

above, and in the same editorial article from which the foregoing quotation comes, now considers to bethe true situation with reference to peace:

The conditions now existing in the Philippines are as near to peace as any that are likely to prevail for a good many years—probably for a generation, perhaps for several generations. They are the conditions under which we must expect to govern the islands so long as the population is hostile to us and we are determined to keep them under American sovereignty. Increasing the army will make no difference unless it should be raised to such size that a strong garrison could be put in every hamlet and a guard over every farm. A column of 500 American troops could probably march anywhere in the archipelago now. After such a triumphant demonstration of our power, let the same column be broken up into detached parties of 25 men each, and every man of them would most likely be killed or captured within 50 miles of Manila.

That is what the democrats said during the campaign. The republicans denied it then. But there is worse to come. In the same article, the Express admonishes the American public, whom for the sake of McKinleyism it joined last fall in deceiving, that when we abandon the Philippines we must exterminate the native inhabitants. After assuming that probably in the course of years, after the present generation both of Filipinos and Americans has passed away, hostilities may die down, it proceeds:

But if we are going to conquer the people, we must recognize the fact that we will have to fight the people, not an army or a government. We shall have to imitate the course of Great Britain in South Africa. Where an armed body of rebels appears we must burn the village that gave it shelter and destroy the crops on which it fed. We must concentrate non-combatants in small garrisoned districts, as the Spanish did. We must send all prisoners to distant exile. We must execute promptly any who are detected in breaking their oaths of allegiance. We must make our soldiers a terror to the whole population, because a people can be ruled by force only after they have been taught to fear. The work

of tyranny can be done only by the methods of tyranny.

There you have as lurid a picture of imperialism as any supporter of Bryan ventured to draw even in the most exciting moments of the presidential campaign. Yet it is now given us calmly by a leading McKinley journal. The election being over and won, the truth comes out. Lurid as the picture is, it is not over-colored. The opportunity was ours once, to foster a republic off the shores of Asia, a republic modeled after our own, and whose people would be our most grateful and devoted friends. Instead of availing ourselves of that opportunity, we first deceived those people, then bullied them, then fought them until their armies were scattered and their government demolished, and now, even according to this Buffalo organ of McKinley, we must either abandon them or reduce them to subjection by terror. And the Buffalo paper is right. Though wrong, terribly wrong when it supported McKinley and his imperial policy by helping to inspire the American people with delusions which it now begs them to get over, it is nevertheless right at last. The work of tyranny can indeed be done only by the methods of tyranny.

The British government is now well packed with nephews, sons and sons-in-law. Nepotism has never before flourished in England so luxuriantly. It was made a subject of debate in parliament on the 10th, when a member moved to the address to the queen an amendment expressing the regret of the Commons that Lord Salisbury had recommended so many of his own family to offices under the government. The motion was lost, but the fact that 128 members voted for it indicates that it was taken seriously. While the debate was on, Mr. Balfour, a nephew of Salisbury, and one of his governmental family, op-

posed the motion with the plea that "the unhappy accident of birth ought not to be a bar to public service." Mr. Balfour appears to be something of a humorist. That plea had always been used against nepotism. Mr. Balfour is the first person, either nepotist or nepotee, to give it the other turn.

Lord Salisbury's remarks in parliament apropos of the address to the throne in response to the queen's speech is significant of a radical and disquieting departure in the laws of war. Great Britain must make it felt, he said, that no one, by the issue of an insolent and audacious ultimatum, can force the British government to humble itself and abandon its rights; in such a case not a shred of independence should be left. It might be observed in passing that the "audacious ultimatum" which the Transvaal issued was a justifiable demand that the British government cease threatening it with military invasion, accompanied with an offer in return to withdraw the Boer troops from the British border and to submit the differences between the two countries to arbitration. That was not insolent, even if audacious. But the vital point about Salisbury's remarks is his cool contention that because this ultimatum was issued and in the hostilities following the Boers were defeated, they forfeited their independence. If any principle at all is involved in this contention, if it is not a mere assertion of unlicensed power, it means that Great Britain is asked by Salisbury to establish a principle and a precedent in international law for the extinction by victors in war of the independence of the defeated power. Let that principle be established, and the world is on its way with lightning speed back to the barbarism from which it has partly emerged.

In his argument this week before the supreme court, John D. Lindsay, the able New York lawyer who