

cratic party win at the next presidential election imagine that Bryan's words can be treated with indifference. They have a portentous meaning to every one who would place the Democratic party upon the low plane of merely "getting there." They do not mean that Bryan must be nominated. They do not mean that any personal favorite of his must be nominated. They do not mean necessarily even that free silver coinage must be demanded in the platform or that any other particular demand shall be made. They do not mean that past issues must be galvanized. They do not mean that a faction must rule or ruin. But they do mean that there shall be no retreat. They do mean that the money power will not be allowed to acquire the ownership of the Democratic party as it has already acquired that of the Republican party, and that if it should succeed in seizing the party machinery another Democratic party will spring into existence which will at least make the success of the election of the candidates of the kidnaped Democracy impossible. They mean, too, that the acknowledged or manifest leadership of either Hill or Cleveland in the party organization would be regarded as a signal of danger. Those who hope for Democratic victory in 1904, might as well know, now as well as later—it is not a threat; it is a simple fact—that victory cannot be achieved under either Hill or Cleveland. It is not merely Bryan who says this, but also an army of Democratic voters who speak through him. Victory may be impossible without the leadership of Hill and Cleveland. It is absolutely impossible with their leadership.

To divert attention from the main issue in the Philippine question, the imperialists are raising a virtuous cry about "the honor of the army". It is not merely proved, it is conceded, that a general ordered that Samar be made a howling wilderness even to the extent of killing women

and children; it is boasted by the officer who received the order that Samar has been turned into a howling wilderness; it is admitted that the water torture was applied in numerous cases, and the Manila papers make no concealment of its being a general practice adopted not for punishment or retaliation but to extort information from prisoners of war. Yet the apologists for cruelty and the promoters of imperialism, from Mr. Roosevelt down, complain that condemnation of these atrocities amounts to an attack upon "the honor of the army," and ask a suspension of opinion pending investigation. What is there to investigate? The facts are admitted, even boasted of. The question is not whether accusations against the army are true, but whether conceded doings of the army are infamous. It is not whether Gen. Smith ordered indiscriminate killing, for he says he did; but whether indiscriminate killing is civilized warfare. It is not whether Smith and Waller made a howling wilderness of Samar, for one admits he ordered it, and the other admits he did it; but whether that is civilized warfare. It is not whether Waller murdered prisoners of war off-hand, without charges or trial, for he says he did; but whether that is civilized warfare. It is not whether the army all over the islands have administered the water torture, nor whether it was administered only in exceptional cases and under excitement in revenge, for the testimony is uniform that it was administered commonly and in the presence and with the approval of officers, and that in most instances it was administered to prisoners of war to extort information regarding their uncaptured comrades. The question at this point, then, is not whether this torture was in fact used for this purpose, but whether it is civilized warfare to extort information from prisoners by means of torture. If it is, then the honor of the army is as secure in this respect as army honor can be; if it is not, then whoever tries to divert at-

ention from these admitted atrocities, puts his own honor in pawn.

Some, however, of the Philippine atrocities are open subjects for investigation. Among these may be included the reconcentrado camps. Regarding them, it is said in behalf of "the honor of the army" that they are quite unlike the Weylerian camps of Cuba; that, indeed, they are really paternal institutions, into which the natives are invited for their own good but not forced to come. We are unable, of course, to deny these pretty descriptions. All we can say is that the pretenses of affection for the Filipinos which have been spread upon the records of the Senate Philippines committee appear, under the circumstances, to be somewhat over-acted, and that they are challenged by eyewitnesses. Here, for illustration, is an extract from a private letter now before us, written from the Philippines by one who, while he abhors, excuses what he describes:

In [one of the provinces, name excised to prevent identification of the writer] all the people, willy nilly, had to come into towns. All found outside after a certain day were to be shot on sight. I do not know whether these orders were made public, but of their truth I have no doubt, for I heard them issued by one officer to several officers under his command. . . . The crops in [same province] were burned and every living thing was killed outside the concentration towns—that is, everything seen. Now at first sight these measures seem horrible; and, I suppose, will remain repugnant to the merciful and humane no matter how long they are held up to view. But still they ended in three months a war that would have dragged on for three years or perhaps longer. If the slaughter of human beings can be justified at all (I think not), the short, severe method is better than the temporizing one, which starves the innocent and brutalizes the youth.

Of the truth of that description of the American reconcentrado camps we have no doubt. It is confirmed by the atmosphere even of the contradictory testimony. Nor have we any doubt that it could be proved if the Philippine committee of the Senate were conducting its inquiry as openly and thoroughly as investigating com-

mittees are expected to do. There was no necessity for reconcentrado camps at all (and it is admitted that our army established them), except to drive the inhabitants into them and devastate the country so that the enemy would have no place to draw supplies from. Is it not probable, then, that the people were driven in on pain of death and their homes destroyed? At any rate the question is whether the American reconcentrado policy has been what our correspondent describes or not. If it has not been, why not open the doors to testimony? Why suppress the facts? If it has been, why prate about "the honor of the army?" Why not either excuse the barbarity bluntly, as our correspondent does, or frankly admit, what all authorities on civilized warfare teach, that it is atrocious?

Meantime let us not be diverted from the main issue, which is colonialism, imperialism, un-Americanism, and not specific questions of cruelty. Cruelty is a nominal concomitant of colonialism. If the latter is just and wise and beneficent, the former must be patiently endured. Though it is right to expose the incidental cruelties for the purpose of illustrating the wickedness of the colonial policy, it is after all not particular outrages but the general policy that is at issue. The Springfield, O., Democrat, although it rather unjustly criticizes the Democratic senators for too much discussion of individual outrages and failing to center their fire upon the colonial question—unjustly because much attention was given to colonialism in those speeches—is nevertheless right in its main contention when it crisply says of the Philippine civil government bill:

It will rest with the saner Democratic press and speakers during the campaign of the Summer and Fall to enlighten the people upon the iniquities of this colonial scheme. The measure will have become operative meanwhile, but that will be no reason why its unconstitutional and un-American character should not be made known to the great masses of our patriotic people. The encroach-

ments of imperial power upon popular prerogatives throughout history have almost always begun in far-off provinces and, insidiously and unseen, crept like slow poison to the center of national vitality. The Democracy is the only herald left in the field to warn the people and arouse them to resist this liberty engulfing policy.

Mr. Mitchell's address to the public in behalf of the striking anthracite miners is an important document in more ways than one. It is important in the first place as a frank presentation of the case for the striking miners, and in the second for its exposure in detail of the cold-blooded policy of the coal trust. But one of its most important features is the proof it offers of the fact that our much vaunted prosperity, which Republican leaders have exploited for obvious party purposes and certain labor leaders have confirmed for purposes not so obvious, is a delusion.

It is shown by Mr. Mitchell that the average earnings of the anthracite miners is less than \$300 a year; and that while a 10 per cent. increase was granted to save the election in 1900, most of that was afterwards extorted by the trust as the price of abolishing an old powder grievance, and the remainder and more has been swept away by higher living expenses. The "purchasing power of a miner's earnings is less now," says Mr. Mitchell, "than before the strike of 1900," which Mr. Hanna settled so snugly on the eve of the presidential election. Nor is that all. Although wages have been raised only nominally, and their purchasing power has diminished, so that the miners are getting less than in 1890, their productive power has increased. The daily product per employee in 1890 was only 2.16 tons, whereas in 1901 it was 2.36 tons. And as to value of product the showing is similar. For the eleven years preceding 1901 the average selling value of coal loaded on the cars at the mines was \$1.48 per ton; whereas in 1901 the average price was \$1.87. That makes an increase of 39 cents in the value of the

product, while the operators themselves claim an increase in cost of production of only 13 cents, leaving a net gain for the trust of 26 cents. Here, then, is a sample of our boasted "prosperity." The trusts get an increase in product and values, while the workmen produce more but get less. This is the kind of prosperity which Senator Hanna regards as so good that it should be "let alone."

Mark Bangs, the Chicago lawyer who died this week at the advanced age of nearly 81 years, deserves to be remembered for more than his accidental fame as one of the oldest citizens, or his well earned reputation as a lawyer. He was a democrat—one of those democrats who retained their democracy through all the shifting positions of political parties, from his youth to the very latest years of his life. It was as a democrat that he became one of the founders of the Republican party, then the only party of real democracy; and as a democrat that he saw with sorrow this party of his young manhood turn from its ideals and become to the generation of to-day what the degenerate Democratic party of Pierce and Buchanan was to the generation of more than half a century ago. As Mark Bangs had been an anti-slavery man, so he continued. His abolition was not limited by the social crime of another section of the country than his own. It was a living and universal principle, which made him welcome the leadership of Henry George as that of a later prophet in a newer abolition for the destruction of a more subtle slavery.

#### THE LIMITATIONS OF EXPERTS.

It is a remarkable and very significant fact that experts are seldom pioneers. When Sir Isaac Newton has been named, the list of men who have ranked high as experts in any calling, yet who have led in the development of its great primary truths, is almost exhausted.

To be sure there are many who come to rank high after the truths they disclose have been generally ac-