

the free silver men to refrain from repeating the coinage clause of the platform of 1896, after the reception which the republicans had given to the state platforms that merely reaffirmed. Even the platform adopted in Illinois, which reaffirmed in whole and in part, in letter and in spirit, was described by the republican press, and even by some of the gold democracy press, as a backdown. This made it necessary to do what might otherwise have been unnecessary. The only alternative was to reassert the silver declarations of 1896 or to go into the campaign under charges of trimming. Bryan preferred the former course. Another reason doubtless influenced him. It was the evident intention of the mere "peanut" politicians of the party to make a reaffirmation the basis for a free silver campaign in the west, and the neglect to reassert it the basis for a gold campaign in the east. That was the kind of campaign that McKinley made in 1896. But Bryan is not like McKinley. Come victory or come defeat, Bryan is frank with the people. So the free silver clause was repeated because the democratic party stands for free silver. Any ambiguity on that issue would have been a fraud. At the same time it must be conceded, and this will be demonstrated as the campaign progresses, that the repetition of the free silver clause puts the money issue out of this election. Had there been no repetition the revolt of the populists and the free silver republicans, the anger of free silver democrats, and the letter of Bryan whether of acceptance or declination, would have given a new impetus to that question which even so fundamental an issue as imperialism might not have checked. As it is, the money issue remains in abeyance while the issue of republic or empire is tried at the bar of American citizenship.

And now it leaks out that Mr. McKinley tried to hedge on the silver question. Postmaster General Smith drafted a platform for the Philadel-

phia convention in which the party would have been made once more to oppose silver coinage "except by international agreement," and this statement of the issue Mr. McKinley approved. But the bosses were too much for him. Knowing that such a declaration wasn't worth a nickel for corruption fund purposes, they changed it to a flat-footed gold standard demand, which Mr. McKinley swallows as meekly as he swallows all the other doses that Hanna has prepared for him. The contrast between such a man and the man who notified his party that if it stultified him in its platform it must seek another candidate is worth studying.

An American military officer in the Philippines has been convicted and sentenced to be reprimanded for conniving at the looting by his men of Filipino homes. The articles taken from these "naked savages," as the imperialist papers delight in describing the Filipinos, were such things as one silver watch, two hypodermic syringes, one diamond glass cutter, one bugle in leather case, one lot of clothing, three canes with silver heads, one box canned goods, two bottles of wine, two bottles of rum, one double-barrel shotgun, one parasol, and one lot of coins. The convicted officer must have been surprised when in the formal reprimand he was advised that the army is in the Philippines to protect, not to despoil. As a rational being he must have observed that the army is there to do on a large scale what he allowed his men to do on a small one.

A letter published in the Omaha World, from A. F. Miller, Thirty-second United States volunteers, tells of a method of torturing Filipinos which is as ingenious as it is devilish. It is called the water cure. Describing it, Mr. Miller, with no little gusto, as becomes a Christian soldier bent on converting the heathen by force of arms, explains that the soldiers put the Filipinos—

on their backs, a man standing on each hand and each foot; then put a round

stick in the mouth and pour a pail of water in the mouth and nose, and if they don't give up pour another pail. They swell up like toads. I'll tell you it's terrible torture.

This torture is applied to compel the Filipinos to give up their hidden arms. In confirmation of Miller's story an officer, writing to the "City and State," of Philadelphia, also tells of the water cure; but he attributes its use to the Macabebe scouts whom the American government employs. The Macabebe is a bitter enemy of the Filipino, in much the same way and probably for much the same reason that the American Indian was bitter in his enmity toward the colonists of our revolutionary period. Like the American Indian, also, he is a savage. His employment, therefore by our government is analogous to the employment by the British government of savage Indians in the war of subjugation against the American patriots. The Indians scalped and burned their prisoners; the Macabebes flood theirs with water until they "swell up like toads." While it relieves our soldiers of the charge of brutality to attribute this torture to the Macabebes, the responsibility is only shifted from the soldiers to their government. Great Britain has been condemned by the civilized world for engaging savage Indians to torture the American revolutionists; shall we escape similar condemnation when it appears that we have employed Macabebe savages to torture Filipinos?

That extraordinary democrat, St. Clair McKelway, editor of the renegade Brooklyn Eagle, has evolved from his inner consciousness a principle of constitutional law of the first magnitude as a curiosity. Arguing for imperialism, he says that this republic as a nation "made the constitution and the constitution did not make it." As if that were not absurd enough, he adds that the nation "derives from the constitution no right and duty of sovereignty." Yet further he proclaims that "its sovereignty is in itself, not in the constitution;" and asserting that "its sovereignty