

victory over the helpless Montejó. His pitiable exhibition of moral cowardice with reference to the Filipinos, with whom he formed an alliance which he afterwards tried to deny at the instance of the administration, must have had a prejudicial effect upon his popularity. McKinley's casting him aside like a squeezed lemon after "making use" of him as he confessed to "making use" of Aguinaldo, must also have had an influence; for this threw him into the shadow with all the powerful newspaper and other agencies of the administration. The ridiculous gift-house affair, too, was a factor in undoing him. And, then, to cap all, he made an astounding exposure when he concluded to run for president. The influence of all these circumstances we fully recognize. But a military hero is not so easily unhorsed. He holds the affections of a military people in spite of intellectual and moral weaknesses, in spite of his exposing himself to ridicule, in spite of everything except the one fact that he is a military hero. For that reason we incline to believe what we hope, that Dewey's decline is really due to the fact that the American people are losing their morbid disposition to exalt military heroes.

The pneumatic tube swindle in connection with the post office system received a temporary knock down last week in the lower house of congress. Representative Moody charged open bribery to promote legislation in its favor, and other members explained that the government was paying annual rentals in excess of the capitalized value. This explanation would indicate that the tube people have taken a lesson from the railroad people, who charge the post office department more for the rent of a postal car for one year than the car could be built for. But the tube people are somehow not "up to snuff." Their swindle, unlike that of the railroad, has been voted down. A motion to strike out the appropriation for pneumatic tube service was adopted by 87 to 50. This ought not to cripple the

postal service. It only raises a question of whether the postal department shall maintain its own pneumatic service system or leave it to the corruption of private contracting. On that question there should be no disinterested dispute. A postal pneumatic service is legitimately no more a private business than is the cancelling of stamps.

The disposition of the senate, though by a slender majority, to suppress a declaration of sympathy with the Boers in their struggle to maintain the independence of their republics, is not a gratifying fact. Under the circumstances it is deplorable. For a distinct impression had been created that the American government sympathizes with the British. This impression is deepened by the attitude of the administration, and it will be deepened still further if the senate remains silent upon the subject. So it will go abroad that the British, in the war of subjugation they are waging, have the sympathy of the American people. Yet that is not the fact. The American people, by an overwhelming majority, sympathize with the Boers. No one of intelligence here doubts this. Every observer knows it to be true. Max O'Rell, who has just returned from this country to England, assures the English of it. Some expression, then, of the national feeling ought to be made in an authoritative manner. If the government were really neutral, there would be no impropriety in maintaining silence. But as the government is not neutral, as it impresses all Europe as well as the British ministry with its British leanings, as it gives color to Chamberlain's assertion that there is "an understanding between statesmen"—for these reasons the senate owes it to the country to set the country right in the eyes of the world.

The one fact to be borne in mind at this stage of the South African war, is that it is confessedly on the part of the British government a war of subjugation. The Boers have of-

fered not only to arbitrate the issues, but to make peace on any terms, with the sole reservation that their continued independence shall be respected. This offer the British ministry rejects. Independence, therefore, and nothing but independence, is the issue. It is to maintain that, and only that, that the Boers are fighting. It is to destroy that, and for no other purpose, that the British ministry continues the war.

A peaceable disposition on the part of the British ministry would lead it to accept the proffered arbitration. A friendly disposition on the part of the American government would dictate that England be advised in the interest of peace to do so. This advice cannot be given diplomatically. In the first place, diplomatic etiquette would interfere; in the second, a disposition is absent. But the senate could proffer it by resolution as an expression of American sentiment. Nor should any notion that England cannot arbitrate with dignity be allowed to interfere. It is an absurd pretense that England cannot arbitrate because the South African republic is not a sovereign state. It is a sovereign state, except in the narrowest technical sense. There are some treaties which it cannot make without England's consent. Technically, that takes it out of the category of sovereign states. But it is as sovereign as England herself respecting its internal affairs. And it is over internal affairs, not over foreign treaty affairs, that the present war is waged. With perfect dignity, therefore, and in entire harmony with the spirit of international law, England could arbitrate those questions. And she would do so if her ministers were better disposed toward peace and amity and less inclined to swap English blood for colonial conquests.

The British idea of arbitration has been parroted by Frederick W. Holls, who acted as secretary to the United States delegation to The Hague peace conference. In a lecture before the