

case of emergency, which Capt. Allen thinks will be rare. The actual policing and guarding of life and property and the operations against the ladrones and other criminals would be conducted entirely by the constabulary. Capt. Allen has had a large experience with the natives, and I think understands them better, is in closer touch with the pulse of the people, than any man we have. I wish the press would correct the impression that there is war on all the islands. The insurrection is confined to two localities—the province of Batangas and the island of Samar. This morning I received a most encouraging cable from Gen. Wright, who is the acting governor in my absence. He said that owing to Gen. Bell's strong repressive measures the trouble in Batangas was being quieted. I don't think Gen. Bell will have need to adopt the reconcentrado principle in Batangas.

On the latter point Gov. Taft appears to be in error. Two weeks before the governor left Manila, Gen. Bell had adopted "the reconcentrado principle in Batangas." His order dated December 8, and made public at Washington January 20, through the Associated Press, provides, in substance, as the Associated Press describes it—

for the establishment of a zone around the garrisons, into which the friendly inhabitants are to be required to come under penalty of confiscation and destruction of their property. This is said to be necessary to prevent the collection of forced contributions from the inhabitants by the insurgents. This order is followed by a long circular by Gen. Bell to his station commanders, commenting on existing conditions and giving them advice how to proceed. It begins with the statement that he shares in the general conviction that the insurrection continues because the greater part of the people, especially the wealthier ones, do not really want peace. He says it is regrettable that the innocent must suffer with the guilty, but the greatest good to the greatest number can be best brought about by putting a prompt end to the insurrection. A special injunction is laid on the commanders to hunt down through loyal spies secret sympathizers with and contributors to the rebellion, many of whom will be found among municipal officers.

Gov. Taft appears to be mistaken also when he asserts that "the insurrection is confined to two localities—the province of Batangas and the Island of Samar." For Gen. Chaf-

fee, in his annual report, made public on the 19th at Washington, is reported by the Associated Press to have summed up the situation from the military point of view by saying that—

the provinces of Batangas and Laguna, in southern Luzon, and the islands of Samar, Mindoro and Cebu constitute the disturbed area in which bodies of insurgents in force are to be found.

Even that does not appear to comprise the whole field of native resistance to American sovereignty, Gen. Wade having cabled from Cebu on the 19th, so say the Washington dispatches of the Associated Press, that—

365 insurgents surrendered on the island of Bohol last Friday.

One of the reported incidents of the war is the capture of a Filipino woman general, Aqueda Kahabagan, who has been fighting the Americans for two years, as prior to their arrival she fought the Spanish. Another Filipino leader, Briocio Laque, is reported to have surrendered in Batangas. In that province, Gen. Bell, with 2,000 men, is pursuing Gen. Malvar. During the week ending on the 19th, he was reported to have captured and destroyed 20 tons of Filipino supplies, captured 70 rifles, wounded 30 Filipinos and killed 100, with a loss to his own force of five wounded and two killed.

From the field of the British war against the Boers in South Africa the only news of moment relates to the execution by the British of a prisoner of war, Commandant Scheepers. Wounded in a battle last October and unable to retreat, he was captured. Charges before a British court-martial were then preferred against him, the accusations being various and comprehensive. He was accused of having, while commanding Boer troops in the field, committed seven murders; of whipping natives; of looting and burning government buildings; and of maltreating prisoners. In his own defense Scheepers testified on the 28th of December that the homicide charges were totally unfounded, except in one instance, when he ordered the execution of a native spy who had been tried and convicted; that he had whipped natives convicted of acting as British spies; that his destruction of government buildings was in reprisal under the orders of Gen. De Wet; that he had always fed and treated his prisoners as well as he was able; and that

in every respect he had acted under the orders of his military superiors. Nevertheless he was convicted by the British court-martial and sentenced to death. The findings were approved by Lord Kitchener, and on the 18th Commandant Scheepers was shot.

Similar charges have been made against Commandant Kritzinger, one of the most successful of the Boer guerrilla leaders, who was captured about a month ago. With reference to him, however, a dispatch has leaked out by way of Durban, Natal, to the effect that Gen. Louis Botha has notified Lord Kitchener that if the British execute Kritzinger, five British officers now held by him as prisoners of war will be shot in retaliation.

Opinion in England is insistent that the war is about to close, a belief prevailing that negotiations for peace have been opened by leading Boers with the British government. Circumstantial rumors to the same effect are prevalent on the continent. But Boer representatives at The Hague deny all these rumors, denouncing them as stories fabricated by British agents with a view to British publication. They say that no negotiations are in progress.

On the 18th Dr. Krause, former governor of Johannesburg, charged with treason for inciting Cornelius Broecksman to kill a member of Lord Roberts's staff, was convicted of "attempting to persuade" Broecksman to commit the crime, charges of the higher grades of crime being withdrawn. He was sentenced to two years' imprisonment. In the course of the trial the British censor at Johannesburg, a witness in the case, let out the fact that the British post office officials at Johannesburg were in the habit of sending to the censor all letters addressed to the American consul. Being asked by the lord chief justice if such letters were subject to censorship he declined to reply and his right to refuse was sustained.

Parliament assembled on the 16th. It was formally opened by the king in person, attended by the queen consort. King Edward read the speech from the throne, in which he referred to the tour of the world by the prince and princess of Wales; spoke of his friendship with other powers, and expressed his regret that "the war in South

Africa is not yet concluded." In the latter connection he said:

The course of operations has been favorable to our arms and the area of war largely reduced. Industries are being resumed in my new colonies. Despite the tedious character of the campaign my soldiers have throughout displayed cheerfulness in the endurance of the hardships incident to guerrilla warfare and humanity even to their own detriment in their treatment of the enemy, which is deserving of the highest praise. The necessity of relieving those who have most felt the strain of the war has afforded me the opportunity of again availing myself of offers from my colonies. Further contingents will shortly reach South Africa from Canada, Australia and New Zealand. He hoped that "the international conference on sugar bounties may lead to the abandonment of a system by which my sugar producing colonies have been unfairly weighted," told of the interoceanic canal treaty with the United States, and of an arbitration treaty with Brazil on the Guiana-Brazil boundary; noted the slight rainfall in India and the consequent necessity for a continuance, though less extensive than last year, of famine relief measures; referred to the change of rule in Afghanistan and of the new ruler's cordial relations with British India; and concluded with a parliamentary programme advising educational bills, a water supply for London and land purchases in Ireland.

In the Commons the Conservative reply to the speech from the throne was met by a proposed amendment offered by Frederick Cawley, Liberal. It asserted that while the House of Commons was prepared to support all proper measures for the effective prosecution of the South African war, it was of the opinion that the course pursued by the ministers and their attitude toward a settlement had not conducted to the rapid termination of hostilities and a durable peace. The amendment was rejected on the 21st by 333 to 123. Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader, and Harcourt and Morley voted for it, as also did a few Imperialist-Liberals; but all the Irish and the Radical members refused to vote at all because the amendment, while it satisfied them by condemning the ministry, repelled them by its pledge of support to a prosecution of the war.

The Boer question came before the French Chamber of Deputies on the

20th. It was brought to the attention of the Chamber by various interpellations. M. Berry, Conservative, declared that Great Britain had excluded the Transvaal from The Hague conference because she was then intent upon forcing a war there; and, contending that certain articles of the peace convention authorize the powers to intervene if they wish to do so, he urged the French government to bring about intervention. M. Delcasse, the minister for foreign affairs, replying to the interpellations, said that France was willing to invoke arbitration when certain that the offer would be accepted, but that nothing had happened during the Transvaal war to indicate that an offer of mediation would be favorably received. If such an offer were rejected, he continued,—

it would be necessary to impose mediation, which would make war inevitable. We are therefore obliged to refrain, whatever may be the sympathies all here profess for that courageous people. Intervention on the part of France would only result in entangling her foreign policy, and it is the duty of the government to retain the entire liberty of that policy.

This position was unanimously approved by the Chamber.

An explanation of an historical event connected with the American war with Spain, and until now undisclosed, has been brought out in the British parliament and through the British foreign office. It relates to the attitude of the European powers toward the United States at that time, and was evidently called out for some ulterior purpose, for the disclosure was made apropos of nothing. Henry Norman, the newspaper correspondent and a Liberal member of parliament, formally asked the ministry whether any communication, proposing or concerning joint or collective action by the European states, in view of the outbreak or expected outbreak of the war between the United States and Spain, was received from the Austrian or any other government, and, if so, what was the nature of the reply of the British government. Promptly in response to this interpellation, Lord Cranborne, under secretary for foreign affairs, stated in the Commons on the 20th, as reported by the Associated Press, that—

no such communication had been made to the government after the outbreak of the war, but that immediately before the war communica-

tions were received from other powers suggesting the presentation of a joint note to the president of the United States. Her majesty's government agreed to join with the other powers in a note expressing the hope that the negotiations of her majesty might lead to a peaceful settlement, accompanied by guarantees acceptable to the United States for the preservation of order in Cuba. The government first took steps to ascertain whether the presentation of the note, as well as its terms, would be acceptable to the president. Her majesty's government, Lord Cranborne continued, declined to associate itself with other subsequent proposals which seemed open to the objection of putting pressure on the government of the United States and offering an opinion on its action. The under secretary concluded with saying he was unable to lay the papers in the case on the table.

Later the Associated Press correspondent elicited from the British foreign office the information that—

Great Britain had been twice formally approached on this matter, but only once after the commencement of hostilities between Spain and the United States. . . . The occasion upon which Great Britain deliberately put down her foot was, according to the foreign office, when the Austrian ambassador at London interviewed Lord Salisbury and asked him if Great Britain would be willing to join in a collective note from the European powers urging the United States to desist from war with Spain. Such a note was not to threaten reprisals or intervention, but was to be in the nature of a strong protest and a plea for arbitration. Lord Salisbury regarded this proposition as unwarrantable interference in the affairs of a friendly country, and frankly said so, declaring that Great Britain would not be a party to any such step, especially in view of the late President McKinley's attitude toward the antebellum efforts of European powers to avert war. The foreign office heard nothing more on this subject, the matter of a collective note apparently being dropped.

A more definite explanation is reported by the Associated Press as coming from a high official of the British foreign war office, whose name is withheld. He said:

We have no documentary evidence to prove that any power other than the one which formally approached us was concerned in this effort to send a collective note to the United States, the purport of which, however polite the wording, must naturally have been that of a threat. . . . We had at the time, however, every rea-