

ing as a sort of an aid to the officer in command of our two companies, Maj. Geary. . . . A man is thrown down on his back and three or four men sit or stand on his arms and legs and hold him down, and either a gun barrel or a rifle barrel or a carbine barrel or a stick as big as a belaying pin . . . . is simply thrust into his jaws and his jaws are thrust back, and, if possible, a wooden log or stone is put under his head—under his neck, so he can be held firmly. . . . He is simply held down, and then water is poured onto his face, down his throat and nose from a jar, and that is kept up until the man gives some sign of giving in or becomes unconscious, and when he becomes unconscious he is simply rolled aside and he is allowed to come to. That is as near a description as I think I can give. All the cases were alike I saw on that occasion. . . . A man suffers tremendously; there is no doubt about it. His suffering must be that of a man who is drowning, but who cannot drown. . . . Some men would yield almost instantly, and would not be put through as brutal methods as I have described, while other men would have more courage or, perhaps, would be more ignorant, and they would be put through the stage where they were unconscious or almost drowned. . . . I think the men who were more courageous or perhaps did not have any guns suffered the most. By ignorant I mean that they did not really know anything to tell us.

This torture appears to have been practiced by the Americans or under their authority pretty generally throughout the islands. If it had been in Armenia by the unspeakable Turk, our churches would be thundering their demands for war to make the Turks stop. It remains to be seen whether enough ministers will follow the lead of their courageous but not very numerous New York brethren, who are appealing for their signatures, to make an influential showing in number and professional standing sufficient to oblige the Americans to stop.

In this connection it should be remarked that another ingenious method of torture in vogue in the Philippines for purposes of "pacification" and "benevolent assimilation" was reported in the Washington correspondence of the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper, on the

10th. It is known as the "rope cure;" and, in the complacent language of the Washington correspondent, "for simplicity it is unrivaled." Here is the description, quoted from John Loughran, who had seen it "administered to natives in the islands during the first year of American supremacy" (which was certainly before the natives had been discovered to be a cruel set of people):

A light but strong rope is passed across the throat of the man to be examined. It is crossed behind his back and carried under the armpits, the ends are again brought around the neck and over to the back, turned under the armpits and shoulders, and then the free ends are carried as a girdle around the waist just at the end of the ribs and tied fast and securely. A stick is put through the ropes where they cross between the shoulders and then turned to suit. "Will it make a man talk?" Mr. Loughran was asked. "A wooden Indian would make a speech if you gave him the rope cure," he replied. Mr. Loughran says that this was far more effective than the water cure, which is slow. The rope cure often persuaded a native to reveal the hiding place of his gun, and it did it quickly, because he knew that as soon as he consented to talk the stick would be loosened and would fly back, relieving the agony instantaneously. Of course, if the victim should have a weak heart he might die of shock, but the native Filipino does not seem to be troubled with the malady.

The American pacification of the Philippines is a promising candidate for the place in history of twin horror with the Spanish inquisition.

Another hue and cry over Senator Tillman was raised in the press a few days ago. He had again broken loose on the Negro question. But a comparison of his speech as reported in the Congressional Record, with the daily press reports, affords an excellent example of the unbalanced methods of reporting public matters now in vogue. In what Tillman said there was enough, though barely enough, to justify the sensational reports that went over the wires. On the whole, his speech was able, judicious and well tempered. But Senator McComas had dug up the "bloody shirt" and waved it in Tillman's face, ac-

companied with taunts about the maltreatment of the Negro in the south. It was in answer to this that Tillman furnished his adversaries with further material for campaign documents to be used among Negro voters and hesitating Republicans at the North.

We have had occasion before to criticize Senator Tillman's bitterness of mind toward the American Negro, and those criticisms still stand. But in fact he is no more bitter in that respect than the majority of the people he represents; and they are no more bitter than Northerners who go South to live. Southerners often say that the Northern man who settles there comes to have the same repugnance to the Negro race that they have, and this is true. In both cases the repugnance is due to a feeling, active in the South and latent in the North, that white men are superior beings whom black men were born to serve—precisely the same feeling that white rich men in the North have for all poor men, that the Hohenzollerns of Germany have for the common man of every shade. Tillman's distinction is that he is perfectly candid in dealing with the question. He makes no pretense. Thoroughly democratic until he touches the Negro question, he bluntly renounces his democracy when he does touch it.

But suppose that Tillman's attitude toward the Negro is as bad or worse than that of Lodge and Roosevelt and Root and the rest toward the Filipinos. What of it, so far as the Philippine question is concerned? That question rests upon its own facts and not upon Tillman's ideas of white domination in the South. No matter how reprehensibly wrong Tillman may be on the Negro question, that cannot make the administration policy right on the Philippine question. "You're another" may be good invective, but it is bad argument. Tillman himself made this clear enough in his speech in question. For partisan purposes Republican senators had goaded him

into making a characteristic excursion into the Negro question; but he came back quickly to the real issue, and in words which sounded the keynote of his whole speech, all but the discord which has been so magnified by the press, he begged the imperialists to put the "bloody shirt" back again into its grave. Said he:

But do not let us discuss these questions. We want you to vindicate before the people your policy toward the Philippines, to exonerate the American army from the stigma now resting upon it, and we propose to hold you to the issue. We will discuss the South; we will discuss the Negro; we will discuss carpet-bag government; we will discuss anything you want if you will bring in a bill affecting those questions, but we are not going to run off after foxes just now. We are after this Filipino coon, and we want his hide. . . . I think that if Congress had the authority, sustained by the Supreme Court, to pass an act forbidding any member of either body ever injecting into debate any discussion of the civil war or the revival of any of those bitter feelings of the past, it would be a blessing to our country.

No decision has yet been made by the President on the question of the American breach of neutrality at New Orleans, nor has any authentic report of the investigation appeared. But the general nature of the decision, should the matter ever come out of the pigeon hole in which it seems at present to be resting, may be surmised from an article in the *North American Review* for May, from the pen of an official of the state department. It is hardly probable that an officer so closely related officially to the question under advisement (or at rest) would have been allowed to publish an argument upon it in a popular magazine unless his argument were in harmony with the views of the head of his department and the probable decision of the President. It is interesting, therefore, to learn that this official concludes that the British mule and horse station at New Orleans, and the operations in connection with it, do not amount to a breach of American neutrality. It is also in-

teresting to observe that he evades the vital point at issue. This point is not whether American citizens may sell munitions of war to a belligerent, "in the ordinary course of commerce," which is the point upon which the state department official places his emphasis. No one disputes their right to do that. Nor does anyone dispute the right of the British to buy munitions of war in this country, "in the ordinary course of commerce." The question is whether they may establish on American soil an army supply station for the reception and shipment of munitions of war, not "in the ordinary course of commerce;" and whether they may enter an American port with naval transports and anchor there while they load those war vessels with munitions of war, "not in the ordinary course of commerce." On that question the state department official is silent. Will the state department, the law department, and the President also be silent on that point? At any rate, the legislature of Louisiana is not. A concurrent resolution passed both houses on the 13th, fully sustaining Gov. Heard in his protest to the President, and urging him "to take any such further steps, conformable to law, as in his judgment may be necessary to establish and maintain in this state obedience to the law of nations and respect for the treaties of the United States." Here is an earnest that, in at least one state of this Union, the merry dollar is not the advance agent of that "Destiny which determines Duty."

The supreme court of the District of Columbia, through Judge Bradley, has made a group of gratifying decisions on the subject of second-class postal matter, a subject to which we have heretofore had occasion to refer at length in terms of criticism (vol. iv., pp. 596, 628, 643) of the postal law, the postal regulations and the post office department. The court has by these decisions restored to second-class privileges some of the publications which the department had excluded, and has issued injunctions

restraining the exclusion of others which the department had threatened. Judge Bradley bases the decisions upon the ground that the post office department cannot legislate under the guise of making rules and regulations. It cannot exclude publications by a ruling, which Congress does not exclude by law. This principle is so simple, so sound and so obvious, if government by law and not by bureaus is to prevail, that it is inconceivable that a public officer should ever have questioned it. Yet it was questioned, or else deliberately defied, by the postmaster general when he made rulings—now reversed by the supreme court of the District—for which his department had vainly sought the sanction of Congress. Congress having refused to amend the law as he desired, he proceeded to amend it himself. This has now been stopped by the interpretation of the courts of the District.

The Postal Progress league, of which James L. Cowles, of Farmington, Conn., is secretary, proposes to settle all questions regarding second-class mail matter in the only fair way. This league suggests two classes, and only two classes of matter—letters and parcels—to be carried on the basis of cost. The second, or parcel class, would include periodicals; and as the charge would be based upon cost of service, the only just arrangement, there could be no discrimination such as now prevails, nor any danger of the censorship of new or small papers which is now threatened. From the biggest daily to the smallest weekly, every publication would be equal before the postal law. If the established rates would not pay, the necessary increase would be assessed pro rata, as it should be. Deficits would not then be reduced by excluding from equal mailing rights papers that were distasteful to the administration.

Whenever the post office department has given reasons for its crusade against unwelcome publications, it has