

such tricks upon him in the intricacies of finance as in this simple first principle of the nature of wealth, the Lord have mercy on the intelligence of the farmers whom he teaches! Not that we object to his distinguishing the soil and its natural resources by the term "wealth," if he wishes to. That is as good a name, perhaps, as any other. But when he undertakes by the same term to distinguish products, he doesn't distinguish at all. He might as well say that "cattle" consist of cows, together with their accumulated products of milk, butter and cheese, as to say that wealth consists of the soil together with its products.

The president's committee for investigating the mismanagement of the war jogs along cheerily, with what is rapidly showing itself to be a neat whitewashing job. Complaints of mismanagement laid before the committee, instead of being made the basis of a search for proof, are used for the purpose of drawing out general denials from friendly witnesses. For example, the Rev. R. Heber Newton had made serious charges regarding the management of Camp Wikoff. These were laid before the committee, and here is the use the committee made of them: Said Mr. Beaver, questioner-in-chief for the committee, to Gen. Wheeler, the witness, after reading Newton's charges to him, "Might it not be that a civilian, and particularly a gentleman of the standing of Dr. Newton, who has been in the habit of visiting the best hospitals of the world, might be impressed with a tent hospital lacking some facilities? Is it not possible that he would regard conditions as unfavorable, which a soldier of your experience would regard as more than ordinarily satisfactory from the standpoint of a soldier in camp?" Gen. Wheeler thought so, and Heber Newton and his charges were duly squelched. Another of the many indications of the animus of the committee may be observed in this question of the medical member: "Could

all the medical men and all the medicines in the world, in your opinion, have prevented the outbreak of sickness at Santiago?"

It is perfectly evident that the president's committee understands its business to be not to fix responsibility for the notorious mismanagement, but to make it appear if possible that there was no mismanagement. Its purpose is not to search out guilt, but to exonerate. Not only are the questions largely of the kind quoted above, but there is no cross-examination worthy the name. Though Gen. Wheeler's testimony was almost wholly negative—that is, after the manner of the Irishman's flood of witnesses, who put to shame the one witness who swore to seeing an accident by swearing that they didn't see it—but he was subjected to no questions at all calculated to probe his knowledge or lack of knowledge. His "cheery optimism," as some one has called his testimony, was allowed to pass for real evidence. Gen. Wheeler certainly is both cheerful and optimistic. He has reason to be. His native good feeling was stimulated by an interview with the president, who, he said, treated him so kindly that he could never forget it; and this was followed by the promotion of his young son, a recent graduate of West Point, over the heads of 1,706 older and more experienced army officers.

The strictures we have made upon the good faith of the administration in connection with investigating the war scandals do not rest upon our judgment alone. For this very bad faith, amounting so nearly to hypocrisy that the difference is not easily distinguished, the administration is being scored by its own supporters. By way of illustration, here is an editorial from the issue of October 8 of one of the most ardent advocates of McKinley's election, the New York Evening Post:

The whitewashing investigation of the war department, by a commission containing two or three men who said beforehand that there was nothing in

the charges, and one man whose son had received a most desirable appointment in the army, is already seen to be such a farce that even republican congressmen treat it as worthless and promise to force an inquiry that will really find out something. Representative Lawrence, of Massachusetts, in a speech to the convention which re-nominated him the other day, after paying a warm tribute to the soldiers, said that "they deserved at the hands of the government they so unselfishly served anxious and tender care," and, after a reference to the present sham inquiry at Washington, made this explicit announcement and promise: "I am in favor of an investigation which shall investigate; which shall place the responsibility—let the blow fall where it will. The people of western Massachusetts demand it. It is their right, and I pledge my efforts to that end."

From Tokyo, in far-away Japan, there comes to us a little book by an American missionary, the Rev. Charles E. Garst, entitled "A Great Economic Equation." It aims to co-ordinate the principles of individualism and socialism. The key note of the book is struck by the assertion that "individual righteousness and social unrighteousness cannot co-exist." In explanation of this Mr. Garst says: "Individual purity in the midst of social impurity, is much like household purity without a sewer system, in a great city." Mr. Garst's little book is a helpful contribution to economic discussion.

Too little attention has been paid to the instance of mistaken identity which the discovery a few weeks ago of a mutilated body at Bridgeport, Conn., afforded. It is a whole commentary on a fatal facility of judges and juries in a certain class of murder cases. In the Bridgeport case the dismembered trunk of an unknown woman had been found, and a resident of Middleboro, Mass., identified it as that of his daughter, Grace Perkins, who had recently disappeared. The identification was made by means of birthmarks and body scars, for the face was unrecognizable. But so positive was Mr. Perkins, that he expressed his willingness to stake his life upon his identification; and he was corrob-