronized liberally by the superior classes. Fourth in grade will be the managers of great industries, a high salaried class, and next beneath them, foremen and superintendents recruited not from lower classes of skilled workers but from technical schools. Skilled workers of cities and towns, more or less regularly employed and partially protected by their organizations, will come next, and beneath them will be the unskilled workers of towns and cities not at all protected by organization. In a still lower grade will be the working attaches of great estates, then the small landowning farmers, petty tradesmen and manufacturers; and after them subtenants of great estates, followed in turn by a class living in isolated places and corresponding to the ancient cotters, and at the bottom of all the old time "wastral," known in our day as the "tramp."

This classification which is intended to be suggestive rather than exact, grades the classes not according to wealth, nor earning capacity, nor economic freedom, nor intellectual ability, but according to—

the relative degree of comfort—material, moral and intellectual—which each class contributes to the nobility. The wastrals contribute least, and they are the lowest. The foremen, superintendents and entrepreneurs contribute most of the purely material comfort, and their place is correspondingly high. But higher yet is the rank of the courtiers and court agents, the legates and nuncios. This class will include the editors of "respectable" and "safe" newspapers, the pastors of "conservative" and "wealthy" churches, the professors and teachers in endowed colleges and schools, lawyers generally, and most judges and politicians. During the transition period there will be a gradual elimination of the more unserviceable of these persons, with the result that in the end this class will be largely transformed. The individual security of

place and livelihood of its members will then depend on the harmony of their utterances and acts with the wishes of the great nobles; and so long as they rightly fulfill their functions their recompense will be generous. They will be at once the assuagers of popular suspicion and discontent and the providers of moral and intellectual anodynes for the barons. Such of them, however, as have not the tact or fidelity to do or say what is expected of them will be promptly forced into—

lower classes, or, "in extreme cases, banished from all classes, to become the wretched pariahs of society."

The process of adjustment will not be frictionless. Large displacements of labor and business interests will arouse popular discontent, which will be fomented somewhat by cautious and relatively barren agitation, the possible danger of which will be averted by a host of economists, preachers and editors, who will demonstrate that—

the evolution taking place is for the best interests of all; that it follows a "natural and inevitable law;" that those who have been thrown out of work have only their own incompetency to blame; that all who really want work can get it, and that any interference with the prevailing regime will be sure to bring on a panic, which will only make matters worse.

When the evolution into this "benevolent feudalism," this domestic "benevolent assimilation" of other people's rights, shall have become complete—

the nobles will have attained to complete power, and the motive and operation of government will have become simply the registering and administering of their collective will. And yet the state will continue very much as now, just as the form and name of the Roman republic continued under Augustus. The present state machinery is admirably adapted for the subtle and extra- legal exertion of power by an autocracy; and while improvements to that end might unquestionably be made, the barons will hesitate to take action which will needlessly arouse popular suspicions. From petty constable to supreme court justice the officials will understand, or be made to understand, the golden mean of their duties; and except for an occasional rascally Jacobin, whom it may for a time be difficult to suppress, they will be faithful and obey. . . . A happy blending of generosity and firmness will characterize all dealing with open discontent; but the prevention of discontent will be the prior study, to which the intellect and the energies of the nobles, and their legates will be ever bent. To that end the teachings of the schools and colleges, the sermons, the editorials, the stump orations, and even the plays at the theaters will be skilfully and persuasively molded; and the questioning heart of the poor, which perpetually seeks some answer to the painful riddle of the earth, will meet with a multitude of molifying responses. These will be: From the churches, that discontent is the fruit of atheism, and that religion alone is a solace for earthly woe; from the colleges, that discontent is ignorant and irrational, since conditions have certainly bettered in the last 100 years; from the newspapers, that discontent is anarchy; and from the stump orators that it is unpatriotic, since this nation is the greatest and most glorious that ever the sun shone upon. As of old, these reasons will for the time suffice; and against the possibility of recurrent questionings, new apologetics will be skilfully formulated, to be put forth as occasion requires. On all sides will be observed a greater respect for power; and the former tendency toward rash and bitter criticism of the upper classes will decline.

Peace and stability are expected to be the defensive arguments of the new regime—

and peace and stability it will probably bring. But tranquil or unquiet, whatever it may be, its triumph is assured; and existent forces are carrying us toward it with an ever accelerating speed.

It is at this point that Mr. Ghent's dash of pessimism appears. The certainty of the coming benevolent feudalism, evidently without charms for him, arouses him to one mildly hopeful suggestion. "One power alone," he writes, "one power alone might prevent it—the collective popular will that it shall not be." But of this he discovers "no fear on the part of the barons, and but little expectation on the part of the underlings."

No thoughtful American, alive to the inspiring traditions and high ideals of his race and country, and observant of the signs of the times, can read Mr. Ghent's remarkable article without feeling that what he describes is not coming, but that it is here. There may yet come a heightening of the special features, but in general outline we already have the living model of the picture as he has painted it. Feudalism has revived, and its distinguishing characteristic is benevolence.

To many, doubtless, the picture is not revolting. Its benevolence purifies it. Their highest ideal of righteousness is "doing good to others" and regulating their lives. They do not see that a benevolent despotism is the most degrading of all despotisms. It degrades him who lives under it by making him proud of his dependence, proud of his yoke; it degrades him who administers it by making him vain of his self righteousness.

But to most persons traditions of American manhood are yet fresh enough to inspire hopes of recovering American independence, and to them the appeal must lie. How can the yoke of this new feudalism be thrown off? Mr. Ghent looks hopelessly to the power of the collective will. He is hopeless because every revolt against the new condition has proved so futile. "We subscribe," he says, "to newspapers and other publications which criticize the acts of the corporations, and we hail as a new Gracchus the ardent reformer who occasionally comes forth for a season to do battle for the popular cause. But this revolt is for the most part sentimental; it is a mental attitude, but rarely transmutable into terms of action.

The indictment is true, but it need be true no longer. Let the great interests that are turning the forms of our free republic into the service of a new feudalism, be interrogated. How have they succeeded? They have used political methods, the same methods by which alone they can be and must be repulsed. How have they used them?

The answer is simple and obvious. They found ready to hand a great political party, with a great history in the struggle for human liberty. It was the "strong government" party, a fact which adapted it admirably to their purposes. Hosts of the rank and file of that party were out of sympathy with their aims, and leaders were intractable. But they stopped at no such obstacles. They took possession of the party.

What they have done for evil with the aid of the Republican party, can be done for good with the aid of the Democratic party. Its fundamental principle of "individual liberty" is adapted to opposing the new feudalism, just as the Republican principle of "strong government" is adapted

to fostering it. There are hostile elements in it, but why care for that, any more than the plutocrat cares for elements hostile to him in the Republican party?

To neglect the opportunity, to fail to take advantage of the momentum of this existing organization, so well adapted to the purpose by its fundamental principles, would be a crime against humanity which nothing could condone. And the responsibility lies largely with the truly democratic elements of the party. Being in the majority in the party they have the duty to inspire others of their way of thinking with confidence in its professions. They must assert themselves and their principles without compromise. They must turn a deaf ear to the blandishments of "reorganizers" who would make this party the servant of feudalism even as the Republican party has already been made its servant. Thus only can the Democratic party be made to draw to itself the masses of the people who are opposed to the Republican policy of the past 25 years, which has at last plunged us into benevolent feudalism. There is no other organization that can hope to accomplish any immediate results. Let the leaders of the new party—this renewed democracy, this democratic Democracy—boldly appeal to, and by an aggressive policy, deserve the right to appeal to, all the forces—many now vague and scattered—that believe in "equal rights to all, and special privileges to none," not as a sounding phrase, but as the one essential truth for preserving freedom and manhood.

By this principle shall we conquer. The new feudalism comes from natural causes no more than did the old. An evolution it may be, but only as all disease is evolutionary. It has evolved from an abnormal adjustment which may be summed up in the one word Privilege. Abolish all legal privileges, restore equality of right under the law and feudalism will die. Democracy alone is the cure for feudalism, whether it be the feudalism of the middle ages or the benevolent feudalism of our own time.

Funston has been reminded of the old adage that "little folks should be seen and not heard."—Boston Transcript.

NEWS

The Philippine revelations reported last week have caused the Republican side of the Senate to change their former plans and enter vigorously into the discussion of the Philippine civil government bill. Senator Lodge takes the lead in the debate on that side, the keynote of which is the defense of the army in the field against Democratic attacks upon it. The debate began in earnest on the 3d and is still proceeding.

Gen. Smith's court martial trial at Manila for ordering the killing of all natives over ten years of age and the the burning of their homes (p. 54) closed on the 3d. No announcement of the findings of the court has been made, but it is the general impression in Manila that Gen. Smith, although he admits having given those orders, has been acquitted. The findings have been forwarded to the President for review.

Another court martial has been formed by presidential order. It is to try "Maj. Edwin F. Glenn, Fifth infantry, and such other persons as may be brought before it," the object being to try officers charged with administering the water torture and inflicting other cruelties upon Filipinos. The members are Gen. Frederick D. Grant, Col. Almond B. Wells, Col. Alfred C. Markley, Col. Henry C. Ward, Lieut. Col. Argalus G. Hennissie, Lieut. Col. P. Henry Ray, Maj. William L. Pitcher, Maj. John C. Dent, Maj. Frank De L. Carrington, Maj. William W. Wootherspoon, Maj. Bernard A. Byrne and Capt. Abraham P. Buffington, with Maj. Harvey C. Carbaugh as judge advocate. This court martial is to meet at Catholonan on the 12th.

While American atrocities in the Christian parts of the Philippines are undergoing investigation, and reports of the complete pacification of this region are forwarded by Gen. Chaffee, the American war has been carried into one of the Mohammedan islands of the Philippine group. As reported two weeks ago (p. 36) Gen. Chaffee was given a free hand by the President to send a punitive expedition into the Mohammedan island of Mindanao, the home of the Moros. On the 24th of April Col. Baldwin, in command of the expedition, reported the capture of a fort at Pulas as having had a salutary effect, white flags being put out by the chiefs in place of the red battle flags with which the Americans had at first been welcomed. The Pulas fort was captured after only slight resistance and without casualties. A less pacific condition was reported on the 2d. An ultimatum sent to the chiefs by Gen. Davis, in command of the island of Mindanao, had not been answered and his messenger had not returned. On the same day the American outposts were fired upon, and a hard battle was fought in the territory of the sultan of Bayan, about six miles from Malabang, on the southern coast of Mindanao. The American loss was nine killed and 41 wounded, and the defenders were overcome with terrific slaughter. Their survivors, 84 in number, surrendered on the morning of the 3d. A few hours later they attempted to escape, and all succeeded except 35, who were killed by their American captors, and nine who were wounded.

Reporting the battle and its result, Gen. Chaffee cables the war department:

In light of present knowledge, could have besieged the principal forts and in time forced surrender, but that would probably have resulted in a sortie for freedom and escape for many. By attacking them they have been completely crushed—the only kind of lesson these wild Moros seem to be able to profit by. . . . The result to follow this action very important, namely, it secures respect for United States authority in the center of Moro savagery.

The British war in South Africa, though to a degree in suspense pending the decision of the Boers on the peace proposals, is kept alive by occasional small engagements. Gen. Kitchener reports, however, that the British are allowing unrestrained meetings between the Boer leaders and their various commandos.

Tariff duties on food (p. 41), as a means of raising revenues for the war, are exciting much feeling in England, fears of a revival of old-fashioned protectionism being freely expressed. This agitation has made an opportunity for the British advocates of land value taxation, known better as "the single tax," to attract attention generally to their reform. The London cable dispatches of the 5th note the fact that a letter from Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, is being extensively circulated from London, in which Mr. Johnson encourages the movement. "New life and strength," reads one of the press dispatches, "have been given