

without any difference under the article which has been substituted.

For the interpretation, then, of the Mexican treaty, in so far as it is to be cited as an American precedent with reference to expansion, we must go back to the third article of the Louisiana treaty, which for that reason is here quoted again:

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the religion which they profess.

Our only other treaty of expansion prior to the McKinley administration was that with Russia ceding Alaska. It was made March 30, 1867, and proclaimed June 20, 1867, and it may be found at page 939 of the 1889 compilation of treaties. In the third article this treaty follows in principle the example set by the ordinance of 1787 and adopted by all preceding treaties. It provides that—

The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

Here we have, then, a consistent line of expansion precedents which are pronounced against imperialism. Our whole expansion policy, from the foundation of the government, thus appears to have been in the direction of recognizing citizenship and conferring statehood. It was reserved for President McKinley to reverse that policy. His administration is the first to turn away from the American ideal of statehood and citizenship toward the imperial Roman system of colonies and subjects.

This will be perfectly clear upon contrasting the treaty provisions we have quoted, with the corresponding provision in the Paris treaty with

reference to the Philippines—a provision which President McKinley himself caused to be inserted in the treaty, and upon which his imperial policy of making colonies and subjects is founded.

The Paris treaty, along with much other matter of great collateral interest and importance, is published officially in senate document No. 62 of the third session of the Fifty-fifth congress, which may be bought of the government printing office at Washington for 35 cents. The treaty occupies the first nine pages of that most luminous document. By article three, to be found on page four of the document—

Spain cedes to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine islands,

and by article nine (page nine of the document), it is stipulated that—

the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the congress.

Beyond this, and a clause securing freedom of religious worship, there is no provision whatever in the treaty for the protection of the native inhabitants of the Philippines. So far as the treaty is concerned, congress may do as it pleases with them. Their country belongs to ours, but may not be of it. They may be subject to our laws, but not citizens of our republic.

Both the Louisiana territory and the Floridas came to us under treaty pledges that their inhabitants should be incorporated into the union and admitted to all the rights of citizenship; and the Mexican cessions were made upon the same terms. But we are under no such pledge as to the inhabitants of the Philippines. With reference, then, to every treaty of expansion prior to Alaska—and it is these that the imperialists cite as precedents—there isn't so much as the shadow of a basis for the contention that they are precedents for the Philippine treaty. Pledges of statehood and citizenship cannot be precedents for the denial of both. Yet statehood and citizenship for the Filipinos are precisely what the president's policy denies, and precisely what the Philippine treaty makes it possible to deny. Nor does the Alaska treaty substantially alter the orig-

inal policy. While it does not in terms provide for statehood, it does in terms provide for the American citizenship of all the civilized inhabitants who remain in the territory. There is no such provision in the Philippine treaty. Though the Filipinos are a Christian people and were vouched for by Admiral Dewey before the making of the treaty (document 62, page 383) as so far civilized that they "are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba," yet no distinction is drawn in the treaty between them and the uncivilized tribes that inhabit remote regions of the archipelago. The Philippine treaty, then, lacks the support as a precedent of even the Alaska treaty, which turned over to us an almost uninhabited territory.

It has no precedent whatever in the whole history of our territorial expansion down to McKinley's time. But, in flat defiance of our national ideals, it is a radical departure also from the policy and practice of a century of national life.

NEWS

The most important home event of the week is President McKinley's formal letter of acceptance of the republican nomination as the candidate of that party for reelection. Dated at the executive mansion on the 8th, it appeared in the newspapers on the 10th. Mr. McKinley leads off with congratulations of his party upon the victory it won for the gold standard in 1896; and, while deploring the fact that its antagonist reopens the financial question, he accepts the issue and invites "the sound money forces to join in winning another," and, as he hopes, "a permanent triumph for a sound financial system which will continue inviolable the public faith." Following this at length with quotations from all the opposing platforms, for the purpose of showing that in the event of Mr. Bryan's election a victory for the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 of gold will have been won, he proceeds briefly to discuss protection and reciprocity, prosperity, trade balances, pensions, loans to Europe, the Boer war, ship subsidies, the Isthmian canal, trusts, civil service reform, the Cuban situation and the Puerto Rican

question, after which he takes up the Philippine question and devotes to it considerably more than half his letter. Here he gives in great detail so much of the history of the Philippine acquisition as he considers pertinent, from which he infers that there has been no time since the destruction of the Spanish fleet in Manila bay when we could or should have left the Philippine archipelago. To the criticism that there would have been no fighting in the Philippines "if congress had declared its purpose to give independence to the Tagal insurgents" he replies that—

the insurgents did not wait for the action of congress. They assumed the offensive, they opened fire on our army. Those who assert our responsibility for the beginning of the conflict have forgotten that before the treaty was ratified in the senate and while it was being debated in that body, and while the Bacon resolution was under discussion, on February 4, 1899, the insurgents attacked the American army, after being previously advised that the American forces were under orders not to fire upon them except in defense.

He also refers to papers since found in the Filipino archives as showing that "this attack had been planned for weeks," and concludes that—

their unprovoked assault upon our soldiers at a time when the senate was deliberating upon the treaty shows that no action on our part except surrender and abandonment would have prevented the fighting, and leaves no doubt in any fair mind of where the responsibility rests for the shedding of American blood.

The letter ends with a brief reference to the Chinese affair, preceded by an argument against the Philippine policy announced by Mr. Bryan in his Indianapolis acceptance speech, and in support of a continuance of the present policy.

Next in importance probably to Mr. McKinley's letter of acceptance is the state election in Maine. This event is of general interest, because the September elections in Maine, in presidential years, are regarded by politicians as indicative of the results to be expected throughout the country in November; not according to the way Maine goes, for the state always goes republican, but according to the size of the majority. When the campaign closed, on the 8th, the chairman of the republican state committee, J. H. Manley, issued a signed statement, in which, as published by

the Chicago Tribune, he predicted that—

the republicans will carry Maine on Monday next by a majority greater than they ever did in years since the party came into existence in 1856. The republicans will poll their full strength, and the vote will show no falling off on their part. The democratic vote will increase somewhat over the vote four years ago, when the party was paralyzed in this state, but it will not reach the average democratic vote for the last quarter of a century.

This prediction failed of verification. Though the full vote is not yet reported, it is evident that the democrats made large gains, while the republicans have suffered loss. The republican loss, as compared with the election of 1896, is estimated, upon the basis of the vote reported, at 11 per cent., and the democratic gain at 18.

Complete returns from the Vermont state election, held on the 4th and reported last week at page 345, are now available. They give the republican candidate for governor a plurality of 31,468, and a majority of 30,192. Following is a comparison of the vote with that of the three preceding gubernatorial elections:

| Year. | Rep. | Dem. | Republican Plurality. |
|-------|--------|--------|-----------------------|
| 1900 | 48,466 | 16,998 | 31,468 |
| 1898 | 38,555 | 14,686 | 23,869 |
| 1896 | 53,246 | 14,855 | 38,391 |
| 1894 | 42,663 | 14,142 | 22,521 |

Thus the increase of the democratic vote as compared with that of the corresponding election four years ago is over 14 per cent., while the republican loss is nearly nine per cent.

Other political items relate to state conventions. Gov. Lind has been nominated by the democratic and the people's parties of Minnesota for reelection. The democratic, the silver republican and the people's party conventions of Colorado have made a fusion ticket. In New York the democratic convention met at New York city on the 11th, and on the 12th it nominated John B. Stanchfield for governor. This was a victory for Croker over Hill. The latter had pressed the nomination of Bird S. Coler, who got 154 votes to 294 for Stanchfield. The platform denounces trusts, and in the denunciation it includes specifically the Platt-republican ice trust of New York city, in which Tammany-democratic office holders became partners and were exposed by the New York Journal early in the summer.

Turning now from American politics to the news from China, it should be explained at the beginning, with reference to the Russian note abstracted in our last issue at page 344, that the publication by Russia of the full text of the note shows that Russia's proposal was to withdraw her minister and troops, not from China, as reported last week, but from Peking. Since then Russia has received replies from all the interested powers, other than the United States, whose reply was reported last week. France accepts the proposal without modification. This makes three nations that are willing to evacuate Peking immediately—France, Russia and the United States. The other five—Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan and Austria—indicate their intention of remaining. Great Britain declares her purpose of doing so as long as may be necessary properly to protect British interests.

On the part of the old government of China there is manifest an earnest disposition to reestablish its sovereignty. To this end it has issued an imperial edict, dated August 24, which Li Hung Chang forwarded September 7 to the Chinese minister at Petersburg, who transmitted it through the various Chinese ministers to the powers on the 9th. It is as follows:

Li Hung Chang, envoy plenipotentiary, is hereby vested with full discretionary powers, and he shall promptly deal with whatever questions may require attention. From this distance we will not control his actions.

The purpose of Chang's appointment as envoy had already been disclosed by the following edict of August 19:

The Iho-chuan outlaws (Boxers) in their hatred of foreigners and Christians have attacked them at Taku and Tientsin. The allied forces have therefore taken Tientsin and Taku, and on the morning of August 15 attacked the imperial capital from the east and the Tung-chi and Chao-yang gates of the city were blown up by the Japanese. We therefore prepared the departure of the empress dowager for the west. We have repeatedly telegraphed to the foreign powers, remonstrating against the invasion of our kingdom. They have replied that they fight only against the Iho-chuan (Boxers) and their leaders are not in conflict with our government, showing that they are not unwilling to make peace. But, as all the ministers are safe in Peking, we hereby com-