

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

dispose of the "surplus" more easily and quite as profitably by throwing it into the sea. That it will not be paid for with money is evident, for but little money is ever imported. Considering silver and gold together, we export much more than we import. If paid for, then, our exported "surplus" must be paid for chiefly if not altogether with "pauper goods." But in that case what becomes of our workingmen? Will not this influx of "pauper goods" take the bread out of their mouths, so to speak? Or were the Republicans mistaken when they taught us to believe that importations of goods are only a little less injurious to American labor than importations of cholera?

In a book called "English as She is Taught," a story may be found which contains a subtle lesson on "trade-balances." A pupil being asked to define the meaning of the words "imports" and "exports," wrote this answer:

The imports of a country are the things that are paid for; the exports are the things that are not.

That boy's idea of exports was evidently derived from the American statistics of foreign trade, which show such enormous "favorable" balances that are not paid for.

"Confidence begets confidence," says a Chicago paper in discussing the possibility of an end to the present era of prosperity. Its essential idea is that prosperity will last while confidence lasts. That is true of a confidence game. So long as the victim is confiding, the buncoer flourishes; and to the extent that the prevailing prosperity is confidence-prosperity, it will doubtless continue as long as confidence does. But people don't eat confidence, nor wear confidence, nor live in confidence houses. The things they need are substantial things produced by human labor; and unless they get these things—not merely see others have them in abundance but get their share themselves—no amount of confidence, however begotten, will be an acceptable sub-

stitute. The basis of genuine prosperity is not confidence, but comfort.

That there is less comfort than confidence in the prosperity which now prevails is evident from the signs. Colored census figures may indicate a flourishing condition for workingmen, but obtrusive facts grimly refute these rose-colored statistics. One instance is typical. The Johnstown Democrat, which advertised recently in a trade paper for a printer, ordered the advertisement out, saying—

Overwhelmed with replies. Your medium is too good. We're out about \$2.00 in stamps notifying applicants that the place is filled.

If multiplying experiences of this kind were not enough to convince reasonable persons, the cry that some labor organizations are making about the "dead line" which large employers have established—refusing to hire men who are over 45 years of age—should do it. In one Chicago labor union the bafflement over this found expression in a bitterly satirical proposal to shoot every man of that age who is dependent upon his labor for a living. No such "dead line" could be maintained if opportunities for employment were really abundant; none would have been set up if the employers did not find workers in excess of demand. This makes prosperity, of course, for some persons. No one doubts the prosperity of the trusts. These exploiters say they are prosperous, and all the indications confirm them. But what is prosperity food to the trusts may be adversity poison to everybody else.

It is not an easy fight that the home rulers of Colorado have entered upon in their movement to secure constitutional authority to each county to raise its own revenues by taxing land speculators, if the inhabitants of the county so decide by popular vote. Of course the land speculating fraternity are resisting with all their might. Of course the land-grant railroads are joining in. Of course the Republican papers are behind them all. And of course an attempt will be

made to commit the Republican party at its state convention against the movement. But the supporters of the movement are working, too. Handicapped as they are for want of funds, they have, nevertheless, placed 100,000 copies of the Bucklin report in the hands of as many Colorado voters. Although much of the work necessary to this accomplishment has been contributed without pay, the funds for printing and incidental expenses are exhausted, with 118,000 voters not yet reached. But hope rises high that so important and promising a movement will not be allowed to languish.

An example of the kind of opposition this Colorado home rule movement arouses is furnished editorially by the Denver Republican, which describes the Bucklin amendment as "a menace to all real estate investments in any part of Colorado," and urges that—

it should be defeated by so overwhelming a majority that no such crazy proposition would ever again present itself for the consideration of the people of this state. There is no element of good in it, and the fact that we had a legislature foolish enough to submit it to the voters has brought all Colorado into disrepute among intelligent people of other parts of the union. . . . When they go to the polls next fall the people should reject each and every one of these amendments. They should not risk making a mistake by trying to vote for some and against others. All should be condemned. They are all the spawn of a legislature made up of cranks and irresponsibles of every species and degree. No one had a right to look for any good from that conglomeration, and no good has come from it. The answer of the people should be a condemnation of all that was done. There should be no hint or suggestion of approval in any degree whatsoever; and especially should anything like approval be withheld from the proposed constitutional amendments. Each and every one of them should be voted down.

A pointed reply to that startled exclamation of Colorado plutocracy is made by the Monte Vista (Col.) Journal, when it says:

The Republican undoubtedly voices the sentiment of its party, and yet that party will hardly dare to express its position at the next state conven-