

would regard the annihilation of the South African republic and the Orange Free State as contrary to the law of nations and as an act which our government and people would not willingly accept as a precedent, so far at least as their own interests are concerned.

In making that recommendation, Mr. Smalley points the way to a speedy ending of the war in South Africa through an entirely peaceable and not unfriendly protest on the part of President McKinley. If he were to advise Minister Choate as Mr. Fish advised Minister Washburn in 1871, or were in some public manner to deplore the fact that Great Britain demands such rigorous terms of peace, as President Arthur did with reference to Chili in 1882, the British ministry would at once end the South African war upon the basis of the independence of the two republics. Nothing but their refusal to adopt that basis prolongs the war, for upon that basis the two republics have offered peace. And nothing but confidence in the friendly support of the American government encourages the British ministry in insisting upon that refusal. The destiny of those little republics, along with a portentous precedent in international usage, depends upon President McKinley.

The question of admitting clubs of colored women into the National Federation of Women's Clubs, is a very different question, so far as the general public is concerned, from that of denying colored people their civil or political rights. Within the federation itself, the despicable absurdity of excluding a woman like Mrs. Josephine Ruffin, for no other reason than that she is not a pale face, was a legitimate subject of discussion; but as it involved none of her rights as a woman the subject is not one with which the outside public has anything to do. It is the prerogative of the Federation of Women's Clubs, as of all other voluntary organizations, to admit or exclude at pleasure.

Voluntary association is a matter purely of congeniality and in its choice of membership every club or federation of clubs may give as full play as it wishes to the prejudices of its members against race, religion, politics, or color of skin, hair, or eyes, or against anything else whatsoever. Outsiders may have their opinion and express it freely about clubs which, having professedly large objects in view, are influenced by such petty considerations; but persons who are excluded cannot complain, nor can the public complain for them. It is when rights, civil or political, are involved, that public protests are in order. Negroes have the same rights as white men, and those rights must be maintained. But privileges of personal association are a different matter.

"Of course Mr. Bryan is not correct on any economic question," is the manner in which the New York Journal of Commerce begins a criticism of Bryan's North American Review article. The eminently judicial spirit of that opening remark challenges admiration. But it also excites suspicion. The critic who assumes at the outset that of course the person about to be criticised is not correct on any question, discredits his criticism in advance. In this case, however, the Journal actually proves, while trying to show the contrary, that Mr. Bryan is correct upon the very matter upon which it ventures specifically to criticise him. Bryan having written of home owning as decreasing and tenancy as increasing in this country, the Journal essays to show that the statistics to that effect imply increasing prosperity instead of increasing poverty, but in fact shows the contrary.

We quote the Journal on this point from the issue of the 7th, in the very language of its criticism of Bryan:

Tenancy appears from the last two censuses to be decidedly on the increase in this country, but it is not the result of growing poverty among farmers; it is the result of the increasing price of land; one of the com-

mon marks of prosperity. Tenancy does not grow by the change of the same individual from an owner into a tenant; the farmer does not sell his farm and then hire it. Tenancy increases because farm land becomes too expensive for a man of small capital to buy, or because the owner can get rent for it and live in town on the rent without working. In the west vast numbers of farmers acquired land many years ago for little or nothing from the government and the land-grant railroads. They were owners because the land was cheap. They are now getting old and retiring from active work and their farms are worth \$20 or \$40 an acre, and there being no more cheap lands the young men or immigrants who are looking for farms, hire these farms instead of buying. Thus the owning farmer is replaced by the tenant farmer because the former has acquired a competence, not because he has become poor. This process has been going on so extensively in Nebraska that Mr. Bryan's unconsciousness of it shows how poor an observer he is.

Instead of showing how poor an observer Mr. Bryan is, the editor of the Journal of Commerce here shows how poor a reasoner he is himself. The difference between him and Mr. Bryan is that whereas Mr. Bryan considered tenants as well as landlords, when reflecting upon the increase of tenancy, he considers only landlords. This one-sided consideration is evident at once from his remark that increasing price of land is "one of the common marks of prosperity." That increasing price of land marks the prosperity of landlords may be true enough. But it does not mark the prosperity of tenants. Higher price of land means for tenants not only higher rents, but it means also reduced opportunities of acquiring homes. It is the landlord's prosperity, not the tenant's, that the Journal of Commerce has in mind. And that this is so is confirmed by its remark farther on, where it says that "the owning farmer is replaced by the tenant farmer because the farmer has acquired a competence, not because he has become poor." We have to take the Journal's word for this contention. There is no proof. But let that pass. Suppose the farmers who got land for nothing years ago are in fact

all rich now, what of the tenants who are hiring their farms? These tenants are not rich; but owing to the increase in the price of land and the fact which the Journal notes that there are "no more cheap lands," they are compelled to become tenants. Here, then, is Mr. Bryan's critic confounded by his own logic. For if, as the Journal of Commerce concludes, "tenancy appears from the last two censuses to be decidedly on the increase in this country," what difference does it make whether the tenants are impoverished ex-landlords or rent ridden young men. The essential thing is that tenancy is increasing, and that in consequence of the increasing price of land and the disappearance of cheap land it is tenancy of the hopeless kind.

In fact, however, tenants are not altogether newcomers. The same individual often does descend from the level of landlord to that of tenant. It is no uncommon thing for farmers to sell their farms and then hire them; it is a very common thing for farmers to sell their farms and then hire farms elsewhere. And one or the other or both will become more and more common as men who, in trying to be owners instead of tenants have been obliged to give purchase money mortgages in order to get any land at the higher prices, find that they must submit to foreclosure.

Hamlin Garland has won the noble distinction of getting roundly hissed at an old settlers' meeting in Wisconsin for paying a just tribute to the memory of Black Hawk, the Winnebago chief. So long as white men sing of heroes who strike for the "green graves of their sires, God and their native land," Black Hawk is entitled to be counted in. That is precisely what he did. And white men should none the less account him a hero because it was men of their own race who made it necessary for him to strike. Hissing a speaker who dares tell them so, as Garland did, does not lessen their race's guilt.

Neither can they explain it away by pleading that as Black Hawk's people were few while the whites were many it was the right of the whites to appropriate the Indians. That plea is in the last degree hypocritical. When the claim of a few hundred people to the land of England is recognized by white man's law as good against the millions of English landless; when less than half the American people own any land, while millions upon millions of acres are fenced in against the rest; and when this is defended by the whites as just, it ill becomes them to denounce Black Hawk as a land monopolizer and attempt to justify their treatment of him upon that ground.

Senator Mason's intimation of his intention to support McKinley this fall should not be taken too much to heart by those who have admired his magnificent speeches in behalf of the elementary principles of democracy. He has given no intimation of any intention to support McKinleyism. It should not be forgotten that Senator Mason, like Senator Hoar, by supporting McKinley, makes his anti-imperial speeches all the more effective against McKinley.

The democrats of the Columbus district of Ohio give evidence of their power of discrimination and appreciation in making John J. Lentz for the third time their candidate for congress. Mr. Lentz, while a party man, is a democrat of the Jefferson order, who, in two terms of service, has proved his supreme fitness for congressional work. He is an attractive orator, a convincing speaker, an intelligent and tireless worker, and a fighter whose courage serves as well in passive resistance as in the excitement of conflict.

A firm of Baltimore bankers, Hamblin & Co., solicitous for the substitution of Gorman as the democratic candidate for president in place of Bryan, has circularized large numbers of business men and bankers in the south and east in Gorman's be-

half. This uneasy firm of financiers apologizes for thus entering into politics by saying that while wishing it were otherwise it is nevertheless—a regrettable fact that politics and finance are so indissolubly connected that it is impossible to mention the one without alluding to the other.

This is, indeed, both a fact and regrettable. But it is the Gormans of both parties and not the Bryans of any party, that have made it so. It is Gormanism, not Bryanism, that puts government into private business and private concerns into government business. And that is what connects finance with politics so indissolubly. Bryanism would break the connection.

In announcing the fact that the Pennsylvania railroad has secured control of the Philadelphia & Reading railroad, one of the newspaper reports explains that—

this completes the partition of the anthracite coal territory between the New York Central and the Pennsylvania systems.

That is an exact expression. In the old days great barons partitioned territory between them; but now it is great railroad corporations. The effect, however, is the same. Now, as then, the people are the sufferers; and now, as then, it seems quite the proper thing—so supinely do the people adjust themselves to injustice.

Gen. Otis has repeatedly assured the American people that the Philippine "insurrection" has been put down, and that only robber bands, or ladrones, are now resisting American authority in the islands; but now he makes this discomfiting admission in a newspaper interview:

For a number of years it will be impossible to control the situation with fewer troops than we now have in the Philippines. When the terms of the volunteers expire they must be returned to this country, but the troops withdrawn must be replaced by others. For the present the islands will have to be governed by a military government.

"For a number of years," then, we must maintain an army of 65,000 troops in a country where there is no