

**The Scranton Tribune**

Published Daily, Except Sunday, by The Tribune Publishing Company, at Fifty Cents a Month.

LIVY S. RICHARD, Editor.  
O. F. BYXBEK, Business Manager.New York Office: 150 Nassau St.  
S. B. VREELAND,  
Sales Agent for Foreign Advertising.Entered at the Postoffice at Scranton, Pa., as  
Second Class Mail Matter.When space will permit, The Tribune is always  
glad to print short letters from its friends bearing  
on current topics, but its rule is that these  
must be signed; for publication, by the writer,  
not by his friends. Contributions to the ac-  
ceptance is that all contributions shall be subject  
to editorial revision.**THE FLAT RATE FOR ADVERTISING.**The following table shows the rates per inch  
each insertion, space to be used within one year:

DISPLAY.	Run of Paper	Sliding on Full Position
Less than 500 inches.....	25	25
500 inches.....	25	25
2000 ".....	16	16
2000 ".....	15	15
6000 ".....	15	15

For cards of thanks, resolutions of condolence  
and similar contributions in the nature of ad-  
vertising The Tribune makes a charge of 6 cents  
a line.Rates for Classified Advertising furnished on  
application.

SCRANTON, NOVEMBER 8, 1901.

There is certainly an element of the dramatic in the turn of affairs which apparently gives Controller Jones a plurality of 2 votes. Coming as the unexpected, it is doubly gratifying to know that this splendid official, clean-cut Republican and admirable gentleman may have three years more to serve. The gallant fight he made under adverse circumstances would render his victory notable even though its margin should be the closest on local record.

**How Long?**

ONE of the most effective arguments brought by labor leaders against trusts is that they are liable to enforce their supremacy by tyrannical methods, such, for example, as crushing out small competitors or demanding of transportation companies preferential rates by means of secret rebates. It has also been claimed that trusts restrict the liberty of the retail dealer by making war upon him if he dares to handle goods not bearing the trust label.

Is there not danger of labor unions using and justifying, when used by themselves, the weapons which, when used by others, they have bitterly condemned? To make our meaning clear, let us cite an instance.

In a certain city not a thousand miles from Scranton, two merchants leased store rooms in a newly constructed building well situated for their purpose. They did not learn, until after they had signed leases and spent much money in fitting up their stores, that the owners of the building had had trouble with the labor unions. The first knowledge they had of the matter was through notice from a labor union that they had been boycotted for moving into a non-union building.

Their trade is mainly with working people. They have always been on friendly terms with the labor unions. Many a time, during strikes, they have extended liberal credit to strikers, some times at a considerable loss. This apparently counted for nothing in the present case. The boycott was decided upon in star chamber fashion and clapped on before its victims had had any opportunity of defense. It was an illustration of tyranny as bold and unadorned as was ever credited against the most domineering trust, and we are sorry to say that it is not an exceptional case.

How long will American manhood stand for such practices?

For once Lackawanna county can sympathize with Tammany.

**Li Hung Chang.**

LI HUNG CHANG was a typical Asiatic. Few careers have been more instructive to the student of Oriental politics than that of the statesman, soldier and courtier who has passed away amid the wreck and partial ruin of the kingdom whose destiny he has during the past fifty years so largely influenced in its relation with the western world. Li Hung Chang was as enigmatic to Occidental conceptions as the philosophic ideals of his countrymen are esoteric to our perceptions. He knew vastly more about us than we knew about him or the motives which directed his actions, and he was as conscious of our ignorance as we were unconscious of the ulterior aims of his policy and tortuous diplomacy. He could not control the trend of events from the west as he surged on with a tidal impact on the shores of the Middle Kingdom, but he did what it was possible for him to do to hold back the inundation by concessions and placations where the mere denial of European or American demands would have proved fruitless or worse. He was a great statesman in the sense in which he and his more conservative countrymen understood statesmanship, but his life and works were as alien to our notions of political progress and expediency as Oriental conservatism and reaction could be.

A great deal of ingenuity has been expended in reconciling Li's position with a desire to open up China to western civilization. There is little room to doubt that he fully understood if he did not appreciate the value and underlying principles of modern thought and progress. He was intimately associated with the representatives of European governments and our own for half a century. He had traveled around the world, professedly not as a tourist or diplomatic agent, but as a student whose mind was open to the impressions and influences of the West; who was prepared to import the opportunities which the cessation of hostilities between his country and Japan brought about, to begin a new era in the history of his country. He even went so far as to profess sympathy with such a design. It is exceedingly unlikely, however, that he ever sympathized with a prospective revolution so tremendous in its potentiality, while it is certain that he did all he could after his return from Russia to frustrate it. In this course

he was possibly abetted, if not urged on by Russia, which saw as Li himself discerned that the regeneration of China lay in two directions, as far as it was possible to regenerate it within a historical period—the predominance of Russia in the commercial expansion of the celestial empire and its integrity; or the predominance of the other European countries and the United States with their nominal spheres of influence but with China's actual political disintegration.

Li Hung Chang had no scruples. His partition was such as it is impossible for us to supply with motives much less seriously to attempt to analyze. Such as it was its psychological basis was identical with that of the immovable horde of barbarians that somehow held together the imperial unity of a heterogeneous and unwieldy empire, neither more enlightened nor more unselfish.

Li Hung Chang used his immense and autocratic power with all the ruthless savagery of the Tartar barbarian. He knew no mercy and practiced none. He was as indifferent to human life and suffering as Kughis Khan, where his means subserved the cause which he had in hand. He had something of the constructive genius of true statesmanship, but his opportunities to exercise it were circumscribed by the peculiarities of a court which no sooner elevated him to the pinnacle of power than it degraded him next day, until the advent of another crisis made his cruelty, craft, and experience indispensable.

It would be unfair to judge Li by modern or western standards. Human nature moves slowly and more slowly in China than elsewhere. As a Chinaman Li Hung Chang was not by advancement of his age. But he seems to have kept step with it.

Mr. Croker's reception of the news is worthy of consideration by the Pennsylvania Fusionists. He frankly admits that Tammany's defeat was due to a lack of votes.

**Why Not?**

AMONG the many messages received by Mayor-elect Low was one from Secretary of War Root expressing his satisfaction at the victory gained for the principle of independent municipal politics. "I completely believe," he added, "that you will give the city an administration which will make its people unwilling ever again to sacrifice the interests of good government for the pretended benefit of a national party organization."

It is singular that one usually so clear-headed as Elihu Root should indulge in day dreams on this subject. The endeavor to separate municipal from state and national politics, to make fish of one and flesh of the other, has been tried for a great many years in a great many places, under all kinds of promises of success, and it has invariably failed. By this we mean that there has not been power enough among its supporters to keep municipal politics and other politics apart. It is scarcely too much to assert that the public affairs of Brooklyn through his mayoralty became as though his private business, and as far as possible were administered upon the same basis and by the same methods as would characterize a private business. He tried to save money for the people precisely as he would have tried to make money for himself. He endeavored to secure the largest possible returns from the resources at hand, just as he would have labored for like results for a firm in which he was a partner. He required taxes paid by citizens as a definite investment, a sum which he could not afford to risk upon this investment as though it had been made by or for a corporation or when he was a director or the president. He made character and efficiency the sole test for appointments to public service and the sole assurance of continued tenure. He could not, however, reach the enlightened point of principle ever reached in this country. And in all he manifested the characteristics which gave him success at Columbia, and which made him conspicuous in the educational world.

Men who do things have to be partisans; have to be for or against each other, which is the basis of partisanship. And so long as party organizations are maintained in state and national affairs, those interested in them will use them in municipal affairs in preference to going to the trouble and expense of keeping up separate political establishments. It is undoubtedly true that in city affairs party lines are not as stiff as in federal affairs. But generally speaking, the party alignments correspond, and we can see no reason why a party fit to administer the government of a state or a nation should not be equally competent to administer the government of a city.

It is for the sultan to decide whether the seizure of Mitylene was an act of war or an original feature of the collection agency idea.

**Something About  
Mayor-elect Low**

MORE THAN ten years ago in a gathering of prominent educators in the city of Washington, when the question of a national university was under discussion, a western man said: "If Columbia university ever reaches the Atlantic ocean, it will be submerged." But to his Columbia college to the plane of the Atlantic, he added, "and it will be submerged." The association is in entire sympathy with the proposition to erect a suitable memorial to the late president at his grave in Canton, Ohio.

The association is in entire sympathy with the proposition to erect a suitable memorial to the late president at his grave in Canton, Ohio.

TURKEY AND FRANCE.

Editor of The Tribune, Sir—The last words of the British cabinet was a long one, and it is reported that it was chiefly occupied with a consideration of the attitude of France toward Turkey. The situation in the Levant is unquestionably grave. It is within the domain of probability, or, at least, within the limits of possibility, that the action of the French fleet in seizing Turkish ports in the Island of Mitylene and in the Asia Minor sea-board may lead to complications which may eventually bring about a European war. In any diplomatic embroilment in which Turkey is involved a platoons among European publicists to decide that it is a good idea to a good suggestion. Unquestionably, the materials are there for such a combination. The proceedings of France may be the spark which is needed to set fire to the tinder.

With singular unanimity, says James H. Gaffield, in the Review of Reviews, the choice fell upon Seth Low. He was just 40 years of age, in the very prime of his life. He was graduated at the head of his class in 1870. A little more than a decade later he had become a man of absolute independence, his strong sense of civic duty and his leadership had so commanded him his fellow citizens in Brooklyn that he was chosen mayor under the new charter of that city. His administration constituted an epoch in the history of Brooklyn, a model of good government. Men who watched him grow from boyhood to manhood saw the more to praise and the less to blame. Adverse criticism was rare and constantly decreasing; appreciation grew by leaps and bounds. When he turned aside from this task Brooklyn was one of the best governed cities in the Union and every Brooklynite was proud of its record.

He hesitated long and sincerely about accepting the presidency of Columbia. He made no pretensions to being an educator in the technical or professional sense; the task was a severe one, the burdens were very great, the necessary sacrifices were exacting, the old system of government was at a good price to purchase advantageously the land for another campus, to determine in all its details the occupancy of this new ground, to plan buildings and drive construction through to a finish, to transfer all departments with no serious break in their work, to successfully refund all existing indebtedness, to provide large enough endowments to expand and maintain the institution and to thoroughly organize the entire educational machinery, to accomplish the affiliation of the hitherto independent colleges, and in ten years to be able to leave all this so reasonably complete that the leading spirits of it all may withdraw without a gift or a jar being felt in any part of the machine and with no appearance of difficulty. It is a very able administrator who can determine and direct the relations and work of others so well that they will not interfere with his plans. No one can better illustrate the meaning of a truly accomplished achievement. It is probably without a parallel in the history of educational institutions. It is a very able administrator who can determine and direct the relations and work of others so well that they will not interfere with his plans. No one can better illustrate the meaning of a truly accomplished achievement.

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment, out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean open. Territorially she has little or no interest in Turkey, leaving Egypt, for the moment,

out of the question beyond that of trade, and of course, she cannot afford to permit France or Russia to crush the Turk and absorb or divide his territory. It is all very well to speak of driving the Turks out of Europe bag and baggage, but where is it? Out of what form of government is to be left?

England's interest in Turkey has practically discontinued in maintaining the Eastern Mediterranean