

President McKinley had been dictator for the past nine months, would have precluded him also from even trying a friendship-winning policy? Was there some iron decree of fate that doomed our name anyhow to become "from the word go" an object of execration to the Luzon population? That predestined every superior personality among them to become militant against us?

Hardly! It is safe to say that the governor perceives as much as any one the personal blundering and incapacity, and knows as much as any one that President McKinley is the sole culprit officially responsible. Yet like any Hun or Tartar, like President McKinley himself, his only notion of a remedy, now that we have committed the crime, is to kill, kill, kill our way through all its witnesses and victims. It is strenuous war, divine and glorious, and accursed be the mock philanthropists and weaklings who presume to call a halt!

I submit to Governor Roosevelt that here is a matter for a perfectly definite political issue in these states. Shall the mere killing policy continue, or shall it stop? Is a brown man's government, that has for nine months carried on a war against the finest white army of its size in the world, being beaten in every special engagement and retreating, yet holding together and never losing heart, and foiling us completely when the campaign, as a whole, is taken—is such a government as completely "unfit" to even be allowed to try the task of domestic administration as we have abstractedly assumed it to be? No government ever proved its fitness for trial in any other way. For God's sake, we say, then, let up on the fine fellows; give them a fighting chance with their government and see what they will do. It will be time enough to fall to and massacre them again when they shall have begotten an anarchy remotely resembling that which the McKinley policy has wrought. Therefore speak, write, agitate, in season and out of season, until that policy is reversed, or its sole proprietors and inventors are driven out of power.

And I submit that Mr. Roosevelt's attempt to turn this concrete political issue into an abstract emotional comparison between two types of personal character, one strong and manly, the other weak and cowardly, is an evasion unworthy the student of history which he is. He knows that courage is equally distributed among persons of divergent opinions and that taking one human being with another, all are abstractly equally willing to fight. He knows that the only difference between them that betrays itself in politics is as to the sufficient cause for fighting. To enslave a weak but heroic people, or to brazen out a blunder, is a good enough cause, it appears, for Colonel Roosevelt. To us Massachusetts anti-imperialists,

who have fought in better causes, it is not quite good enough.

Duties and responsibilities towards these islanders? Indeed, by this time we have them enough! We have done them such injury that it would be craven, indeed, to leave them exposed to similar outrages at the hands of other pirates as densely stupid as ourselves. With such a guarantee of safety to them in our hands, and with a dictator able to see things concretely beyond the field of American party politics, who of us can say that a modus vivendi with them might not be begun which might end, long hence, happily enough for us both?

#### THE ATKINSON INCIDENT.

It is well that the discussion of national policy, novel or otherwise, shall be on the lines of reason and conducted with calmness. Edward Atkinson is one of the most distinguished of American publicists, and with the single exception of the late David A. Wells, has been the most copious writer in this country upon economic and public subjects. He has chosen to write and print statistics bearing upon the commerce, climate and characteristics of the torrid zone, and to draw therefrom conclusions as to the wisdom of large expenditures of life and treasure in the conquest and occupancy of tropical territory. These publications he addressed to Admiral Dewey, Generals Otis, Lawton and MacArthur and to the members of the Philippine commission now in Manila. The civil officers of the government have been ordered to exclude them from the mails, and it has been done.

No one is prepared to defend the wisdom of Mr. Atkinson in sending his pamphlets to our highest naval, military and civil officers in the Philippines. They are all busy. It is a languid climate, and in their moments of repose we have no doubt those grizzled sons of Mars are more interested in a cool drink or the study of how to "shuck" some additional garment made necessary in the temperate zone but not conventionally nor physically required under a vertical sun.

Perhaps it would have been better to let Mr. Atkinson's pamphlets go and test the fidelity of those martial and civil officials by writing them that the same are on the index expurgatorius of the government and must not be read. To take the matter out of the mails may seem like a suspicion of immaturity on the part of these uniformed gentlemen, and the fear that they may be led astray by tables demonstrating the loss of revenue to the United States by abatement of the tariff on sugar. Mr. Atkinson has addressed himself to a quite impassioned table of figures on that and other subjects of equally vivid interest. The administration should

not permit itself to be misunderstood in this matter. That there is danger of misunderstanding cannot be denied.

Divers views are held as to the Philippine policy. Official tolerance and hospitality to the expression of them all would seem to be the proper American policy, consistent with the still prevalent idea of what American liberty means. In the period of our revolution Burke, Fox and Pitt in the beginning of that struggle took sides with our forefathers in revolt against the crown, and in parliament, clear to the end of the struggle, continued to speak and vote on the side of the Americans and in sympathy with their struggle for independence. The speeches of these English statesmen used to be printed in our common school readers as patriotic pabulum for American youth. We all gained from them not only a love of liberty but a high appreciation of the freedom of speech and tolerance of opinion maintained in England a hundred and twenty-five years ago.

For a century and a quarter it has been supposed that we have gone on in this country improving upon that freedom and tolerance. Let not the act of the civil authorities in taking stamped matter out of the mails be taken as a symptom that we have not improved. Let no one in authority do anything that will warrant the belief that there is less freedom of speech and tolerance of opinions in this republic than there was in England under George III in 1776.

Let nothing be done that will justify the fear that in escaping from British rule we escaped from more liberty than we have established for ourselves.

It will be seen clearly, and should be seen and understood at once, that every show of arbitrary power or sign of fear that a policy will not bear criticism and therefore comment must be suppressed gives strength to the fear that designs of imperialism and militarism are cherished, and that when they come it will be not only to rough ride the rights of subjects in the tropic, but to abridge the liberty of citizens at home.—Call, San Francisco.

#### CORN STALKS. THE CONSERVATIVE

is convinced that a machine which will cheaply cleave corn stalks and divide the nutritious stover from the pith will be equal in money making and money saving to three millions of acres of land in meadow for the state of Nebraska, which has eight millions of acres in corn.

Every acre of corn stalks which, by an economical stover-saving machine can be reduced to a nutritious cattle food will add three dollars, at least, to the income of the Nebraska farmer. Just as soon as such a machine can be perfected, patented and put into general use the farmers' income in Nebraska will be enhanced millions of dollars.