

der those circumstances, would our renewal of the war place us? It would place us in the position of prosecuting in cold blood, for real estate, a war of conquest. All the purposes of the war with Spain would have been accomplished in the withdrawal of Spain from western waters. If we then continued the war it would be for the purpose of seizing and appropriating land in another hemisphere, the sovereignty over which was in no wise involved in the questions which alone justified our war at its beginning.

And if in order to conquer the Philippines we renewed the war, whom should we be fighting? Not so much the Spanish as the Filipinos, who are struggling for independence. That indeed will be so whether we buy the Philippines of Spain or conquer them from her. We shall in either case have the Filipinos to subdue. And wouldn't we then be a spectacle for gods and men? Behold a nation founded upon the principle of government of the people, by the people and for the people—behold that nation taking over from an autocratic nation the bloody work of subduing a people who are fighting for liberty, fighting for their God given right to govern themselves! When the United States engages in putting down the Philippine rebellion, either for Spain, or as Spain's assignee or conqueror, we may fitly celebrate the event by striking out the second letter from "Old Glory's" second name.

It makes one's blood tingle with satisfaction, at a crisis like this, to hear the inspiring words of Senator Hoar. He is a republican, but his republicanism is impregnated with the democratic spirit of the anti-slavery conflict, and in an interview this week he said, answering a question as to whether he favored giving the Philippines back to Spain:

I think we should set the people on their feet, and let them govern themselves. My opinion is that if the United States acquires the Philippine islands to govern them as a subject or vassal state, the destruction of the American

republic will date from the administration of William McKinley.

Those words are prophetic. When subject colonies become part of the American system of government, then Lincoln's conception of government of the people, by the people and for the people will have perished, if not from the earth, at any rate from so much of the earth as rests under the shadow of the American flag. England may have vassal colonies and yet become freer than before, for England has never advanced in democracy to the point of resting her government upon the doctrine of equal rights. But for us to establish vassal colonies is to turn back. There is no comparison between the two countries in this respect. With nations as with men, what they do is to be tested not by the thing in itself but by its relation to them. The sot who had reduced his daily tippie to a dram would be improving; the teetotaler who increased his to a dram would be backsliding.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the cable rumor is true that Spain intends to repudiate her Cuban debt, leaving the bondholders to look for reimbursement directly to such government as may acquire sovereignty over Cuba. Possibly this rumor has been started merely to make a bear raid upon the bonds, in expectation of their being cared for in the end. Nevertheless, the repudiation is not improbable; and if it occurs it will be one of the most wholesome events in modern history. Ever since England stepped into Egypt in the interest of European bondholders, the whole world has been drifting toward a system of government of the people by bondholders and for bondholders. National bonds have come to be regarded in the realms of "high finance" as most secure investments; and a little sharp experience with repudiation might be a salutary warning to "high financiers" and the mob of investors who furnish them with "money to loan."

In commenting upon the usurpation, and the massacre of blacks, at Wilmington, N. C., just after the election, the Outlook plays with dubious skill in a role with which it is not altogether unfamiliar, that of Mr. Facing-both-ways. Starting out to give a southern view of the matter, meaning a southern white view, it shows beyond controversy, as it could not help but do, that the whites deliberately conspired to kill the negroes if they outvoted the whites. That should be enough to condemn the whites; but the Outlook goes on to express what it has the hardihood to call a "moral judgment," which is this, that the "primal cause" of the massacre was not the determination of the whites to ride rough-shod over the golden rule and to abolish the declaration of independence, but "the unstatesmanlike endeavor made at the close of the civil war, to establish universal suffrage in the south, without respect to either intelligence or character." That is, the denial to the negroes, by threats of murder, of all right to a voice in the government by which they were to be governed, was caused by the law which invested them with that right! This is very much as if one should say in defense of a robber who while under arrest should shoot the sheriff, that the "primal cause" of the shooting was the unstatesmanlike law against larceny.

It will be seen that the Outlook goes to the core of the question. It doesn't believe in universal suffrage, but believes that some of the governed have the right, law or no law, to govern the rest; and it carries this undemocratic, not to say un-Christian, doctrine to its logical conclusion. If the law giving suffrage be defied by the "respectable" and "intelligent," who incidentally commit murder, then so much the worse for the law. It is due to the Outlook to say, however, that it denounces the acts of the whites as criminal. But its reason for the denunciation is unique. Those acts were criminal not because