

double reprimand of Gen. Miles, administered officially by the secretary of war under the president's orders and unofficially but characteristically by the president himself in a personal interview. Of the official reprimand we do not venture to speak. Presumably it was regular in form; and clearly it was deserved, according to the rules of military discipline which forbid military servants from expressing praise or censure of other military servants. Gen. Miles had commented upon the verdict in the Schley case by saying in a public interview that he thought Dewey's summing up of the matter would be indorsed by the patriotic people of the United States, and that he had no sympathy with the efforts to destroy the honor of Schley. But while the official reprimand of Miles may have been just, under the rules of military discipline, there is something sadly shocking about the personal reprimand by the president.

According to the report of the Chicago Tribune, the leading administration paper of the west, the president—

received the lieutenant general commanding the army in one of the window seats of the president's office, and flayed him alive for the interview he gave out at Cincinnati. The president went at his work with the impetuosity characteristic of him, and was so much in earnest, and felt that Gen. Miles was so much to blame, that he made no attempt to conceal the matter. On the contrary, it appears to be true that Gen. Miles was humiliated by having the scathing rebuke heard by many other people. According to common report it was more severe than the official letter of censure signed by Secretary Root, but which is understood to have been practically dictated by the president himself.

Such conduct may become an officer, even one of the highest rank, but it does not become a gentleman of any rank. And when it proceeds from a military superior to his military subordinate, who is denied the ordinary human right of replying in kind, it is cowardly. These rules are of universal application. They hold good all the way up from master and servant in private life to commander-in-chief

and lieutenant general in the military service of the United States.

Moreover, the fact that the reprimand in this case came from a superior to a subordinate in military station, cannot wholly obliterate the further fact that the superior in station was a young man of very limited military service, while the subordinate he thus brutally reprimanded was a gray-haired veteran of 40 years' service, who had risen from the ranks through the terrible ordeal of the civil war and a series of ordeals even more trying in the Indian country after the civil war. This consideration alone, had there been no other, should have shielded Gen. Miles from the humiliation of the insulting interview recorded above, though his offense had been ten times greater than the breach of military etiquette for which he was berated. For that offense, a formal written reprimand from the department, much milder than the one that came from the department, would have been severe enough punishment, without the added indignity of a tongue-lashing at the White House.

If Gen. Chaffee isn't more careful he will get the deadly reputation at Washington of the unfortunate parrot which talked too much. His observations regarding the patriotism of the Filipinos, made in reviewing a number of court-martial decisions received at Washington from the Philippines last week, is exasperatingly out of harmony with the whole theory of the American invasion of the Philippines and the destruction by American arms of the Filipino republic. All along have the American people been assured that this invasion was not only in the interest of the Filipinos as a whole, but that it was in accordance with the real desires of all but a few ambitious agitators. And now Gen. Chaffee, who is upon the ground and whose testimony has at least the force of an admission by an adverse witness, recklessly discredits these soothing assurances. He testifies that the whole

Filipino people are bitterly hostile to the American occupation. "History affords no parallel," he says, referring to the Filipinos, "of a whole people thus practically turning war traitors." That is a refreshing confession. It discloses the fact that the difficulties of conquering the "little brown men" are attributable not merely to a few agitators, but to the universal sentiment of the subjugated inhabitants.

In one respect Gen. Chaffee is mistaken. He says that "history affords no parallel." No parallel to what? To "a whole people thus practically turning war traitors?" War traitors to whom? To foreign invaders. But history is rich in such parallels. The trouble with Gen. Chaffee is that he is misled by words. This action of "a whole people" in revolt against a foreign invader he calls treason; whereas history always calls such revolts patriotism. Let Gen. Chaffee substitute "devoted patriots" for "war traitors," and he will find historical parallels in abundance.

The announcement this week of the hanging in the Philippines of a brother of Sixto Lopez, ought to awaken the American people to some realization of the official infamies that are being perpetrated in those far-off islands in their name. The reported charge against the young man was that of holding "treasonable communication with the insurgents." Think of it! His own countrymen, his own friends, his own neighbors, his own compatriots by ties of blood as well as love of country—these were "insurgents" and "enemies" with whom he must not hold patriotic communication, in his and their own country, against the military interest of an alien invader whose armies have come ten thousand miles over sea to "regulate their lives and do them good"! And for so communicating with them, he is ignominiously hanged. Is there no righteous wrath left in the American people that they sanction, though only by silence, such an outrage upon what they used to

consider sacred. Have they so completely forgotten the spirit of Halleck's once popular tribute to the struggling Greeks—who struck for their altars and their fires, for the green graves of their sires, for God and their native land—that they are deliberately willing to be turned metaphorically into marauding Turks? Nor is the hanging of this man all. To forestall any tendency of American sentiment to revolt at this return, in worse form, to the barbarities which Spain practiced against Philippine "traitors," the report of the hanging is accompanied by an absurdly false story to the effect that Lopez caused a wholesale murder and plundering of Spanish prisoners in the year 1898. Are our people to be hoodwinked in this amateur fashion? Have they become a nation of fools as well as a nation of world power pirates?

John Barrett has been calming the fears of our neighbors to the south. Noticing the alacrity with which the American government assumes the white man's burden of governing "inferior peoples," these Latin-Americans had taken it into their heads to wonder what would happen if Uncle Sam were to get into the notion that they also are "inferior peoples" and accordingly set about assuming the burden of governing them. But Mr. Barrett appeared before the Pan-American conference in Mexico and assured the assembled delegates that "the Pan-American policy of the United States shall ever be corollary of the golden rule." Our inferior neighbors—they must be inferior; they can't even understand English speech—should not be so easily pacified. We have all heard of the backwoodsman who explained that out his way they didn't have any law except the golden rule, and if a man broke that, "why, plague take him," they hanged him! This simple polity fairly represents the American conception of golden rule government that has prevailed for the past three years; and there is a possibility that we may feel called upon to so inter-

pret it to the restless republic south of the Rio Grande. We are almost certain to if we keep on growing in imperialistic grace and developing our cock-sure knowledge of the duties which Providence has coupled with our destinies.

While Mr. Charles M. Schwab was in attendance at a dinner of the Chicago Bankers' club he indulged himself and his hosts in a little play upon words, jocosely intended to entertain them and incidentally designed to fool workingmen. Said he:

Many people imagine that the bonds of the United States Steel company are a first mortgage on its great properties. They are not. If you give the subject a moment's thought you will see that the first great mortgage is that which is owed to labor. The United States Steel corporation pays to labor \$150,000,000 a year, equivalent to a mortgage debt of \$3,000,000,000 on the property.

Commenting upon that sapient remark a local paper gravely and approvingly observes: "We doubt if organized labor has ever taken this view of the bonds of the great steel company." For the sake of the intelligence of organized labor, we should hope not. A mortgage which cannot be foreclosed, under which the mortgagee gets nothing except as he works for it, and notwithstanding which he may be put wholly out of the transaction at the will of the mortgagor—such a mortgage, though it may be "good enough for workingmen," is not what would be regarded in financial circles as gilt-edge security.

"Government by injunction" was never more succinctly yet distinctly explained than by Judge Tuley, of Chicago, in a recent speech, when he said:

The use made in 1894 and often since of the writ of injunction in quelling labor strikes is a substitute for a trial by jury. Since that time those who wish to suppress disorder or violence or trespassers in connection with a strike, or to break such strike, rush to the United States court, and sue out a writ of injunction, which in its prohibitory clauses is only limited by the ingenuity of the counsel drawing the bill in chancery.

The judge, without hearing the de-

fendant, commands—that is decrees—what he shall or shall not do in advance, and without a hearing enforces the performance of the commands of the writ; then brings the defendant before him, tries him without a jury, adjudges him guilty of a violation of the commands of the writ formulated by the judge himself, in the absence of the defendant, and sentences him to punishment not defined by law but resting in the breast of such judge. Not only does the amount of punishment rest in the breast of the judge, but even the place where the imprisonment shall be inflicted rests in the breast of the judge. Is not such a proceeding by the judge government by injunction and a substitute for trial by jury?

It is to be regretted that the McKinley national memorial committee has decided to appeal to congress instead of the public for the expenses of a McKinley monument at Washington. Since Mr. McKinley's admirers name him as a president who was especially beloved by the people, a memorial fund strictly voluntary would be peculiarly appropriate. Congressional appropriations for these purposes are in their nature perfunctory. They testify to nothing but official recognition. Public men who are disliked as well as those who are loved, come in for this sort of honor, and that does not seem quite right. Those who have been loved should be honored by those who loved them. It was bad enough to cast a shadow over Mr. McKinley's memory by coercing contributions from workingmen through the heads of large establishments. It is worse, if possible, to abandon the public subscription and fall back upon congress. As tributes of affection, coercive and perfunctory contributions are about equally incongruous.

Ex-Congressman Warner, after a study of the new ship subsidy bill, concludes that it is as bad as the old one, which became so odious that its friends were obliged to desert it. And why should it not be as bad. Hasn't it the same sponsors and the same purpose? The only improvement to have been reasonably expected would be in its external dress and