

tion they absolutely lost. The number of Democrats in the California delegation was increased from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896, though both were lost in 1900; that of the Illinois delegation from none in 1894 to 5 in 1896, and 11 in 1900; that of the Indiana delegation from none in 1894 to 4 in 1896 and the gain held in 1900; that of Kansas from none in 1894 to 1 in 1900; that of Massachusetts from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896 and 3 in 1900; that of Michigan from none in 1894 to 1 in 1896, which, however, was lost in 1900; that of New York from 5 in 1894 to 6 in 1896 and 12 in 1900; that of Ohio from 2 in 1894 to 6 in 1896, but reduced to 4 in 1900; that of Nebraska from none in 1894 to 2 in 1900; and that of New Jersey from none in 1894 and 1896 to 2 in 1900; while the Democratic delegation from the Southern state of Tennessee rose from 6 in 1894 to 8 in 1896, remaining at 8 in 1900, and that from Missouri from 4 in 1894 to 12 in 1896 and 13 in 1900. Under these circumstances Mr. Cleveland crowds the line of delicacy very close when he implies that the Democratic defeats since Tilden's day are chargeable to Bryan's leadership.

The speech of David B. Hill on the occasion of this Tilden club "harmony" banquet, is not open to the criticism that it all ran to "fat." Hill did say things. And the things he said were Democratic in substance as well as verbiage. One of them is especially worth quoting, because it puts into compact form a sentiment which needs just now to get emphatic expression. Referring to the Republican trick of confusing the government with the party in power as if they were the same, and taking President Roosevelt's Decoration Day speech as his text, Mr. Hill mentioned that speech as—

the partisan address of President Roosevelt, delivered on Decoration day, in violation of the proprieties of the occasion, wherein he purposely or inadvertently confused the well recognized distinctions which exist between the administration and the government, between the army and the gov-

ernment and between all the other officials of the government and the government itself, and assumed to question the loyalty of those who have ventured to criticize the cruel acts of a few officers of the army, who, if semi-official reports are correct, have undoubtedly disgraced the uniform they wear. This confusion of the state itself with the ruler thereof, is not new in history. It was Louis XIV. who once made the same mistake when he assumed to be France and uttered the famous declaration: "I am the state"—a remark which might have lost him his head in later times of less despotism; and President Roosevelt, in another sense, seems to have already lost his head when he forgets that this country differs from both ancient and modern France in that it is not a crime to criticize the army, or the President, or any other servant or servants of the people; and he needs to be reminded that this is a government of law—a government under a written constitution, wherein the right of every citizen freely to express his sentiments upon administrative questions is expressly guaranteed—and that loyalty to the government does not consist in loyalty to individuals or to the policies of those who happen to hold official positions. Loyalty to this government consists in attachment to our free institutions—in faithful observance of constitutional provisions, in respect for its flag as the emblem of civil liberty, in support of the authorities of the United States against the attacks of our foreign or domestic foes; but it does not consist in ostentatious professions of "intense Americanism," nor in indifference to the preservation or spread of republican forms of government everywhere, nor in suppressing free speech, nor in conquering the free people of other and distant lands who desire to govern themselves. . . .

That is the best democracy that David B. Hill has ever uttered, and he should have credit for it.

On another matter also Mr. Hill was more than usually radical and definite. While condemning trusts he demanded "free trade in all articles controlled by trusts," and said:

Everybody of discernment and intelligence must recognize the folly of the maintenance of a system of tariff taxation which enables manufacturers enjoying a monopoly of governmental favoritism here to undersell foreign manufacturers in the latter's own country and at the same time compel the people of this country to pay a larger price for the manufactured articles which they purchase in their

home markets than American manufacturers themselves are willing to accept from foreign purchasers in foreign lands. . . . The whole system of governmental favoritism, whereby the constitutional power to tax for the purpose of providing revenue for the needs of the federal treasury is improperly used for the purpose of building up one man's business at the expense of another's, by discriminating in favor of one industry as against another, is a vicious system which has long afflicted the country and which has grown more and more intolerable with years and against which Democracy has ever protested. It is utterly indefensible upon any just and proper principle of government. There is no justification for the exercise of the power of legislation to make millionaires out of one class of people and paupers of another. . . . If the policy of protection is to continue in whole or in part to be tolerated by the country it might be well to consider whether it were not better that its evils should not be attempted to be mitigated by piecemeal or popgun legislation, but that our efforts should be reserved until the country has become so surfeited with its monstrous injustice that it is prepared to destroy the whole citadel of protection and to return to a constitutional and just system of taxation for the purposes of revenue only.

If David B. Hill were a man to be trusted, that utterance could be accepted as the strongest and most satisfactory in the direction of free trade which can yet be hoped for. But to know Hill's record is to distrust his professions. He has always been a "peanut politician," with no political principles that he could not throw off or put on as seemed to him from time to time expedient. From such a leader the Democratic party may most devoutly pray deliverance. It were better for the party to suffer defeat at the election in 1904 as in 1896 and in 1900, than to suffer it after the election, as in 1892.

In responding to the challenge of the "harmony" banqueters to whom Cleveland and Hill spoke at New York, Mr. Bryan makes an indictment which is criticized for dealing in personalities. That is a weak evasion. Indictments always deal in personalities. The question is not whether Mr. Bryan's indictment is personal but whether it is true. Let no one who hopes to see the Demo-

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-