"Hysteria" in 1898 and Now.

Col. C. A. Woodruff, speaking on Saturday in defence of Gen. Smith before the court in Manila, alluded to "the hysterical public opinion" which had brought about the trial of "this gray, wounded, victorious general." It was in evidence that the victorious general had given orders to take no prisoners, to kill "everything over ten," and to make Samur a bowing wilderness; but he insisted that such measures were "sentiment," Col. Woodruff asserted, and he added that, though sentiment is an "excellent thing," there is "no place for it in war."

Now this may be sound military doctrine, on general principles. On such a defence Napoleon might have fallen back, or the Duke of Alva, or Gen. Weyler; but no American can possibly make use of it. Our mouths are stopped. As a nation we solemnly denied the validity of such a doctrine of cruelty in warfare, and appealed to the arbitrament of the sword in protest against it. We went to war with Spain for conducting war cruelly. We did not sneer at "sentiment" in 1897 and 1898, when stories of Spanish inhumanity and torture roused our indignation. Not for a moment did we admit that it was "hysteria" which set the country aflame with noble rage at the reported Spanish atrocities in Cuba and in the Philippines. No, that was the generous uprising of a humane people to put an end to unaccountable abominations. Talk not to us of military necessity. Urge no precedents. We would listen to none of them, but went to war calling men and angels to witness that our motives were of the purest, and that we resorted to arms only because our outraged nature could no longer endure the sight of miserable beings tortured and massacred by a ruthless soldiery.

It is this great fact, within the memory of all, which puts us out of court when we begin to philosophize about the necessary evils of war. We deliberately renounced any such defence for ourselves when we refused to accept it for those with whom we were in controversy. In demanding a better standard of others, we bound ourselves to abide by it. With what judgment we judged the Spaniards in 1898, it must be meted to us again in 1902. Not for us are the apologies to be drawn from that most comfortable apophasis, "War is Hell"; we put them all aside; we would hear no palliation, and vowed to high heaven that the conduct we complained of had no justification except on the principles of the devil. This is what makes it so impossible for us to come into court to-day with clean hands. Our own course we ourselves have derived in advance.

These Republican newspapers which are slowly plucking up courage to excuse the inhumanities of our war in the Philippines, take much satisfaction in reproducing the worst orders ever issued by Northern generals in the civil war. They recall what Sheridan did in the Valley of the Shenandoah, what black ruin attended Sherman's march through Georgia, and quote with delight Gen. G. K. Rice's saying of those countess Tennessee that "I believe our policy is to burn us these counties," together with Gen. Haleck's announced determination to "punish all whom I can catch, although I have no doubt there will be a newspaper howl against me as a blood-thirsty monster." To all which, we have to say that it does not in the least break the force of our present self-condemnation. These very examples from our own civil war were cited in 1898 as a reason why we should not madly rush into conflict with Spain for similar bloody incidents of war, but no one would pay the slightest attention. All the citation of precedents, even out of our own history, was then furiously brushed aside. It will as little avail us now.

Furthermore, we find a strange fatality, or an ironic stroke of fate, in this reopening of the wounds of the South. The Spanish war, we know, brought one of its many blessings in reuniting the severed sections of our country. The blue and the gray side by side in Cuba made the past forgotten, and a true spirit of brotherhood. After all this, there is something eulogistic in this latest sequel of the Spanish war. Northern newspapers are admitting, even boasting, that the worst grievances of the South against the Federal armies were well founded. "Yes," they are saying, "we harried you and burned you and shot down your men without distinction of sex, as Gen. Haleck put it. As Gen. Weyler treated the Cuban rebels, and as Gen. Arolas used fire and sword in the Philippines, so did our armies ravage the South." Thus the providential Spanish war obliterated all ill feeling between North and South!

Above and beyond all this, we have, fortunately, in the official utterance of President Roosevelt a moral and military standard which discredits all the apologists for cruelty. The President of the United States, Commander-in-Chief of all our armies, has declared that torture and massacre will not be tolerated under the American flag. No matter what the provocation, that offence will not be unpunished. This Executive deliverance is what clipped the periods of Senator Lodge's oratory on Monday. He undertook to tell the story of Philippine cruelty. That this has been extreme we do not doubt, though Lodge had nothing but the vaguest allegations to make. But this has nothing to do with the case. I call all such impinging defences as Lodge's an out of existence by the single broad assertion of the President: "Great as the provocation has been in dealing with foes who habitually resort to treachery, murder, and torture against our men, nothing can justify or will be held to justify the use of torture or inhuman conduct of any kind on the part of the American Army." Senator Lodge seemed to be dizzy aware that his entire speech was smothered in advance by that one sentence. That is the reason, perhaps, why he made his oration a specimen of smoking flax as easy to quench.

The Feckless Anti-Imperialists.

It is most provoking, we know, for Anti-Imperialists to pretend that they are still alive. They have been killed so often. After 1898 we were to hear no more of them. In 1890 they were again pronounced dead, although, like the obstinate Irishman, they continued to protest that, if they were dead, they were not conscious of it. Last year the slain were slaughtered once more, and that time buried as well, with all due ceremony. Yet, the impudent vestiges have resumed activity during the past few months just as if their epiphanies had not been composed again and again.

And the worst of it is that they seem to have acquired a strange power over the public and over Government. What the lonely and ridiculous Anti-Imperialists whispered in the winter which discomfits the great,280 they can now, by the formidable proclamation of the President of the United States, and have even compelled the approval of Congress. When Gen. Funston, for example, began his bloodshedding on the streets of Mexico, it was the formidable Anti-Imperialists who said that the President ought to reprimand and silence him, and how the jeers arose! That was just like the silly old impracticables—attacking a popular hero. But presently the said hero had a gag firmly inserted between his teeth by Executive order, just as if the Anti-Imperialists had been right about it from the beginning. It is not necessary to recall the triumphs of the mistaken beings in the whole matter of the Philippine investigation and of courts-martial for the implied offenders. Enough to say that, in the entire affair, the Administration and Congress have acted on the demand and as if by the advice of that handful of out-of-date and laughable persons, the Anti-Imperialists.

The phenomenon occasions much scratching of the Imperialist head. How to account for it? Imperialist editors and statesmen are puzzled. Their despair and helpless opponents are actually swaying the policy of Government. It is absurd, of course, quite preposterous, but there stands the fact. It is all very fine, and it's lots of fun, to make merry at the expense of
wrong-headed people who get in the way of national progress, and hope to turn back the hands on the dial of evolution, but how if they succeed? Prodigiously unreasonable, it goes without saying, and truly disgusting to the well-ordered mind of the Imperialist; but what is the explanation?

Very simple, coolectors of the Empire, we assure you. All you have to do is to remember that Anti-Imperialism is only another name for old-fashioned Americanism, and all will be clear to you. An American who has settled body of convictions, as to which he is ready to speak out at a moment's notice, and which he is ready to apply promptly and sharply to every fresh set of circumstances that turns up; who with his inherited ideas has an inherited courage, an inherited love of equality and of justice; who has also a sense of humor which cannot be imposed upon by Uncle Sam masquerading in Louis Quatorze garments—why, he is a natural Anti-Imperialist, and it is simply his Americanism that makes him think and act as he does.

We have had some beautiful illustrations of this truth in the weeks last past. What is the true American way of dealing with a rampent military ban-quetor like Funston? Or with news from the Philippines that makes the blood boil? It is to say on the spot what you think, if it is not? Well, that is exactly what the Anti-Imperialists did. It was the other sort who looked at each other in wild surmise, wondered if they dared say anything at all, kept still until shame finally drove them into mumbling speech, and acted in all ways as if they were the terrified and hunted; afraid to say the soul was theirs. Is that Imperialism? We do not know. We only know that it is not Americanism, and that in this case, as so many times before, the citizens who first found their voices, who first spoke out their honest indignation and made their righteous demands, were the ones to move public opinion and to influence official action, while the para- teners and the apologists had to come shamefacedly after.

And it is, too, the "ancient humor," as well as the older staunchness, of true Americanism that has been coming to its own in the recent successes of the Anti-Imperialist cause. What are our anxious and solemn Imperialists thinking of when they imagine that Uncle Sam has forgotten how to take a joke? They gather about the old gentleman with attentive flatteries, and keep serious faces when he nervously asks them how his ermine hangs, and if his crown is on straight. All the while he would much prefer to have them laugh at him openly and tell him not to be a durn fool. May God in his mercy be showing us to-day how true is his descent in the right line of American humor by his con-}
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**Reformers and Apparances.**

Another version of President Roosevelt's reason for giving an avowed spoilsmen a lucrative Federal office is furnished in a Washington dispatch to the Times. It is that Mr. Roosevelt "liked" Clarkson. He made him Surveyor of the Port because "he knew him to be a big, strong man." It was not a case of yielding to "importunity;" the President "was as much pleased with the idea of making Clarkson Surveyor as were any of Clarkson's Iowa friends." This explanation sounds very probable. It pulsed with Clarkson as a man with that manner of Murray and Daniels—who man whom the President knew to be big and strong. Very likely, he is in the habit of calling the new Surveyor "Jim," just as he calls the others "Joe" and "Ben." He could not, of course, overlook the fact that Ben had omitted to mention that he was an ex-convict; but it would obviously be drawing it quite too fine for an admirer of big and strong men to refuse to appoint one of them to office on account of some miserable little technicality like having previously been denounced by Mr. Roosevelt himself as hostile to decent government.

Now we are quite ready to believe that President Roosevelt's intentions, in all this matter of the civil service, are of the best. We know that he has fought and is still fighting the spoilsmen of his party. His general standards of appointment are undoubtedly high. But what he seems to forget is the fact that good intentions cannot excuse a reformer for doing things which appear precisely like the acts of a spoiler, and that to jus-
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