

who take dirty bribes, but your respectable business element, both within and without the council, who are swayed by fears, etc., for the stability of financial interests and the "property" of "innocent" investors.

Senator Rawlins is trying hard to carry through the Senate a resolution calling for the records of court-martial trials in the Philippines. But Senator Lodge struggles to keep these records out of sight with the ingenuity and grim determination of a criminal's lawyer objecting to the admission of a particularly incriminating piece of evidence. The worldly wisdom of Mr. Lodge's policy is evident when it is considered that Maj. Glenn, charged with torturing natives, and pleading in his defense that he did it under orders, has been acquitted by the court-martial that tried him.

Upon President Roosevelt's recent speech at Canton, in which he lightly shifted the responsibility for barbaric war in the Philippines, from the Americans against whom it has been proved, Erving Winslow makes this suggestive comment:

The President again asserts at Canton as a matter now patent to all men that the abandonment of the Philippine Islands would have "led to a welter of bloody savagery." Does the President really believe that his high office can give any permanent value to this unjustified assertion, however often reiterated? The peaceable establishment of a government by the Filipinos, with excellent auguries for its continuance, is a well known historical fact. The "welter of bloody savagery" is, as his own words imply, a purely gratuitous invention of the President's imagination, invoked perhaps like a back-fire to divert attention from that which has been proved, alas, against the United States in the conduct of the Philippine War. Compare with the orders given and approved by General Bell, General Smith, General Chaffee and the War Department, to "kill and burn," to "obtain information at any cost," to make a "howling wilderness" of suspected provinces—one of the last proclamations of General Malvar, of which a translation follows:

Orders and general instructions issued by the commanding officer of the South of Luzon for strict compliance in this district:

The generals, chiefs and officers of the army of deliverance will prevent any ill-

treatment in word or deed, by soldiers or peasants, of any disarmed, sleeping or drunken enemies and of all those who, throwing their guns down and raising their hands, declare thus their surrender, or of any others that may become prisoners in any way; meting out exemplary punishment to all who act against this order.

They will receive with kindness and courtesy, and accord good treatment to all soldiers, officers and chiefs of the army of invasion who may come to our camp, after leaving their guns at a predetermined place, to prevent any deception, conceding to them the best of treatment as specified in previous orders.

At the headquarters, April 28th, 1901.

The Commanding General,  
MIGUEL MALVAR.

The responsible authors of what was indeed a "welter of bloody savagery" are in a painful position when they try to persuade us that such an one as Gen. Malvar would have created such conditions, had he and his compatriots been left to work out their own fate. Which is the Christian here, and which the savage?

When impartial history answers that question, as in time it will, Americans who are not shameless will blush for their ancestors who invaded the Philippines and cruelly tortured and wantonly slaughtered their inhabitants.

The usually logical Pilgrim, of which Willis J. Abbot is editor, drops into the common error of supposing that it is a logical fallacy to test theories by carrying them to their logical end. This is another form of the notion that there are exceptions to every rule. The truth is that no rule which really expresses a natural law either in morals or physics has any exceptions. It is easier, of course, when a rule is found to lack that universality of application which belongs to natural law, to acknowledge the rule and assume an exception than to investigate the exception and if need be bring the supposed rule to new tests. But it is not "scientific," as the professors say.

The particular matter the Pilgrim was considering had to do with Prof. Bascom's distinction between taking for colleges, churches, etc., money derived through immoral conduct in defiance of law and money derived through unjust institutions in accordance with law. We regard the distinction as sound, both logically and morally. There is no question involved of rule and exception. There are two rules. One holds that money acquired by individual wrong doing

carries with it the taint of its origin into the church or college treasury. The beneficiary condones the individual wrong by taking it. The other holds that money acquired through established institutions, for which society and not the individual is responsible, carries no taint. The offense in the first case consists in acquiring money wrongfully; the offense in the other does not consist at all in acquiring money, but in supporting a wrongful institution. For illustration: A vegetarian society might properly take money from a butcher to propagate vegetarianism, while a church could not properly take the proceeds of a bank robber from the burglar. Better still, a peace society might take money from a general in the army, part of his salary, though a Sunday school could not with propriety accept the gate money of a prize fight. So a free trade society may take money from a free trader who derives his money from a protected business; a socialist society might take it from a captain of industry; a single tax society might take it from a single tax beneficiary of land monopoly. It does not follow, however, logically or otherwise, that they could properly take money from a common swindler.

If James Ford Rhodes writes history with no more regard for its verities than he displays in some parts of his magazine article on "The Presidential Office" in the February Scribner, history from his pen, however interesting, needs to be read with extreme caution. His reiteration of the fiction about Jackson's having introduced the spoils system, may be passed over, perhaps, as of little or no importance; but his comment upon President Cleveland's armed invasion of the State of Illinois, in Altgeld's day as governor, cannot be so lightly ignored:

In the railroad riots of 1894 Cleveland, under the advice of his able attorney general, made a precedent in the way of interference for the supremacy of law and the maintenance of order. The governor of Illinois would not preserve order, and the