

campaign debt that never should have been contracted.

It remains to be seen whether or not Mr. Roosevelt will follow his predecessor's lead in making Mr. Hanna's campaign-fund bargains good.

There is nothing strange about Mr. Hanna's objection to raising further campaign funds from trust sources, without official assurances enabling him to make good the equivalent he bargains to give. The question is whether Mr. Roosevelt will so equip him. Shall it be, hereafter as heretofore, campaign funds in return for official services to the contributing trusts? or prosecution of the trusts and no campaign funds? Big corporations and trusts do not contribute to campaign funds for exercise. Their contributions are purchase money, and they expect the goods they buy.

Senator Spooner made an admission in the Senate on the 19th, which, considering his high professional reputation and his position of leadership among the imperialists of the Republican party in the Senate, is virtually decisive of the legal question regarding the occupation of the Philippines by the American army at the beginning of the actual fighting there—February 4, 1899. The admission came out in the following colloquy with Senator McLaurin, of Mississippi (p. 6,001 of the Congressional Record of May 19, 1902):

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—Now let me ask the Senator a question. Did we, on the 14th of February, 1899, have a perfect title to the Philippine islands?

Mr. Spooner—We had a perfect title to whip any body of troops that attacked our men anywhere under God's Heaven. That is all I care to say about that.

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—The Senator can, of course, answer or not. I cannot force the Senator to answer; but I should like to have a direct answer, as I am willing to answer any question that any senator may propound to me. I have asked the Senator a question, if we had any title of any kind to the Philippine islands on the 4th of February, 1899, and if so what was that title?

Mr. Spooner—We had a perfect

right to occupy the suburbs of Manila under the protocol. I have never claimed that we acquired a legal title to the Philippine archipelago except by the treaty.

Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi—Then the Senator does not claim that we had any title to the archipelago on the 4th of February, 1899?

Mr. Spooner—I do not.

If we had no title to the archipelago on the 4th of February, 1899, we certainly had none on the 21st of December, 1898. Yet that was the time when President McKinley proclaimed American sovereignty, asserting our title, and thereby made war upon the Filipino Republic, which had for months been peacefully governing all the country outside of Manila.

Gen. Chaffee has made a bad matter worse by his action in reviewing the findings of the Waller and Day court-martials (pp. 9, 19, 24, 39). One of these court-martials had acquitted Maj. Waller, charged with ordering the execution of natives of Samar without a trial, on the ground that he had acted "in accordance with the rules of war, the orders of his superior, and the military necessities of the situation." The other had acquitted Lieut. Day, who carried out Waller's orders. The "orders of the superior," mentioned in the Waller verdict, refer to the now notorious instructions of Gen. Smith to kill all natives over ten years of age and to make Samar a howling wilderness. These verdicts, being reviewed by Gen. Chaffee, are reversed. But Gen. Chaffee's reported reasons for reversal present the case in a more shocking aspect than before.

Although Maj. Waller and his counsel had maintained that Waller was in the full possession of his faculties when he ordered the shooting of the native prisoners, Gen. Chaffee decides that he was at that time mentally irresponsible. For this reason, Gen. Chaffee sustains the finding of not guilty. But he reverses the finding in other respects, holding that while the laws of war justify summary executions in certain cases, there were no such cases in this Samar cam-

paign, and that Waller's acts were more like unlawful retaliation than justifiable warfare. Maj. Waller's acts are therefore declared to constitute a crime falling short of murder only because Waller was temporarily insane. But Lieut. Day, who executed Waller's death sentences, was not insane. Moreover, he knew that Waller was incompetent. So, at least, does Gen. Chaffee find. Gen. Chaffee also finds that Day, knowing Waller's condition, should have disobeyed his murderous orders. But as Day promptly executed the orders, Gen. Chaffee finds him guilty of not having prevented "one of the most regrettable incidents," etc., etc., and—solemnly censures him!

So Gen. Chaffee puts the matter in this light: First, Maj. Waller committed murder by ordering the summary execution of several natives whose country he was invading; but as he was mentally irresponsible he is acquitted. Second, Lieut. Day aided and abetted Waller in committing the murder, but as Day was a subordinate owing obedience to Waller, which it was his duty under the circumstances not to yield but which he did yield, he is guilty of something or other deserving censure. All of which goes to show that the "honor of the army" can be conserved by condemning its "regrettable" crimes and acquitting their irresponsible perpetrators. No harm done except to the murdered Filipinos, and they don't complain. Next!

The National Reciprocity league, a nonpartisan body recently organized, declares that "in order to give continuous and remunerative employment to our labor and capital we must secure markets for our increasing surplus products among the 1,500,000,000 of people who constitute the population of the world." Is there not some danger in this movement? If our "surplus" goes into foreign markets, it must be paid for either with money or goods or not be paid for at all. If the latter, we could