

in succession the port holes cannot be opened at night, somebody is to blame and ought to be called to account.

It is difficult to get even a vague idea of the conditions that have caused the revolution in San Domingo, of which more or less intelligible reports have appeared in the American press during the past week. But enough has been printed to indicate that an American syndicate is at the bottom of the trouble. This syndicate, with Smith M. Weed, of New York, at its head, seems to have made a contract with the San Domingan government to collect the customs revenue for San Domingo. It is the old tax farmer system in a slightly new guise, a system which some of our smaller neighbors to the south have been inveigled by American philanthropists of the hoodle type into adopting. The San Domingo revolutionists rebelled against this method of governing by syndicate and contract. They were right. When a government ceases to administer public affairs for the common good and relinquishes its functions to private corporations, it ceases, in virtue of that fact, to be a legitimate government, and if there be no better means of displacing it, rebellion is necessary. All honor to the rebels of San Domingo for their brave and apparently successful fight against the infamous system of farming out to private syndicates that most vital of all public functions—taxation.

The news from Manila though meager is reassuring. Aguinaldo, the insurgent chief, is apparently about to take possession, if indeed he may not by this time have actually done so; and to the uneasiness of land-grabbing Americans whose sentiments Gen. Merritt expressed at the San Francisco banquet, he and his countrymen appear to be civilized enough to govern themselves and human enough to intend to do it. He guarantees protection to non-combatants, and safety to all Spanish soldiers who fall into the hands of his troops—with

a single exception, that of the Spanish governor-general. This functionary, with the barbarity which seems to be characteristic of Spanish warfare upon Spanish colonists, having offered a tempting price for Aguinaldo's head, he has been warned if he does not withdraw that offer there will be no quarter for him personally. It is to be hoped that the threat will be executed, as a salutary warning to official murderers everywhere. The insurgents, instead of being savages, have given evidence of a higher degree of civilization than that which the Spanish authorities have shown in their government of the Philippines, and if Spain could be trusted for three centuries to govern the people of those islands, these people may be trusted for at least a little while, by way of experiment, to govern themselves. At any rate that is what they purpose doing, and at present it looks as if they would be in possession of the islands and engaged upon the experiment before Merritt gets a chance to make a conquest. This is the most reassuring feature of the Manila news. Let us pray that before Merritt can capture the Philippines for the benefit of American land-grabbers, the natives will have conquered back their country for the benefit of themselves.

There is some reason to believe that Aguinaldo has had the sympathy and cooperation of the American authorities in the Asiatic region, in his ambition to establish a republic in the Philippines. Recent mail advices from Hong-Kong tell of an interview between him and E. S. Pratt, American consul general at Singapore, prior to Aguinaldo's departure for the Philippines, at which, after explaining the assistance he could give to the American forces, he guaranteed to maintain order and discipline among the native troops and to conduct the war humanely. He also declared his ability to establish a responsible government on republican principles, and said he would accept the same terms for the Philippines

as the United States intended giving to Cuba. As the result of this interview, so it is reported, Aguinaldo went to the Philippines and assumed command of the insurrectionary troops there; from which it is not unreasonable to infer that our government has placed itself in a position with reference to the establishment of an independent government in the Philippines from which it cannot with honor withdraw, and that, notwithstanding all the talk about appropriating these islands as spoil of war, we shall occupy the more honorable relation towards the much-abused natives, of a protectorate while they organize a free government of their own.

In connection with the question of taking advantage of the war to extend our territory, Gov. Tanner, of Illinois, who doesn't always deserve a good word for what he does or says, is entitled to the credit of emphatically pronouncing against this policy. Though he favors the annexation of Hawaii, he was reported in an interview last week as saying that on the whole he does not favor new acquisitions. "If we could annex the islands where war is now being waged," he said, "it would require a standing army of from 50,000 to 100,000 men, and that is not desirable." He believes we should take Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, and, establishing protectorates over them, leave the people "to work out their own salvation." Upon the assumption that he means temporary protectorates, to enable the people to get started without interference from malicious or covetous nations, Gov. Tanner has here indicated the true American policy.

The first official expression from any branch of the republican party as to the disposition of the Philippines and other territory captured during the war, comes from the Illinois state convention of that party, held at Springfield on the 14th of the present month. It sustains the land-

grabbing policy in the baldest and most offensive fashion. We quote it literally:

Resolved, That the United States should hold all the possessions it has conquered and may conquer from Spain until the Spanish government has agreed to give security that it will pay the United States indemnity for whatever cost that might have been avoided had Spain been a humane government, and also that the United States hold such possessions in the conquered territory as shall be advantageous to its interests in times of war and peace.

To appreciate the utterly dishonorable character of this declaration, let it be compared with the last clause of the resolutions of congress on the basis of which war was declared:

The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island—(meaning Cuba)—except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

After we are embarked in a war regarding which we have authoritatively expressed ourselves as opposed to utilizing it for territorial expansion, the republican party of Illinois tells us to change the purpose of that war and to keep all the land we capture—a proposition which would include Cuba itself. Nor is that the worst. In proposing that we keep the land we capture, the republican party of Illinois suggests no such humane purpose as the giving to its inhabitants of a better government, but as collateral security for the payment by Spain of a war indemnity, the implication being that upon receiving such indemnity we will hand all captured lands not over to the inhabitants, but back to the barbarous Spanish government. Is this in truth the sentiment of the republican party of Illinois? That question cannot be answered until the votes are counted.

How low and degrading is the note which the above quotation from the Illinois republican platform strikes, in comparison with the lofty sentiment of William J. Bryan's oration of the same day at Omaha, the spirit of which is expressed in the conclud-

ing words in which he says: "If some dream of the splendors of a heterogeneous empire encircling the globe, we shall be content to aid in bringing enduring happiness to a homogeneous people consecrated to the purpose of maintaining 'a government of the people, by the people and for the people.'" Were Abraham Lincoln to come among us again, that great republican would be much more likely to find congenial political fellowship with the Nebraska democrat who adopts and applies to the present crisis his Gettysburg sentiment, than with that Illinois republican convention which seems to have had no soul above land-grabbing.

Another plank in the platform of the republican party of Illinois is of general interest. A strong fight had been made by some republicans to secure a pledge from the state convention looking to the repeal of the Allen law, a measure which was bribed through the last legislature by the street car ring of Chicago, and to which a republican governor, for reasons which he doubtless appreciates but cannot explain, gave legal validity by his official signature. The resolution which these objectors to that measure asked the convention to adopt was as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that the so-called ALLEN law is opposed to the interests of the people, and should be promptly repealed. But the street car ring was too powerful, and the following compromise resolution was adopted:

The republican party will uphold the interests of the people, and to that end, if any legislative enactment is injurious to any part of the people or proves objectionable, the republican legislature can be depended upon to correct the same in the interests of the people. That "compromise" would be better understood if it were called a "confession." Well may Mr. Yerkes' personal organ, the Chicago Inter Ocean, refer to its adoption as a victory. Its effect upon the people, however, is best described by the leading republican paper of the state, the Chicago Tribune, as a "ridiculous resolution"

which "will provoke amusement at first, and then anger."

The purchased election of Mark Hanna to the senate of the United States will have been a good thing if the shame of it promotes the passage of the bill offered in congress by Mr. Maxwell, of Nebraska. That bill would require every senator, as a condition of taking his seat, to make oath that he has neither personally nor through others contributed or promised any money or other valuable thing to secure or aid the election of any member of the legislature by which he is chosen. To make this bill really effective, though, it should also prohibit expenditures in any other way to influence the choice of senators. Had a law like that been in force during Mark Hanna's senatorial candidature, the senate would be spared the disgrace of a senator whose election was so notoriously purchased.

Hard pressed for an argument against the silver democrats must those gold standard organs be which speak of the issue by the city of New York, under the direction of the Tammany democrats, of bonds payable in gold coin, as a stultification of the Chicago platform. That is a species of argument which ignores the difference between what is and what ought to be. Men may with entire consistency advocate what they believe ought to be, while practicing what they say ought not to be, if what they say ought not to be actually is. Suppose bonds payable in diamonds could be sold to better advantage than if payable in gold or silver, would Tammany be obliged for consistency's sake either to forego the advantage of diamond bonds or be committed to a diamond currency theory? What sort of cause is it that has to have the chinks in its argument filled up with such stuff?

There is danger, unless the people whose interests are threatened by the bill recommended by the committee on banking and currency of the lower