

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1902.

Number 211.

LOUIS F. PÓST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

At an interview in the White House, duly heralded by the press, between Mr. Roosevelt and Helen Keller, the young woman who in spite of having been blind and deaf from infancy has become an intellectual wonder, Mr. Roosevelt entertained his sensitive guest with a story of how one of his boys enjoyed a rabbit hunt in the White House grounds. Does this man ever think of anything but killing?

In his bid this week at the Tammany "harmony" dinner for the Democratic nomination for the presidency, David B. Hill urged upon the party the importance at this time of unity and aggressive action. Aggressive action in what? Unity for what? Not the tariff, surely; for Hill is as good a protectionist as Roosevelt. Not the money question; for he stands as unflinchingly for hard money and the national bank of issue system as Mr. Gage, or Mr. Shaw. Not imperialism; for if he is opposed to that he has thus far borne the infliction with great fortitude and singular reticence. Not direct taxation; for he prefers indirect taxes, which surreptitiously rob the poor, to an income tax that would fall upon the rich. Not anything that would prejudice the interests of property in legal privilege; for as a thick and thin defender of established privilege he yields to no plutocrat in the land. Upon what principle, then, and for what policy can the Democratic party unite with Mr. Hill? If for anything under heaven which the Republican party does not already represent more efficiently, we should like to be en-

lightened. As at present advised we discern no other motive for a reunion of the Democratic party with Mr. Hill than an earnest hope and a lively expectation of sharing in the spoils of office. For that policy, and for that alone, Mr. Hill stands preeminent.

Senator Depew has saddled the constitutional amendment for the election of senators by popular vote, with a clause requiring that "the qualifications of citizens entitled to vote for United States Senators and representatives in Congress shall be uniform in all states." His implication is that in fixing these uniform qualifications his party in Congress will secure the Negro in the south his right to vote at least for members of both houses of the national legislature. The primary object of the tricky clause is probably what it is suspected to be, a weapon to force Southern senators and congressmen to oppose the principle of popular election of senators. Incidentally, however, the Republican managers expect to get some cheap capital out of the matter by pretending to be the very good friends of the Negro race. If they were really friendly to Negro suffrage rights they would not confine their efforts to making such a clause the condition of an amendment to which it is not especially related. They would at once take steps to secure those rights to the Negro regardless of the senatorial election amendment. But there is possibly an ulterior motive. Suppose the Depew condition were conceded. Suppose Congress were given power to make those uniform suffrage qualifications. Is there any certainty that the qualifications would be broadened so as to include the disfranchised Negroes of the South? Is it not as probable that they would be narrowed so as to exclude great bodies of enfranchised,

white men as well as Negroes everywhere? What better opportunity to perpetuate its power could a plutocratic party already in control of Congress want, than authority to define the qualifications of voters for its successors? May not Mr. Depew be working only nominally for the Negro and more liberty, but really for the great corporations and more restrictions?

The third successive Democratic victory in Cuyahoga county, Ohio, under the leadership of Tom L. Johnson, is attracting marked attention all over the country. It is made especially notable because, for one thing, this is a Republican county, and for another, the Republicans appear to have been generally successful elsewhere in the state at the recent local elections. In these circumstances another fact regarding the spring elections in Ohio is significant. In Loraine, in a neighboring county, Joseph King became the Democratic candidate for mayor at Johnson's suggestion; and, although this town had never before in its history elected a Democrat to office, Mr. King received a plurality of 70 votes. The truth is that Johnson's methods are becoming as acceptable to the people as they are peculiar to politics. Candor and fidelity have been the chief points of his political policy. His purposes are radical, his plans are conservative, his judgment is sound, and his word is at par. These are the qualities that are making him, indeed have already made him, the Democratic leader in Ohio. He is a leader who leads.

One thing about Johnson is only just coming to be recognized at its full value—his civil service policy. He believes in the merit system, and unlike some more pretentious civil service reformers in office, he is apply-

ing it with the same bold confidence and open candor that characterize all he does. Already, for the first time in the history of Cleveland, three important departments of local government have been rescued from the spoils system. One is the water department, which Johnson has placed in charge of Prof. E. W. Bemis, to whom he has given in fact and not as a pretense—as recent developments have fully shown—a free hand to manage the department without reference to party politics, but in the best interests of the city. Another is the city treasury. Upon the death of the republican incumbent, Mayor Johnson appointed Mr. Coffinberry, who was known to be his candidate for the office at the recent election, and Mr. Coffinberry has placed that office upon the merit basis. The third is the public school system, to the head of which Starr Cadwallader was chosen at the same election. Mr. Cadwallader, who was universally regarded during the campaign as the candidate of Mayor Johnson, to whose influence the nomination and election was unquestionably due, has supplanted the Republican spoils system heretofore prevailing in the school management in Cleveland, by the non-partisan merit system. And much to the surprise of old-fashioned politicians, Mayor Johnson's civil service policy has actually strengthened him and his party in politics.

Johnson's possibilities as Democratic leader in Ohio are naturally enough disturbing the Republican managers. They do not understand his kind of politics as well as the voters who have had a chance to express themselves upon it seem to. They are frank enough to admit that Johnson's third successive triumph in Cuyahoga as Democratic leader, means for them a hard battle for supremacy in the state next fall; and they don't conceal the fact that Johnson has them badly frightened. At the same time they are manufacturing an abundance of campaign material for him. Not only are they

openly identifying the Republican party with the street railroad and the steam railroad monopolies, and trying to rip up the government of Cleveland (established by their own legislation and enjoyed by them for more than a decade), so as to deprive Johnson of the power the people have reposed in him and which he has used faithfully in the public interest; but they have in addition enacted tax laws for the state the operation of which ought to damn a far better party than the Republican party of Ohio has come to be.

The Ohio tax laws which have just been enacted were proposed by the Republican governor and forced through the legislature as party measures. They will save the steam railroads and other public utility corporations hundreds of thousands of dollars in the taxes they would have to pay if they were taxed on the same basis as farmers, merchants, mechanics, etc. Moreover, the laws are so drawn as to tax unprofitable private corporations of a given capitalization, and those that are only moderately profitable, more than others of the same capitalization which are profitable enough to put their shares at a premium.

Let us explain this remarkable legislation. To establish the eminently sound policy of home rule in taxation, the Democrats in the legislature proposed bills abolishing the general tax levy of the state and charging the deficiency, as it might appear from year to year, to the various counties in proportion to their respective tax totals for local purposes. This would have relieved the state of its pestiferous board of equalization, for the apportionment would have been arrived at by a simple arithmetical calculation, mere clerical work, and every county could have been left wholly free to raise public revenues in its own chosen way. But that was not satisfactory to the party of tax-dodging monopolists. Its political patrons and legislative beneficiaries would have been in danger under such a system

of being taxed equally with other interests. Yet it was anxious to pose for home rule in taxation, which is popular in Ohio. So two Republican "home rule" tax bills were passed. Under these an annual tax of one per cent. will be imposed on the gross receipts of steam railroads and other public service corporations. As they have heretofore paid one-half of one per cent. the reform will double their taxes, which seems, at first blush, like a bad thing for them. But it is not so bad after all. For under this law they will escape with an aggregate increase of about \$700,000; whereas, under the old law, taxed upon a 60 per cent. valuation like other property owners—and there was growing danger that with Johnson's advent into Ohio politics this would be done—they would have had to pay about \$7,000,000. It was quite worth their while, therefore, to accept the Republican tax "reform" measures. Another feature of these measures is of like inequitable character. All Ohio corporations are to be taxed one-tenth of one per cent. on their capital stock, estimated at par. Consequently every little business which has become incorporated, must, whether profitable or not, pay the same tax as a highly profitable corporation owning special privileges, if the capital stock is nominally the same. Thus, a corporation capitalized at \$100,000, but whose stock is worth only ten cents or less to the dollar, would be taxed the same as a telephone company capitalized at \$100,000 but whose stock was worth 200 cents to the dollar.

There is enough political dynamite in that Ohio tax legislation to blow the party organization responsible for it into fragments. This in itself, of course, would not be worth while. But the Democratic tax bills that were shoved aside by these monopoly-fostering tax laws are worth while. And after the comparison of the opposing policies the two sets of bills respectively stand for, which is certain to be made under Johnson's leadership this fall on the stump throughout Ohio, it

will reflect upon the intelligence of the average Ohio voter if the tax-dodging monopolies and their political friends are not worsted as badly in the state as they have been already in Cuyahoga county.

Why is it that Congressional resolutions expressive of sympathy with the resistance of the Boer republics to the efforts of the Tory party of Great Britain to subjugate their people and annex their territory, never see the light after once getting into the possession of the committee on foreign affairs? Why are they "held up"? Perhaps none of them ought to pass. Possibly the committee ought not recommend all of them or any one of them. It may be that the adoption of any of these resolutions would put our nation in a false light as a neutral power. We might thereby seem to be taking sides with and aiding the cause of the Boer republics, somewhat as in connection with the British army depot at New Orleans we are actually taking sides with and aiding the British empire. This, of course, ought not to be done. No resolution regarding the Boers ought to be adopted by Congress which would really conflict with our obligations of neutrality. But that is not a valid reason for burying the resolutions in committee.

The function of a committee is to inquire into and report upon matters referred to it, not to "pigeon-hole" them. Whether it reports favorably or unfavorably is for the committee itself to decide. But it is its duty to report. When it refuses to do that, the people have a right to complain. And this is what the committee on foreign affairs of the House does refuse to do with the Boer resolutions in its hands. It has "held up" some of them two years, and congressmen and private citizens have tried in vain to get it to make any report, favorable or otherwise, upon any. How is this accomplished? Through the chairman of the committee, as everyone familiar with congressional procedure knows. What the chairman wants

done his associates of the party in power, constituting a majority of the committee, agree to. Unless they do, they get no plums. It is the same with what he doesn't want done. Consequently, if the chairman of a committee wishes to "hold up" any matter referred to his committee, he does so and "no questions asked."

Upon Robert R. Hitt, then, the chairman of the House committee on foreign affairs and a congressman from Illinois, rests the responsibility for the long and comprehensive "hold up" of Boer resolutions in Congress. Of that there can be no question. But what is Mr. Hitt's motive? There can be but one motive for such conduct. If the resolutions ought not to pass, the chairman should report against them with the reasons. But if there are no valid reasons why they should not pass, yet they are objectionable to him, his only recourse is to bury them. And this is what Mr. Hitt has done with the Boer resolutions that have accumulated in his committee during the past two years or more. Opposed to fair play for the Boers, but conscious of the popular sympathy for them which prevails in his state and over the country, he avoids the issue by pigeon-holing the resolutions. Mr. Hitt serves the Tory party of England, by putting the Boers at an unfair disadvantage with reference to American sentiment. He prevents a discussion and vote upon the resolutions in Congress upon their merits, and thereby fosters the notion, of which the British ministry makes much, that in the South African war the sympathy of the United States is with the British. This ought to answer the question of the Chicago Tribune, which wants to know why Mr. Hitt should not be the next senator from Illinois. It is to be hoped that Illinois wants no sympathizer with British toryism to represent her in the United States Senate.

Senator Hanna is widely commended for his fidelity to Rathbone, the Cuban postal defaulter. This is as it should be. Was not Rathbone

the man whose name figured conspicuously in the charges of bribery in connection with Mr. Hanna's election to the Senate—the man who, as the Toledo Bee tersely puts it "handled the legislators who had to be bought"? If Rathbone did push Mr. Hanna into the Senate, it would be only fair for Senator Hanna to pull Rathbone out of the penitentiary.

OUR DEMORALIZING CONQUEST.

I.

The inhumanity which has characterized the American occupation of the Philippines can no longer be denied. It must now be either defended with bravado or confessed with shame. The trial and verdict in the case of Maj. Waller leave no other alternative.

Maj. Waller was court-martialed for killing natives in the island of Samar, not in battle but in cold blood after capturing them.

His plea in part was that the natives in Samar were treacherous. But he conceded that he had not put his prisoners on trial to ascertain their individual guilt. He had executed them off-hand, without regard to whether they were individually guilty of treachery or not. Defending this as being within the usages of war, he urged that without criticism he had dealt in the same way with "boxers" in China; and that not only did this conduct there go without criticism from his superiors, but it was practiced and approved by officers of the European troops. Indeed, they were inclined to make sport of the Americans for chicken-heartedness, because in other respects the American policy was excessively fair and humane from the prevailing military point of view. Maj. Waller admitted the execution of 11 of his Samar prisoners in this unceremonious fashion, justifying the homicide as a legitimate act of war.

But he did not rest his defense on that plea alone. He made a further plea, the nature of which strongly indicates that his motive after all was not to punish treachery, but to terrorize a stubborn enemy by giving them to understand that they were to receive no quarter. He testified that he had acted pursuant to the orders of Maj.

Gen. Jacob H. Smith, the American general in command on the island of Samar and his superior officer. His testimony in this respect was denied by Gen. Smith, but it was positively corroborated by three officers who went upon the witness stand at the trial. Gen. Smith's order, as recited by all the witnesses and as reported by the Manila dispatches, was to this effect:

I wish you to kill and burn. The more you kill the more you will please me. The interior of Samar must be made a howling wilderness. Kill every native over ten years old.

On the 13th the Waller court-martial made known the verdict which had been arrived at by a vote of 11 to 2. As reported by special cable to the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican and imperialist paper, in which it was published on the 14th, this verdict found that Waller had acted in accordance with the rules of war, the military necessities of the situation, and the order of his superiors. In other words, the execution without trial of prisoners of war taken by American troops in the Philippines, is regarded by American military authority as being within the military code of ethics.

Whether such base conduct is in truth in harmony with military ethics may well be doubted. The military ethical code is sadly eccentric when invoked in behalf of peoples too weak to assert its authority with force and too friendless to have it asserted for them by powerful onlooking nations; but it is hardly believable that it would justify the off-hand shooting of prisoners of war unconvicted of any offense.

One military officer of long experience in the field, a Republican at that—we refer to Col. Henry L. Turner, of Chicago—has spoken vigorously in condemnation of the theory of military honor which approves the Waller method of warfare. Interviewed for the Chicago Record-Herald of the 14th he said:

To me this principle is so horrible to adopt that I cannot help hoping there will be some qualification of the news received later. Probably there never was a more treacherous, blood-thirsty enemy than the American Indian ever fought by the United States army. And yet I do not hesitate to declare that had Maj. Waller drawn up 11 unarmed prisoners of the blood-thirsty Apache tribe and ordered them shot without trial, his lightest punishment under Gens. Grant, Sheridan, Crook, Miles, Custer or any of our old

line heroes, would have been dismissal from the army in disgrace or imprisonment for life. My own judgment is that Maj. Waller would have been tried by a drumhead court-martial and shot within 24 hours. That a man who has tried to justify the unwarranted killing of Filipinos by the fact that he had ruthlessly shot down the Chinese, should be acquitted with honor and let loose to continue the destruction of human life at his own sweet will is a matter difficult to realize. If campaigning in the Philippine islands has brought the United States army to the point where it justifies this class of warfare, the sooner the troops are brought home the better.

Much more agreeable to humane sensibilities is Col. Turner's view of military ethics than that of Gen. Funston, who at a Republican banquet in Chicago recently exclaimed, referring to the approaching trial of Waller—"I say, Bully for Maj. Waller!" It is to be most earnestly hoped that the banqueting Republicans who applauded that brutal exclamation do not really represent the ethical ideas of their party, but that Republicans like Col. Turner do.

If Maj. Waller's murderous act was not in accordance with the rules of war, as every honorable soldier and humane man must hope is the case, then the further excuse that it was justified by "the military necessities of the situation" must collapse. Even by the military code, military necessity cannot justify military crime. To justify either a general slaughter of captives or the execution without trial of particular prisoners, on a plea of "the military necessities of the situation," is to throw down all moral barriers to barbarism in warfare. "The military necessities of the situation," whenever a powerful foreign invader was baffled by the stubborn resistance of a weak people fighting for their native land, would always be sufficiently pressing, in the invader's estimation, to warrant a resort to barbarous methods. If it would justify such a departure from humane military ethics as Maj. Waller's, it would justify any departure which the achievement of success might seem to require.

That it has seemed to the baffled American troops in the Philippines to require revolting barbarities is now disclosed beyond the possibility of plausible denial. What Gen. Miles characterized as the "severity" of our military conduct in those islands, for which he was promptly rebuked, proves now to have been but inadequately described by him. The Wal-

ler verdict, together with the horrible revelations of the evidence, is an intimation to thoughtful Americans that here is only one instance of a general policy of inhumanity. But for some such policy, tacitly recognized and approved, Waller would hardly have ventured to kill his prisoners without a trial, no matter what their offense had been; Gen. Smith would hardly have ordered a slaughter of captives, and if he had, Waller would probably have disobeyed; and, last but by no means least, the Waller court-martial, had Waller ventured upon such an exploit, would not have acquitted him of the crime. The whole thing testifies to a contagion of inhumanity.

II.

That this shameful condition has long been known by the authorities at Washington has been more than suspected, and with good reason.

Why has Senator Lodge and his Philippine committee refused persistently to investigate charges of cruelty, if he did not believe that a thorough investigation would uncover what the Waller trial has begun to reveal?

Why has the secretary of war suppressed documents tending to expose the revolting situation, if he does not know, what the Waller verdict indicates, how very revolting it would be to the public mind.

Why is a virtual censorship still maintained at Manila, if there is nothing to conceal from the American people?

Why were all correspondents but those of the three monopoly press associations excluded from the hearings of the Senate Philippine committee, unless there was a purpose to keep the testimony "well in hand."

Every disclosure through private sources of facts like those involved in the Waller trial has been met with official denial or scouted as hearsay; and though the anonymous evidence—anonymous because the witnesses dared not reveal their identity lest they themselves might suffer from the same barbaric policy—has been abundant, the official probe has been strenuously withheld. The government itself has stood between officers like Maj. Waller or Gen. Smith and the American people, officially vouching, in the face of circumstantial reports to the contrary, for the humanity of the American troops in the Philippines.

In this connection, so loyal a Re-

publican paper as the Chicago Record-Herald, censures the war department in its issue of the 12th in these measured terms:

It is clearly exceeding its powers and rights as a branch of a representative government which is responsible to the American public whatever the truth may be. . . . It is known beyond doubt that it has censored press dispatches to the perversion of the truth, that it has concealed the facts concerning an outrageous mismanagement of the finances in the transport service, and lastly that its policy with regard to the stories of Weyerism in the Philippines has been one of persistent deceit. . . . the situation as we know it to-day brings shame upon us all. District after district burned, natives tortured, a population mercilessly cut down, and to crown all, editors imprisoned arbitrarily, not for sedition, but for printing stories of corrupt practices in American administration. The liberty of the press, with accountability for its abuse, is ruthlessly violated by the military authorities in the Philippines in wanton defiance of the first principle of American law. Surely the indictment is one that demands something more than protestations and excuses from Secretary Root.

Official protestations and excuses will pass current no longer. Both Secretary Root and the President have come to that conclusion, as their eleventh hour vigor testifies. One thoroughly authenticated and impressive instance of barbarity, indicative of the general policy outlined by the Record-Herald, was all that was needed to awaken the American conscience. Such an instance is afforded by the Waller verdict. That verdict, with the evidence upon which it rests, lends color of truth to all the reports of inhumanity that have attached to the American name in the Philippines.

And what a story it is that those reports tell!

"The 'water cure' has been administered to thousands of natives in the Philippines, at least in Panay," says a returned soldier of Kansas City, who had himself "seen it administered dozens of times" to natives and asserted that the practice was general in the island of Panay, and who approves it.

Other witnesses, produced before the Senate committee, not by the majority—who are responsible for the investigation but have been much more solicitous to conceal the facts than to permit disclosures—but by the minority, have fully confirmed the Kansas City soldier's story. One of

them testified on the 14th, as the Associated Press reports him, that—

he had witnessed the "water cure" at Igarbas, province of Iloilo, November 27, 1900. It was administered to the presidente, or chief Filipino official, of the town. Upon the arrival of his command at Igarbas the presidente was asked whether runners had been sent out notifying the insurgents of their presence, and that upon the official's refusal to give the information he was taken to the convent, where the witness was stationed, and the water cure was administered to him. . . . he was standing in the corridor of the convent, stripped to the waist and his hands tied behind him, with Capt. Glenn and Lieut Conger, of the regular army, and Dr. Lyons, a contract surgeon, standing near, while many soldiers stood about. The man was thrown under a water tank, which held about 100 gallons of water, and his mouth was placed directly under the faucet and held open to compel him to swallow the water which was allowed to escape from the tank. . . . When at last the presidente agreed to tell what he knew, he was released and allowed to start away. He was not, however, permitted to escape, and upon refusing to give further information he was taken again as he was about to mount his horse and the cure was administered the second time. This time the man was not stripped, nor was he taken into the building. Dr. Lyons said the water could be brought to the spot and given there, and when it was brought in a five-gallon can, one end of a syringe was placed in it and the other in the man's mouth. As he still refused, a second syringe was brought and one end of it placed in the prostrate man's nose. He still refused, and a handful of salt was thrown into the water. This had the desired effect and the presidente agreed to answer questions.

The other witness testified that— he had witnessed the torture of two policemen of the town of Igarbas. . . . the details of the "cure" were in the hands of a squad of the Eighteenth regular infantry, known as "the water cure detail." These acts were committed under the command of Capt. Glenn, who was judge advocate of the department of the Visayas. . . . the water was kept running four or five minutes, and the physician in charge frequently placed his hand upon the man's heart to observe the effect of the treatment upon that organ.

Here we have the fact that a squad was detailed to the special duty of administering the torture; and the names of the officers ordering the torture are given so that the witnesses may be easily contradicted if they have not told the truth.

But there can be no reasonable doubt that they have told the truth. The civil governor of Tabayas, an American army officer, officially confirms these witnesses and all others who tell of similar cruelties. For he declares in his report of last December, which the secretary of war suppressed, that this water torture is in general use. In the same report he accuses the American troops of extensive burnings to "lay waste the country so that the insurgents cannot occupy it." In this connection the letter of a soldier in Batangas province to the Rev. Lewis J. Bristow, of Columbia, S. C., published in the Chicago Chronicle of the 15th, is significant. Telling of the orders for a ten days' "hike" he says:

Our orders were to burn everything we passed, houses and food, all clothing, household goods, etc. We found quite a number of houses from which the inmates had fled, leaving everything just as it was when they were at home and happy. We burned it all. Another paragraph of the order given me instructed us to kill every living thing except women, children and very old men. Thousands of horses, cows, chickens, dogs, etc., bit the dust. On this march and every subsequent one these orders were carried out. You may think us a bloodthirsty crew, but you misjudge us. We do not shoot down these poor devils in cold blood, but always give them a chance to surrender; they won't do it, so we have to shoot. But I'll admit it is somewhat like eating olives—you have to get used to it.

These are but samples of a multitude of reports, more or less circumstantial and authenticated, all showing that the American troops in the Philippines yield their native sense of humanity to "the military necessities of the situation."

III.

Now that this long-denied and long-concealed but vigorously prosecuted policy of cruelty and extermination has leaked out through the Waller court-martial proceedings, it will not be enough for the government to explain it as a matter of retaliatory policy.

The evidence is abundant and conclusive that in the beginning the Filipinos were humane in their modes of warfare. Such cruelty as they have practiced did not precede, but has followed, the cruel methods of the Americans. Our troops adopted the "water cure" not in retaliation, but confessedly to extort information. They have laid waste and exterminat-

ed, not to "get even," but on account of "the military necessities of the situation." Baffled by a stubborn people defending their homes, our army began a series of campaigns which, as Gen. Hughes has cautiously admitted before the Senate committee, could not be called civilized warfare.

Under these circumstances the plea of retaliation for Filipino barbarities will not serve our government as an excuse for the barbarities which it appears to have tolerated and which it has certainly tried to conceal.

Neither will it do to shed official tears of regret, and promise vigorous measures of reform. The condition is chronic and will not yield to any efforts at mere reform.

Gen. Hughes was correct in his thought when, before the Senate committee, he said that new commanders coming into the field would start in to conduct their work much "easier" than the old ones; that "they would come into the country with their ideas of civilized warfare and were allowed to get their lesson." That is, "the military necessities of the situation" speedily converted humane officers into barbarians.

In the nature of the case it must be so. We could not take upon ourselves the colonial tasks of Spain, without resorting to Spain's revolting methods. If our human nature seemed before to be better than Spanish human nature, it was not because we were in reality morally superior to the Spanish; it was because we had not yet had the Spanish temptations. With those temptations we have become as Spanish as the Spaniards.

When any powerful nation undertakes the conquest of a weak people, one of two things is inevitable: either the weak people will submit upon realizing the hopelessness of resistance, as the unwarlike Asiatics have usually done; or they will fight until exterminated, as did the American Indians, or until they repel the invader, as did the Americans a century ago and the Swiss centuries before. If they submit, the work of conquest is easy. But if they resist and resist as the Filipinos did against Spain and are now doing against Spain's assignee, then the war of conquest turns—especially if the resisting inhabitants are an "inferior people"—into a war of extermination, with all the cruelties which such a war naturally begets. In that case it is as Gen. Hughes indicated with reference to the American occupation of

the Philippines. Humane officers who replace those that have become inured to cruelty, come into the country with exalted ideas of civilized warfare, and are allowed to get their lesson; which is this, that in such a war "the military necessities of the situation" justify the execution without trial of prisoners of war, require the use of cruel methods to extort information from reticent natives, excuse the wholesale slaughter of able bodied inhabitants and upon occasion even of women and old men and children above ten, and demand the utter devastation of vast areas of country so that the "rebels" cannot occupy it.

The humane tenderfoot of an officer does get that lesson. It is the only lesson he can get. Being under orders to "pacify" the country, he learns to pacify it in the only possible way. It is no native inhumanity of our soldiers that has made the story of our occupation of the Philippines a shameful and inefaceable blotch upon our history. It is "the military necessities of the situation" which our imperialist world-power policy has produced. Not individual military officers, but imperialism is responsible for it all. The true remedy, consequently, is not a futile policy of sending out new levies of humane officers, to be turned in due time into unspeakable barbarians, but an honorable course more in consonance with our national ideals. We must restrain our world-power ambitions. We must recede from our blood stained attempt at Philippine conquest. We must repudiate our whole greedy, grasping, hypocritical and conscience-deadening policy of benevolent assimilation. It is better to be accused of a national "scuttle" than to be longer guilty of a national crime.

IV.

How different the whole sorrowful situation might be, had we as a nation met the temptation to be a world-power empire with the sturdy command: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" We should then have conquered nobly by the spiritual force of high ideals loyally lived out; and a flourishing republic off the coast of Asia, modeled upon our own, would now look trustfully to this nation as its exemplar in government.

For, let it not be forgotten, the Filipinos had set up a flourishing and order-preserving republic before the present war began. That republic exercised actual jurisdiction over nearly all the Philippine archipelago, as

Gen. Anderson, the first American commander in the Philippines, has testified. In an article in the North American Review for February, 1900, Gen. Anderson wrote, referring to the period of the surrender of the Spanish in August, 1898:

We held Manila and Cavite. The rest of the island was held not by the Spaniards, but by the Filipinos. On the other islands the Spaniards were confined to two or three fortified towns.

And that occupation was peaceably maintained, the republic being recognized by the inhabitants and law and order prevailing. This was true at least of the island of Luzon, and there is no reason to doubt that it was true elsewhere. As to Luzon, we have the testimony of Leonard R. Sargent, a naval cadet, who, with a naval paymaster, W. B. Wilcox, spent the months of October and November, 1898, in a semi-official investigation of the interior of the island. Writing to the Outlook for September 2, 1899, Sargent said of this republic:

It cannot be denied that, in a region occupied by many millions of inhabitants, for nearly six months it stood alone between anarchy and order. . . . We traveled more than 600 miles in a very comprehensive circuit through the northern part of the island of Luzon, traversing a characteristic and important district. In this way we visited seven provinces. . . . As a tribute to the efficiency of Aguinaldo's government and to the law-abiding character of his subjects, I offer the fact that Mr. Wilcox and I pursued our journey throughout in perfect security, and returned to Manila with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which we found the natives to be leading under the new regime.

It was not until the American government interfered that this Philippine republic ceased to stand "between anarchy and order." Then it ceased to do so only because the President of our country gave it a death blow. And that blow was struck six weeks before the first battle. The American republic—which ought to have conserved instead of destroying the Philippine republic—declared war upon it by asserting a hostile sovereignty. We refer to the President's proclamation, promulgated by Gen. Otis on the 4th of January, 1899. At page 66 of his report of "military operations and civil affairs in the Philippine islands," for 1899, Gen. Otis explains certain significant alterations which he made in the language of that proclamation in order to render it less

unpalatable to the people of the islands. He says:

After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos with whom I was daily discussing political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein, such as "sovereignty," "right of cession," and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives. The ignorant classes had been taught to believe that certain words, as "sovereignty," "protection," etc., had peculiar meaning disastrous to their welfare and significant of future political domination, like that from which they had recently been freed.

Although Gen. Otis suppressed these significant and "tersely expressive" words, he did not suppress the essence of the hostile proclamation; but, as appears from his report at pages 68 and 69, he issued a pronouncement of his own, as "military governor of the Philippine Islands," in which he quoted the following from the President's proclamation of sovereignty:

... there will be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority to repress disturbances, and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine islands.

Notwithstanding the suppression of such "tersely expressive" words as "sovereignty," this pronouncement of the American "military governor" over the peaceable republic already described, did not vary in substance from the President's. If it had it would have made no difference; for by an accident the President's got published about the same time—with all its incautious though "admirably employed" words so "tersely expressive" of actual conditions, such as "right of cession," "immediate occupation" and "sovereignty."

After that, the fighting was only a question of time. The war had been proclaimed. Friendliness and peace with the new republic were impossible after the United States had asserted sovereignty over all its territory.

Not only did this sovereignty proclamation amount to a declaration of aggressive war against the new republic.

It involved an act of perfidy. For the Filipino republic, admitted by our own officials to be actually organized and beneficently and peacefully governing, had been our ally in the war with Spain.

This is denied. Like the policy of cruelty and extermination now disclosed, it has been denied persistently. Only a few days ago it was denied under oath by Gen. Mac Arthur while testifying before the Senate committee. Having been asked a question by Senator Culberson, based upon an assumed state of facts, Gen. Mac Arthur answered, as reported by the Associated Press through the papers of the 13th—

"Assuming the facts to be as stated," the witness replied, "if that were all there is in the premises it might be admitted that the inference was to be drawn as indicated. But there are other facts which form a part of the case and which show the cooperation in the attack on Manila was not a voluntary one on our part. Gen. MacArthur then related that on the evening previous to the attack upon Manila, after Gen. Merritt had issued his order of battle, Gen. Anderson received a communication from Gen. Merritt directing the latter to inform Aguinaldo that the battle which was to take place the next day was to be between the Americans and the Spaniards, and that he must not participate under any circumstances. The message was sent to Aguinaldo by wire. The Filipino leader received it, but declined to accept the suggestion, and he and his native force participated in the engagement the next day.

It is not necessary to raise an issue of fact with Gen. Mac Arthur in order to prove that there was a military alliance. Entirely apart from the question of cooperation in the battle referred to by Gen. Mac Arthur, the evidence of an alliance is indisputable. No attempt has been made to dispute it. Though the conclusion that there was an alliance is denied, the facts upon which that conclusion rests are not. They are as follows:

The Filipinos were at war with Spain when Dewey's squadron entered Manila bay on that memorable May morning of 1898. This is proved by consular dispatches printed in "Senate document 62," of the Fifty-fifth congress, third session. Thus:

Conditions here and in Cuba are practically alike. War exists, battles are of almost daily occurrence, ambulances bring in many wounded, and hospitals are full. Prisoners are

brought here and shot without trial, and Manila is under martial law. The crown forces have not been able to dislodge a rebel army within ten miles of Manila, and last Saturday, February 19, a battle was there fought and five dead left on the field.—American Consul at Manila, Feb. 22, 1898, p. 319.

Insurrection is rampant; many killed, wounded, and made prisoners on both sides. A battleship, the Don Juan de Austria, sent this week to the northern part of Luzon to cooperate with a land force of 2,000 dispatched to succor local forces, overwhelmed by rebels. Last night special squad of mounted police were scattered at danger points to save Manila. . . . Rebellion never more threatening to Spain.—Same, Mar. 19, 1898, p. 320.

Cuban conditions exist here possibly in aggravated form. Spanish soldiers are killed and wounded daily, despite claimed pacification, and the hospitals are kept full.—Same, Mar. 27, 1898, p. 321.

In these circumstances, when Dewey was about to sail for Manila bay from Hongkong, he telegraphed to the American consul at Singapore, where Aguinaldo was in exile (see same Senate document, p. 342):

Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible.

Aguinaldo went accordingly to Hongkong, but did not arrive in time to sail with Dewey. Dewey provided for his transportation, however, and in a few days he was at work in Luzon reorganizing the Filipino army. This appears in the same Senate document at page 421, where Gen. Greene is quoted as testifying:

When the McCulloch went to Hongkong early in May to carry the news of Admiral Dewey's victory, it took Aguinaldo and 17 other revolutionary chiefs on board and brought them to Manila bay. They soon after landed at Cavite, and the admiral allowed them to take such guns, ammunition and stores as he did not require for himself.

Also at page 347, where the Hongkong Free Press is quoted as saying that Aguinaldo arrived at Manila—on the 19th inst., and was received with great enthusiasm by the natives. Admiral Dewey was very much pleased with him, and has turned over to him two modern field pieces and 300 rifles, with plenty of ammunition.

Aguinaldo's subsequent great efficiency in serving the American cause against Spain on the land, in cooperation with Admiral Dewey on the water, is acknowledged in an official dispatch of June 16, 1898, from the American consul at Manila, printed in the same Senate document

at page 329 and written long before a single American soldier had put foot on Philippine soil:

I have the honor to report that since our squadron destroyed the Spanish fleet on May 1, the insurgent forces have been most active and almost uniformly successful in their many encounters with the crown forces of Spain. . . . The insurgents have defeated the Spaniards at all points except at fort near Matate, and hold not only North Luzon to the suburbs of Manila, but Batanyes province also and the bay coast entire, save the city of Manila. . . . Manila is hemmed in.

Of that situation, Gen. Otis himself reported at page 13 of his report of "military operations and civil affairs in the Philippine islands" for 1899. He said:

For three and one-half months Admiral Dewey with his squadron and the insurgents on land had kept Manila tightly bottled.

With the Spaniards—virtually the whole Spanish army of the Philippines—thus driven into Manila by the Filipino army, and held there "tightly bottled," by Dewey on the water side and Aguinaldo on the land side, before any American troops had arrived, is it strange that Aguinaldo regarded his army as acting in friendly cooperation with the Americans? Our own officers certainly viewed the matter in that light. When Commander Bradford, of the American navy, testified as an expert on military law before the American peace commissioners at Paris regarding Aguinaldo's operations, his reply to a hypothetical question was this (see same Senate document, pages 488 and 489):

We become responsible for everything he has done, he is our ally, and we are bound to protect him.

So long as all that evidence remains in existence undisputed, why pettefog about the question of an alliance at the capture of Manila? That Aguinaldo was an ally of the American navy in bottling the Spaniards up in Manila is an unavoidable inference from the undisputed and indisputable facts.

With perfidy toward an ally, then,—a contemptible ally, if you like, but one whose aid we solicited and accepted—and with unprovoked hostility toward a young republic—only "a little brown man's" republic to be sure, but one which preserved the peace, gave token of prosperity, inspired the devotion of its people and command-

ed the respect of our own investigators,—with this perfidy and unprovoked hostility toward those people, who were entitled rather to our gratitude and our encouragement, we, as a nation, asserted our absolute sovereignty over their country and drove them in self-defense to war. This wanton war of our own making has lasted three years and more, and without being yet ended, has forced upon us the additional stigma of resorting, upon the plea of "military necessity," to methods which even our own generals, while excusing them, characterize as uncivilized.

The quiet and orderly life of an unoffending people, which our naval cadet, Sargent, observed, has been broken up, and northern Luzon, through which he and Paymaster Wilcox traveled with safety and from which they carried pleasing memories, has been laid waste. The latest dispatches assure us that in all this region peace again prevails. But now it is the peace of the graveyard. Why have we caused this misery? Why have we devastated this country? Why have we remorselessly slaughtered thousands upon thousands of its inhabitants, not only in unequal battle, but also in cold blood after captures? Why have we tortured prisoners to extort information? Why have some of our generals commanded their subordinates to make no prisoners, but to kill all natives over ten years of age? Why do we carry on this contest which breeds inhumanity even in the hearts of the humane? Is it because those people resist our assumption of sovereignty? Then why did we assert and why do we endeavor to maintain that power over an alien and unwilling people 10,000 miles away from our shores? Is it for their good, for their benevolent assimilation? From the President down, we all know that that is not the reason.

One of the real reasons was given by Gen. MacArthur to the Senate committee on the 8th, when, as reported by the Chicago Inter Ocean, a Republican paper, he mixed in with a lot of benevolent phrases and some fantastic evolutionary speculations, a declaration that—

the possession, the permanent possession of the Philippine archipelago, is not only of supreme importance, but absolutely essential to American interests.

That is one of the unvarnished reasons; and the others are like it, only on a smaller scale. Since the

islands are rich in natural wealth, American "interests" want a chance at the grab. To satisfy those interests, with their greed for gain and lust of power that outrun satisfaction and surpass understanding, we have placed our nation in the pillory, self-convicted of perfidy to an ally, of making a war of conquest upon a weak and friendly people, and of waging the war with a degree of cruelty and inhumanity that forces our own military officers to admit, even if cautiously, that it cannot be called civilized. How much longer shall this republic so stultify its own best ideals?

NEWS

The Philippine question has suddenly loomed up like a portentous shadow over the field of American politics, in consequence of some startling disclosures with reference to American barbarities in the islands.

One of these disclosures is the astounding verdict of the court-martial at Manila in the Waller case. The principal evidence in this case, as far as reported, was outlined last week (p. 9), but at that time no verdict had been reached. Maj. Waller was upon trial for murdering natives. He admitted that he had commanded the execution of natives without trial, in the island of Samar, and that 11 had been shot upon his order; but he defended the act upon the ground that it was in accordance with orders from his superior, Gen. Smith, and in conformity to military usage. The verdict was reached on the 12th, after half an hour's deliberation; and on the 13th it was publicly announced that the court-martial, by a vote of 11 to 2, had acquitted the accused officer. As reported by the Manila dispatches, the verdict was to the effect that, in giving orders for the killing of natives, Maj. Waller had acted "in accordance with the rules of war, the orders of his superior, and the military necessities of the situation."

The revelations of the Waller court-martial were nearly coincident with the disclosure of an official report giving similar indications of severity in dealing with natives in the Philippines. This report came first to public notice, though only vaguely, on the 29th of March, when President

Roosevelt sent to the House of Representatives, at its request, the papers bearing on an application by Gen. Miles to be assigned to duty in the Philippines. In Gen. Miles's letter making that application, dated February 17, 1902, he referred to the long drawn out Philippine war, and characterized it as having "been conducted with marked severity." The secretary of war answered on the 5th of March, denying the application and closing with the assertion that—it is not the fact that the warfare in the Philippines has been conducted with marked severity; on the contrary, the warfare has been conducted with marked humanity and magnanimity on the part of the United States army. Replying to the secretary, on the 24th of March, Gen. Miles said upon this point:

It is proper to say that I had in mind such information as was conveyed in the letter of Gov. Wm. H. Taft, addressed to the honorable secretary, dated Washington, February 7, 1902, as well as other communications that have been referred to these headquarters or received by me.

The identity of the documents thus alluded to by Gen. Miles was fixed by the secretary of war in his response of March 25, when he wrote that Gen. Miles's allusion was to a report by the civil governor of the Province of Tayabas, received February 7, 1902, and which had been forwarded February 19th to Gen. Chaffee with instructions to investigate, and if the statements were found to be true to adopt disciplinary measures. The secretary rebuked Gen. Miles for assuming the truth of these charges before they had been investigated. On the 7th of April this long withheld Tabayas report was made a subject of inquiry in the Senate committee on the Philippines, the Democratic members calling attention to the fact that although Gov. Taft had been testifying for three weeks, and had been instructed to furnish the committee with copies of reports received by him from civil governors, and had submitted favorable reports, he had held back a damaging one. A resolution was consequently adopted calling directly upon the secretary of war to produce this report; and on the 10th it was produced, and for the first time made public.

The report in question, dated December 16, 1901, and made by Maj. Cornelius Gardner, formerly of the United States regular army but now civil governor of the Province of Tabayas in the Philippines, advises

the early concentration of the troops in one or two garrisons, if the friendliness of the inhabitants is desired. That a friendly sentiment has existed he avers, explaining that he is in touch with the people, "having visited all the pueblos one or more times and having lived with them in their homes." But, he continues—

of late, by reason of the conduct of the troops, such as the extensive burning of the barrios in trying to lay waste the country so that the insurgents cannot occupy it, the torturing of natives by so-called water-cure and other methods in order to obtain information, the harsh treatment of natives generally, and the failure of inexperienced, lately appointed lieutenants commanding posts to distinguish between those who are friendly and those unfriendly and to treat every native as if he were, whether or no, an insurrecto at heart—this favorable sentiment above referred to is being fast destroyed and a deep hatred toward us engendered. If these things need be done they had best be done by native troops, so that the people of the United States will not be credited therewith.

Hardly had the significance of the Gardner report and the Waller verdict reached the public when two witnesses gave shocking testimony before the Senate committee with reference to the "water cure" treatment. One of them was Charles S. Riley, of Northampton, Mass., formerly a sergeant in the 26th volunteer infantry. The other was Wm. L. Smith, of Athol, Mass., formerly a private in Co. M. of the same regiment. Mr. Riley testified that he had witnessed an application of the "water cure" at Igaras, in the province of Iloilo, November 27, 1900. It was administered to the presidente of the town, a man 40 years of age. The object of the torture was to extort information. It was twice applied. The first time the water from a 100-gallon tank was turned into the victim's mouth, he lying prostrate and his mouth being forcibly held open, until he gave the desired information. The second time a syringe was inserted in his mouth and another in his nose, the two syringes taking water from a 5-gallon can. With the man held down upon his back streams of water were in this manner pumped into him, and to make the torture more effective salt was thrown into the water. The confession thus extorted was to the effect that the presidente, while ostensibly friendly to the United States, was in reality a captain in the Filipino

army and that his policemen were soldiers. For that reason the American troops arrested him and burned the town. The other witness, Mr. Smith, corroborated this testimony and gave also a similar account of the application of the "water cure" to two policemen at Igaras. He explained moreover that the management of the torture was in the hands of a squad detailed for the purpose from the 18th regular infantry and known as "the water cure detail." In describing the burning of Igaras (a town of about 10,000) by the American troops, he said that the inhabitants generally escaped only with the clothes they wore. Both witnesses gave the names of the officers under whose direction the torture was inflicted and the burning done. They were Capt. Glenn and Lieut. Conger, of the regular army, and Dr. Lyons, an assistant surgeon.

The President and the secretary of war are credited by the Washington dispatches of the 15th with having in consequence of these revolting revelations, "taken hold of the army scandals in the Philippines with a vigor and directness which cannot fail to punish the offenders of the past and prevent a repetition of similar offenses in the future." Direct orders have been given to Gen. Chaffee to have Gen. Smith court-martialed if such testimony was given at the Waller trial as is reported in the news dispatches, namely, that Gen. Smith ordered indiscriminate slaughter. As to Conger, Glenn and Lyons, a court-martial has been ordered to sit in San Francisco to try them for their cruelty at Igaras. It is to sit in San Francisco because Conger and Lyons are both in this country. Glenn, who is still in the Philippines, and all witnesses still there, are ordered to be sent home at once.

Gen. Chaffee reported officially on the 16th that Gen. Malvar, the last of the important Filipino generals, had surrendered unconditionally the day before, thus terminating armed resistance to the United States in the department of North Philippines. At the same time he advised the President of the necessity of sending a large force to the island of Mindanao and stated that he was fitting out an expedition of 1,200 men, which is to leave for Mindanao about the 27th.

Passing on from the American war in the Philippines to the similar Brit-

ish war in South Africa, there is little further to report of the peace negotiations mentioned last week, except that they are in progress. The Boer leaders of both republics met at Klerksdorp on the 9th. They had a second consultation there on the 10th. On the 11th it was announced that they had decided to enter into negotiations with the British if granted free use of the cable to consult the Boer representatives in Europe. Whether or not this condition was complied with has not been reported. It is certain, however, that any conditions precedent to negotiations, which may have been exacted, were allowed, for on the 12th the Boer leaders arrived at Pretoria to confer with the British authorities. The two groups—South African Republic and Orange Free State—came on different special trains and were quartered after their arrival in different houses. It is understood that they have since been in negotiation with Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner, the British commissioner for South Africa. On the day of their arrival at Pretoria a message was received from them, through Lord Kitchener, by the British ministry, and was answered. But neither the purport of the message nor that of the reply has been disclosed. There is no further trustworthy news on the subject.

It was announced in the House of Commons on the 11th by Mr. Broderick, secretary for war, that there would be no armistice during the absence of the Boer commandants from the field; and this announcement was confirmed on the 14th by news of severe fighting in the Transvaal region. Lord Kitchener reports about 200 Boers killed and about 100 British casualties. He also reports the overwhelming of a British patrol in the Orange Free State—one officer and three men being wounded and all the remainder of the British force captured.

On the 15th the statement of the condition of British finances, called the "budget," was laid before the House of Commons by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, chancellor of the exchequer. From this it appears that the cost of the Boer war for three years has been \$825,170,000. For the years 1902-3 it is put at \$227,000,000. The national debt has been increased \$290,000,000, and there is a deficit to be met of \$226,620,000. To provide for these obligations the chancel-

lor of the exchequer advocated a further (see vol. iv., p. 41) advance in the fiscal retrogression from the British free trade policy back to a bread tax. He proposed a customs tax of 6 cents per 100-weight on all kinds of imported grain; 10 cents per 100-weight on imported flour and meal; a stamp tax of 2 cents on dividend warrants; a stamp tax of 4 cents instead of 2 as now required, on checks; and an increase of 2 cents in the £1 in the income tax, making it 30 cents in the £1 instead of 28. The import duties on sugar, wine, beer, tobacco and tea, and the export duty on coal (vol. iv., p. 63), are not to be disturbed. Besides proposing these taxes, the chancellor asks authority to secure a loan of \$160,000,000.

It was significant of a more pacific policy on the part of the ministry that the chancellor of the exchequer was able to announce upon asking for this loan, that the ministry has acceded to the Boer demands for the restocking and rebuilding of the ruined farms in the South African Republic and Orange Free State; and still more significant of a changed public opinion that the House of Commons resounded with cheers for several minutes after the announcement. In making this announcement the chancellor is reported as having spoken in praise of the valor of the Boers, and expressed his hopes for friendship between Briton and Boer. During the pause in his speech while that sentiment was cheered he is reported to have "turned towards Mr. Chamberlain, the colonial secretary, who sat pale and motionless, palpably none too pleased at this official recantation of his unconditional surrender formula."

For several days the cable news from Belgium has been lurid, and now the country appears from the dispatches to be upon the verge of revolution. This news is evidently colored in the interest of the ruling class, but an outline of the situation and of the condition of the government of Belgium will enable the reader to draw reasonably accurate conclusions from the daily reports.

Belgium is a constitutional monarchy, both representative and hereditary, the legislative power being vested in an hereditary king and in a senate and a chamber of deputies elected by the people under a restricted and plural suffrage. Senators are

elected for eight years, part of them by the direct popular vote of citizens not less than 35 years of age, and part by provincial councils. Princes of the reigning branch of the royal family are senators by hereditary right. Members of the chamber of representatives are all elected by direct popular vote. The qualifications of voters for members of this chamber are defined as follows by the Statesman's Year Book for 1901:

Every citizen over 25 years of age, domiciled for not less than one year in the same commune, and not legally disqualified, has a vote. Every citizen over 35 years of age, married or widower, with legitimate issue, and paying at least 5 francs (\$1) a year in house tax, has a supplementary vote, as has also every citizen over 25 years of age owning immovable property to the value of 2,000 francs (\$400), or having a corresponding income from such property, or who for two years has derived at least 100 francs (\$20) a year from Belgian funds, either directly or through the savings bank. Two supplementary votes are given to citizens over 25 years of age who have received a diploma or certificate of higher instruction, or who fill or have filled office, or engaged in private professional practice, implying at least average higher instruction. No person has more than three votes.

This plural voting system is the cause of the present disorders.

In 1898 an aggregate of 2,175,957 votes were possessed by 1,418,480 voters, a vast proportion of whom had but one vote each. At the election that year (see vol. ii No. 70, p. 10) the Catholic party secured 112 seats, the Socialists 28, the Radicals 6, and the Liberals 6. To still further strengthen the majority, the premier proposed a measure which the Socialists especially, but also the Radicals and the Liberals, opposed. All these parties favor the "one man one vote" principle. Great opposition meetings were held, and from June 20 to July 1, 1898, there was rioting in several cities. Upon being notified by the mayors of four cities that they could not be responsible for public order unless the premier's offensive electoral measure were withdrawn, the king interfered; and those measures being in consequence referred to a parliamentary committee selected from all parties, which recommended their unqualified rejection, the ministry resigned. The new ministry (vol. ii, No. 70, p. 9) promised to present a proportional representation bill on the principle

of "one man one vote." This was subsequently done after a fashion (vol. ii., No. 73, p. 11), the chamber of deputies adopting the new law by a vote of 65 to 51 August 16, 1899. It was promulgated December 7, 1899. But that law provided merely for a crude system of proportional representation, leaving the obnoxious plural voting system unchanged.

Meanwhile the municipal elections of October, 1899 (vol. ii, No. 81, p. 10), had resulted in such great successes for Liberals and Socialists that hopes of overthrowing the conservative ministry at the next parliamentary election were entertained. These hopes, however, were not fully realized. The Socialists repudiated their fusion with the Liberals (vol. ii. No. 83, p. 9), and at the parliamentary elections of May 29, 1900 (vol. iii. p. 121) the Catholic majority was reduced from 112 to 85, the Socialists chiefly gaining by the change. After this election the news from Belgium was not calculated to excite general interest until early in the present year.

But the agitation for universal suffrage on the "one man one vote" principle had evidently not flagged in the interval. On the 23d of March, 1902, 20,000 persons paraded the streets of Brussels under the auspices of the Socialist party, and there were similar manifestations throughout the kingdom. Petitions were presented to the mayors of different cities for submission to parliament, demanding a revision of the constitution so as to establish universal suffrage and genuine proportional representation. On the 9th King Leopold was surrounded by a great mass of people at a railroad station in Brussels, and the air rang with shouts of "Long live the republic!" and "Long live universal suffrage!" But there were no attempts at violence. The crowd had not gone to the station to meet the king upon his arrival there, but as a compliment to four republican deputies of Spain, who had spoken at a Socialist meeting the night before and been therefore ordered out of Belgium by the Brussels police. Afterward popular sentiment against the police and the conservative elements had risen, and—whether the fault lies with the mob or the police it is impossible yet to tell—encounters between the police and the populace were frequent. The session of parliament on the 11th was also marked with ex-

traordinary violence. Meanwhile a general labor strike had been called to begin on the 14th, and as early as the 12th news poured in from every mining and industrial center of the probable great magnitude of this industrial demonstration in behalf of a revised constitution and universal suffrage. The strike began in earnest at the appointed time. Extensive military preparations have been made for it; but the troops are known to be saturated with socialistic ideas, and great lack of confidence in their fidelity is freely expressed. On the 15th it was reported that 15,000 out of the 40,000 Belgian coal miners had struck, and that more workmen were going out all the time. On the 16th the number of strikers was estimated at 300,000. It seems to be clear that the Socialist leaders are urging their followers to refrain from violence, but the socialists charge that the military display is designed by the ruling class to excite the strikers to acts of violence and so make a pretense for putting down the suffrage agitation by arbitrary means. In parliament the ministry has insisted upon voting first upon the appropriations and then upon the suffrage measures. But the combined opposition of Liberals, Radicals and Socialists, fearing that if the appropriations were once passed the ministry would dissolve parliament without acting on the suffrage reforms, have demanded such action first. They seem in this respect to have been successful; for on the 16th the parliamentary debate on the suffrage measures began.

NEWS NOTES.

—The Rev. T. De Witt Talmage died at Washington on the 12th. He was 70 years old.

—Gen. Wade Hampton, a lieutenant general in the Confederate service and afterwards governor of South Carolina, died at Columbia on the 11th, at the age of 84.

—The state of Minnesota, denied relief in the Supreme Court of the United States (vol. iv., pp. 739, 746), has begun suit in its own courts to restrain the merger of the northwestern railroads.

—The Supreme Court of Porto Rico has reversed the decision of the lower court convicting S. Iglesias, President of the Federation of Workmen of Porto Rico, of conspiracy to raise wages (vol. iv., p. 584), and discharged him from imprisonment.

—The constitution of Cuba was formally promulgated on the 16th by

Gov. Gen. Wood, who at the same time published a decree dissolving the constitutional convention which adjourned last October and calling the first Congress together for its first meeting on the 5th of May.

—On the 16th the Senate passed the Senate bill for the exclusion of Chinese immigrants. It simply extends the present exclusion law. The bill passed by the House on the same subject is much more drastic. (See "In Congress" in this issue.) It now remains for the two houses to come to an agreement.

—On a rehearing the appellate court of Texas, on the 16th, modified its anti-trust law decision (p. 10) so far as to hold that the question of the unconstitutionality of the Texas anti-trust law of 1899 is not involved in the case before it, that law being free from the special exemptions which nullify the previous acts.

—The London Times announced on the 7th that the Johannesburg (South Africa) city council has decided to levy taxes for municipal purposes only on real estate values, exclusive of improvements, and that there is great local opposition to this decision, the object of which is to discourage the holding of vacant building lots.

—The Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 15th, in its Columbus staff correspondence, announces that requests have been extended to Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, by Democratic leaders from various parts of Ohio, in which Mayor Johnson has joined, to consent to accept the Democratic nomination for secretary of state, the head of this year's ticket.

—The Democratic Congressional Campaign committee agreed tentatively on the 11th upon the following executive committee: Ben T. Cable, Illinois, chairman; Lewis Nixon, New York, chairman of the Finance committee; David Overmeyer, Kansas; Thomas Taggart, Indiana; Richard Olney, Massachusetts, and Daniel Lamont, New York.

—On the 14th argument was heard before the United States Supreme Court, on the application of the State of Washington for leave to bring a suit in that court to restrain the merger of the northwestern railroads. This suit differs in some technical particulars from that decided against the State of Minnesota (vol. iv., pp. 739, 746), but is the same in purpose.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE PHILIPPINE ATROCITIES.

Denver Post (neut.), April 12.—We cannot afford to countenance or commend barbarism such as it was reported Maj. Waller was guilty of. . . . And yet, on the other hand, we don't want to become a nation of sentimentalists. We don't want to adopt

a policy weak, vacillating and discreditable before the world. . . . And yet, on the other hand, a war upon a defenseless people and an order to kill indiscriminately women and children has in it no grounds for defense.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), April 13.—Maj. Waller's . . . references to the Chinese campaign were unfortunate. For the atrocities committed by the invading armies have met with the severest condemnation in every civilized country.

Chicago Daily News (neut.), April 15.—If the case of Maj. Waller is to result in giving sanction to the practice of shooting captives a new precedent will have been established, and it is not one which the American people can contemplate with complacency.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), April 16.—If the president and secretary of war were to deny or conceal or encourage the misconduct charged against some of the officers of the United States army in the Philippines they would justly be accused of grave misconduct. They would be accomplices after the fact.

Indianapolis Sentinel (Dem.).—A few days ago Gen. Miles was publicly rebuked, insulted and humiliated for casually saying that the war had been "conducted with marked severity." Secretary Root declared that it had not. Are we to understand that Secretary Root knew nothing of these Waller orders?

Chicago American (Dem.), April 16.—The thanks of the nation are due to Gen. Miles for being the means of extorting from the war department the reports of the acting governors of Batangas and Tayabas. If half of what those reports state be true, humanity has been outraged and this republic is dishonored in the Philippines.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.), April 14.—Shallow, indeed, is that man who expects that soldiers of the United States who find their comrades murdered and horribly mutilated by the Filipinos are going to extend gentle, chivalrous treatment on all occasions to the men they themselves take prisoners, and especially to those who add treachery to cruelty.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), April 16.—We have to thank Gen. Miles and the minority of the Senate Philippines committee for such fragments of the truth as have been vouchsafed to the people. The light should now be turned on and the whole truth laid bare. The committee hearings should be opened to the public and the scope of the inquiry broadened and extended. . . . Too much of this has been attempted in the past, and none of it is wanted for the future.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), April 16.—It is not charged that the "water cure" punishment is worse than the "sweat box" used by the Chicago police to extort confessions from criminals, nor more cruel than many of the methods of punishment in vogue in our reformatories and penitentiaries. . . . But, of course, American officers operating in an enemy's country, even when surrounded by spies and assassins, are not excusable for resorting to methods of punishment used by the police or prison authorities in this country.

JOHNSON IN OHIO.

Cleveland Finance (fin.), April 12.—Mayor Johnson's machine is growing and his power is growing. He stands as a menace to the vested property interests of Cleveland, and until the people see through his hypocrisy and defeat him at the polls, he will continue to be a menace to the fair name and credit of Cleveland.

East Oregonian (Dem.), April 11.—That the people will respond to a sincere summons to duty is shown by the Johnson movement in Ohio. . . . Tom Johnson is doing something in the name of Democracy. He means something. He is building up the interests of the people, and everywhere the cry is raised: "Well done,

good and faithful servant." Out here in Oregon we want work of the Johnson kind.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), April 10.—Tom L. Johnson has again demonstrated that he is a man who does things. The election in Cleveland Monday was a great personal triumph and a vindication at the same time of his confidence in the people. He did not conceal his purposes. The people knew what he wanted and how he meant to get it. . . . Tom Johnson's way is the way to win.

Cleveland Press (neut.), April 10.—Within a year the Republicans have had to surrender to the Democracy authority and offices to such an extent as to fully justify the conclusion that there has been a tremendous revolution in public sentiment. . . . These changes have all come about during the year that Tom Johnson has advocated low fares and just taxation of corporations and invested his money in party organization and work.

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), April 12.—Although the corporation-owned and corrupt Republican ring has been smashed in Cleveland and Cuyahoga county, the State ring, entrenched at Columbus, continues to court the same fate. . . . In going boldly on record as agents of tax-dodging and greedy corporations, and depriving the people of local self-government, the leaders of the party, instead of checkmating Tom L. Johnson are but helping to make his victory more complete and permanent.

WOMEN VOTERS.

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), April 11.—Cleveland women at the recent election in that city made the most practical sort of an answer to that favorite objection of the opponents of woman's suffrage, that women, even if given the voting privilege, would not avail themselves of it. On the contrary, the Cleveland housewives arose betimes and worked like beavers.

TAXATION BY FEDERAL JUDGES.

Chicago American (Dem.), April 11.—Judge Grosscup sets aside the original taxing jurisdiction and the interpretation of tax laws of the state Circuit Court, the state Supreme Court, the Chicago Board of Assessors and Board of Review, the state Board of Equalization, and the executive functions of the county tax collectors. . . . He goes further, and attempts the unheard of process of converting his own court into an original administrator of state tax laws. . . .

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, April 7-12, 1902.

Senate.

During the morning hour on the 7th the conference report on the repeal of the war revenue act was taken up (p. 3961), and after considerable discussion was adopted (p. 3992) by a vote of 36 to 30; after which consideration of the Chinese exclusion bill (S. bill No. 2960) was resumed (p. 3992), several amendments being acted on in the course of the afternoon. On the 8th Mr. Cullom (p. 4047), Mr. Patterson (p. 4049) and Mr. Perkins (p. 4052) spoke on the same bill, and as the latter concluded, the Chinese exclusion bill passed by the House (H. bill No. 13031) was laid before the Senate. It was at once referred (p. 4058) to the committee on immigration; and on the 9th the discussion of the Senate bill proceeded, Mr. Gallinger (p. 4132), Mr. Turner (p. 4143), and Mr. Dillingham (p. 4151) occupying the day. Before taking up the Chinese bill on the 10th the post office appropriation bill was considered (p. 4181) and passed (p. 4186). Consideration of the Chinese question being then resumed, Mr. Dillingham concluded his speech of the day before, and was followed by Mr. Stewart (p. 4186) and Mr. Hoar (p. 4186). After an informal discussion on the 11th between Mr. Money (p. 4229) and Mr. Depew (p. 4238) on the proposition to make senators elective by the peo-

ple, of which discussion the disfranchisement of Negro citizens in the South was the keynote, the Senate resumed consideration (p. 4235) of the Chinese exclusion bill, but was briefly interrupted by a further informal discussion (p. 4236) of the Negro suffrage question. Being again resumed (p. 4241), the Chinese question was discussed by Mr. Teller (p. 4241); and at the close of his speech the senate adjourned to the 12th, when consideration of the bill was proceeded with, Mr. Vest (p. 4263) and Mr. Lodge (p. 4266) being the principal speakers.

House.

Resuming on the 7th the consideration of the Chinese exclusion bill (H. bill No. 13031), the House in committee of the whole took up the bill by paragraphs (p. 4001); and after the adoption of several amendments, the committee rose, reporting the bill as amended favorably, and the House adopted it (p. 4029), but without a ye and nay vote. On the same day the conference report on the repeal of the war revenue act was adopted (p. 4026); and Senate bill No. 178, to extend the charters of the national banks for 20 years, was passed (p. 4029). Mr. Fowler called up the latter bill, asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration (p. 4029). This was objected to, whereupon he moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. After brief debate, a vote was taken (p. 4030)—35 to 40; but there appearing to be no quorum, and a motion to adjourn being defeated—63 to 103,—the doors were closed and the roll called. The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill thereupon received (p. 4030) 116 votes, 48 being in the negative, 18 members answering present, and 173 not voting. On the 9th the House went into committee of the whole (p. 4151-52) for the consideration of House bill No. 12765, to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba. Mr. Smith (p. 4152) opened the debate, and was followed by Mr. Morris (p. 4152), Mr. Sparkman (p. 4158), and Mr. Ball (p. 4162). Mr. Grosvenor spoke on the bill on the 10th (p. 4192), being followed by Mr. Weeks (p. 4192), Mr. Perkins (p. 4197), Mr. Thayer (p. 4197), Mr. Prince (p. 4199), Mr. Miers (p. 4199), and Mr. Kleberg; and on the 11th the speakers were Mr. Shafroth (p. 4247), Mr. Henry (p. 4247), and Mr. Parker (p. 4247). The time of the House on the 12th was devoted to the private calendar, one of the bills discussed (p. 4308) in committee of the whole and passed by the House (p. 4310) being Senate bill No. 2063, granting an annual pension of \$5,000 to the widow of the late President McKinley.

Record Notes.—Speeches are specially reported in the Record as follows: Representatives Kahn (p. 3961), Kern (p. 3970), Napfen (p. 4037), Mondell (p. 4041), Patterson (p. 4042), Green (p. 4168), and Senators Cullom (p. 4066) and Dillingham (p. 4214), on Chinese exclusion; Representative Gooch (p. 3973), and Senators Spooner (p. 4102) and Bailey (p. 4115), on oleomargarine; Representative Thayer (p. 4094), on ship subsidy; Representative Overstreet (p. 4126), on the money question; Representatives Smith (p. 4207), Perkins (p. 4213), and Ball (p. 4256), on Cuban reciprocity.

Text of minority report of the House committee on foreign affairs and the substitute bill passed by it, on the subject of Chinese exclusion, p. 4006.

Amendment to United States constitution making qualifications of voters for representatives and senators uniform in all the states, proposed by Senator Depew, together with his reasons, p. 4173.

Sulzer's resolution on British army supply post at New Orleans as reported back to the House by the committee on foreign affairs and adopted by the House, pp. 4191-92.

House bill (No. 13502) to provide for postal currency, introduced at page 4206.

MISCELLANY

"OH! LAND WHERE THE HEATHER BLOOMS!"

Oh! land where the heather blooms
And the salt spray splashes the beach,
Where only the wind and the sky above
Are out of the landlord's reach!

Oh! wild birds that build in the brae
And sweeten the air with your cries,

Wave not your wings as you sail aloft,
For you are the landlord's prize!

And you, the antlered king,
Who proudly rear your crest,
You live to fall to a landlord's gun
With the warm blood wet on your
breast.

Ye remnant of the brave!
Who charge when the pipes are heard,
Don't think, my lads, that you fight for
your own,

'Tis but for the good of the laird!

And when the fight is done
And you come back over the foam,
"Well done," they say, "you are brave
and true,
But we cannot give you a home.

"For the hill we want for the deer,
And the glen the birds enjoy,
And bad for the game the smoke of the
cot

And the song of the crofter's boy."

Oh! land where the heather blooms,
And the salt spray splashes the beach,
Where only the wind and the starry sky
Are out of the landlord's reach.

—MacKenzie MacBride, in the London
Scotsman.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE IS SICK OF BEING A WORLD
POWER.

Printed from the original manuscript.

Dear John: I am humiliated! I have been complainin' a little of your acts bein' a leetle off color; of your shootin' prisoners of war, John, and the like, barbarities; but, I swan! I never expected to eat humble pie for doin' the same thing, and worse, myself.

Fact is, I didn't believe the stories.

Altgeld and Billy Bryan, and a lot of fellows, said things in the Philippines were all wrong; but I thought they were tryin' to get silver reinstated, and didn't believe 'em; I set store by the old republican party too—didn't believe I could go wrong. And now, what do I hear! that the orders went out, and seem to have been obeyed, to shoot all Filipinos over ten years of age; that I've been guilty of murder and arson and treachery; that I have executed 'natives without trial; that I have abolished free speech; deported editors, and overthrown a republic.

I own up I am in the dust, and it is my fault.

I was a decent man once; had the foremost country in the world, good name and credit and a beautiful flag that people looked up to and blessed.

Then a syndicate with Hanna at the head, arranged to sell me a gold brick; and I bought! I did! after all my experience!

They would make me a world pow-

er, they said. I was a world power then—was already runnin' one hemisphere, and had the other all lookin' up to me—was head and shoulders above everything under the canopy. And I bit! and now what is the result? Why, that my name is placed with that of Jenghis Khan and Tamerlane, Cyrus and Alexander, as one of the scourges of God!

Why, my men own up! And the thing that makes me sicker than all else was, they shot the water buffalo; killed the men, burned the homes, drove the women and children into the towns or pens, Spanish style; and shot their only draft animals—the water buffalo—so they would have to walk, and carry their children, and poor little goods.

Some of my common soldiers had the grace to be sorry. When I first heard that, I was a little off. I vowed I would dismantle West Point, and officer my army from the infernal regions direct; but where'd be the difference? Hell can't beat what I've been a doin'!

And the worst thing about it is they have soiled the flag; the pretty flag!

The ballot I cast for the Philippine war had blood on it; and—the thing is on my hand!

You remember how old Mrs. Macbeth swore when she found it wouldn't come out?

There are more of us.

There is one thing certain: This hand will never vote that ballot again; and my army's got to come back from the Philippines, and be set to hoin' corn.

UNCLE SAM.

ARE WE GETTING OUR SUGAR TOO CHEAP?

For The Public.

To the Editor: De Jones asks me to enlist your sympathy for the suffering beet sugar industry.

De Jones thinks he is not paying enough for his sugar and fears there is something in this Cuban reciprocity bill that might reduce the price.

De Jones works for a big corporation and gets a dollar and a quarter a day when he works. He works most every day except Sundays and holidays and in stormy weather, and comes pretty near supporting his wife and family. In fact, with odd jobs at house cleaning and washing, on the part of his wife, and with the picking up coal around the railroads and coal yards by the children, to assist him, he does support his family, and sends the children to the public school, when

they are not too busy picking up coal. He also wears a white starched shirt on Christmas and the Fourth of July. A man that can do all this would naturally have a level head on him and object to getting his sugar too cheap.

He seems to go on the theory that cheap sugar makes the cheap man, and don't want the industry disturbed. My head is not as clear as De Jones', and I can't see the fine points that seem to influence his mind; but always feeling willing to aid the suffering, I will try to say a word in favor of the beet sugar industry.

By way of digression I want to say that there is a great deal in calling things by their right names. I think if we would persistently call safe-breaking an industry, and continue to do so for a sufficient number of years, that we would lose our prejudice against that kind of business, and perhaps be able to get some sort of protection for it from Congress. It's worth thinking about, anyway.

But De Jones don't want the sugar business disturbed because he thinks there is some sort of connection between the high priced sugar and the dollar and a quarter that he gets from the big corporation. He has the proper idea in regard to being contented with his station in life, and knows it is the business of the rich people to furnish work for the poor.

He admits that we may be under some obligations to Cuba, but would prefer a direct appropriation for the island to any reciprocity tariff tinkering. He says that this prosperity we have now is built upon a pretty solid foundation of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you" sort of business, and if we stop tickling the beet sugar men for a minute, they will turn around and help pull out all the rest of the foundation. So if we destroy the foundation of the prosperity, of course that goes, and with it goes De Jones' dollar and a quarter a day.

I may not be putting this proposition correctly, but as near as I can get to it, it seems that the beet sugar men and the other sugar men can't do business without some help from Congress, and that the beet sugar boys are yet in the infant industry stage.

If this is the correct idea of the matter it does seem to be wrong for the President and Congress to pitch into the infant and let the full grown industry go unmolested.

It may be that De Jones is right, and that it is a dangerous thing to allow the people to get anything cheap. If we make a tariff reduction to Cuban sugar and sugar goes down, the peo-

ple that want cheap things may turn against the tariff and overturn the present structure of prosperity. The people do not all know as much as De Jones. Most of them do, but the glittering idea of cheapness may undermine their integrity and cause them to go wrong.

I hope that you may see this matter in a proper light, and feel sufficiently impressed to help the weak and suffering in this matter. Yours very truly,

JACKSON BIGGLES.

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORY OF JOHN PETER ALTGELD.

Resolutions adopted at the John P. Altgeld memorial meeting at Cooper Union, New York City, April 3, 1902.

Whereas, On the 12th day of March, 1902, death called our distinguished fellow citizen, John Peter Altgeld; and

Whereas, We, working men and other citizens of New York, are met to do honor to his memory, to which end we recite the following events and achievements of his life:

That he was born in poverty in Germany, December 30, 1847;

That while a child he was brought to this country as to a land of promise;

That he had but little schooling;

That he was doing a man's work at a plow in Ohio at 13;

That when the civil war broke out he enlisted on the northern side as a common soldier, though but 16;

That after the war he educated himself and then taught school;

That later he went west, but, having no money, he walked the whole distance;

That he read law and began practice in St. Joseph, Mo.;

That he was elected to the superior bench in Chicago, sitting from 1886 to 1891, when he resigned, bearing a distinguished and spotless record;

That he was elected the twentieth governor of Illinois, and served from 1893 to 1897;

That during his gubernatorial term he incurred the wrath of the privileged class by liberating from prison certain anarchists convicted of implication in the death of eight policemen at Haymarket square, Chicago, Gov. Altgeld taking the ground, which has never been disputed, that their trial and conviction had not been fair and by due process of law;

That he increased the enmity of the privileged class by opposing the destruction of the constitutional safe-

guards of the people, and protesting against the invasion of the state of Illinois by federal soldiers at the order of a president of the United States during the great railroad strike of 1894;

That he intensified to implacable bitterness this enmity of vested rights by his vigorous denunciation of the action of a United States court in superceding the regular and immemorial forms of law by arbitrarily taking to itself powers of government by injunction;

That he added fire to fury in the hearts of those living on the toil and sweat of others by using his conceded great abilities to make increasingly vigorous war upon all forms of privilege, in the endeavor to establish in fact, as well as in words, those inalienable rights named in the immortal Declaration of Independence—the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;

That through fair weather and through foul, through good fortune and through bad, during sturdy health and during years of sickness, he dauntlessly and unwaveringly bore on his course, until, worn out with strife, and at the comparatively early age of 55, he died in a last supreme effort for natural rights; therefore,

Be it Resolved, That we, workingmen and other citizens of New York, assembled in public mass meeting in the Cooper Union hall, where Abraham Lincoln raised his voice against chattel slavery, and which has since been many times consecrated to the struggle against industrial slavery, do now pronounce our most profound respect for the memory of John Peter Altgeld, as one who fought valiantly and died gloriously in the greatest of all causes—the cause of humanity. In our hearts and the hearts of generations after us he will be cherished as an upright judge, a patriot governor, a high-minded publicist, a vigilant citizen and a straight man; and we believe that the great mass of his fellow citizens composing this proud nation will hold his name dear as that of one who did his utmost to make life better and brighter.

A HISTORY OF THE BOER WAR BY A LITTLE BOY.

There has recently been privately published in Washington, D. C., a little book of 31 pages entitled "The Boer War." We are informed in the preface, which is evidently written by an adult, that the author of the book, Allen Welsh Dulles, is eight years old,

and that he has been, since the war began in South Africa, an ardent admirer and partisan of the Boers, and this in spite of the fact that all his immediate family favor the British cause. Two months ago he determined to write a history of the war, with the avowed purpose of sending the money which he should receive from its sale, to the Boer relief committee, for the benefit of the Boer women and children in South Africa, and for the Boer prisoners in the Bermudas. "Since that time he has industriously gathered his facts, and day after day for nearly two months he has written out what he has read and heard, together with his own opinions and conclusions." What he wrote has been printed exactly as written, without alteration of spelling or language, or arrangement.

The book is now in its second edition. All money received from its sale is devoted to the purpose the author designed to aid. The price is 50 cents a copy. The copy which is quoted from here, was obtained by sending to the author, Allen Welsh Dulles, Care Hon. John W. Foster, Washington, D. C.

The extracts which follow this introduction, show that this little American boy has the ideals of the republic in his heart, and that he can think straight.

A. T. P.

EXTRACTS FROM "THE BOER WAR."

There would not be any quarreling if it was not for the gold. It was not right for the British to come in and get the land because the Boers came first and they had the first right to the land. If Britian had got there first then they could have the land. But it looks now as if the Boers were being driven out of the land. It is not because there is not enough room on the earth for there is room for every body to be comfortable, but the reason is that every nation wants more land than each other even if they have not enough people to cover the space. There is not very much gold but England wants to be richer so she will not loose much money by the war. (From Chap. I. The Boers and British in South Africa.)

The British did not know at first that the Boers were going to be so hard to conquer or they would not have started the war but now they have started they think that they cant surrender to such a little country. England will gain very little by the war for it will cost a gret deal to run the mines and the war has already cost England 1,000,000,000 Dollars and the war may not be near an end yet. (From

Chap. II. The First Year of Fighting.)

This camp where they kept the women and children is called a concentration camp. It sounds very bad to think of having everything burned up and it *was* very bad, for you would have to leave your house and go and be all in one camp and they probely got very bad food. Some people think that the British rule is not very bad, but you have to do just what they say, and you cannot feel free to do what you want, like you could if they had their own rule. Many babies died in the concentration camp and the women were all the time crying because they could not see their husbands. (From Chap. III.—The Farm Burning.)

One day the British tied 10 billy goats to try the affects of some lideight shels and so he fired about 20 at them and then went up to see how many were left and he found that there were 11—one had been born. (From Chap. IV. The Second Year of Fighting.)

During the latter part of the war the Americans have been exporting horses to South Africa for the British to use. The people who are having it done dont know how much it helps the British. They think if they send 1,000 horses to South Africa that it wont be much to 300,000 trupes but they think that they can get money and not help the British very much, but they keep on doing it till it does amount to sumthing. I think that England is big enough to get her own horses and if not she ought not to have started the war, for she cant depend on other nations to supply England with horses. This exportment of horses to South Africa is not done by the government but by private people for the reason the Government cannot stop it. (Chap. VI. The Exportment of Horses to South Africa.)

If the gold mine in Johannesburg failed the British would soon get tired of fighting for the land and go back to England. The Boers want peace but England has to have the gold and so she goes around fighting all the little countries but she never dares to fight eather China or Russia. All the people that have their independence should like to see the Boers win for England is trying to take it from the Boers.

All this talk about the Boers having slaves is not true for the Boers have not had any slaves since 1832, for a Boer captain told me so. America cannot say anything about the slavery for the Americans let men have slaves in the Philpens now. (From Chap. VII. The Last.)

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

THE REPUBLICAN PROSECUTING ATTORNEY ON MR. JOHNSON AS A POLITICIAN.

"They may say what they please about Mayor Johnson," said Solicitor Kaiser, "but they all have to admit that he knows how to get the votes. As a political leader who understands the art of making circumstances and men carry out his ends he has few peers in the country. And I admit that his ends are not often bad. He has ideas that mean good to the people and he always seems to be doing or planning something for the masses. I cannot but be amused to see how easily Johnson makes the conditions serve his purposes. He brought this 3-cent fare question to a focus just at the right time, and he puts the Republicans on the unpopular side of the controversy. Here right on election day we find a Republican attorney getting an order of injunction from a Republican judge for a Republican client against Johnson and the new 3-cent fare company. In the eyes of the masses this lines the Republican party up with the old street railway companies and the opponents of low fare, and the result is injurious to the Republicans."—The Cleveland Plain Dealer of Apr. 9.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM AT LAST.

The declaration of City Treasurer Coffinberry that he does not intend turning out the present employes in the treasurer's office, merely because they are Republicans, to make room for Democrats, caused bewilderment among politicians of all parties. They could not believe he made such a declaration or holds such a purpose. Professions of conducting municipal affairs on a strictly business basis are all well enough during the campaign, but after election the "business," as the politicians understand it, is to "turn the rascals out"—all opposition holders of "jobs" being of necessity rascals—and fill the vacancies with the "faithful." If the incoming administration is Republican, then all Democrats found in employment are "incompetent" and must get out, and all Republicans recommended by the party bosses are "competent" and should be appointed. If the incoming administration is Democratic, then "turn about is fair play" and the Republican employes must go. It is the rule of the game and newly elected officials are expected to play strictly according to that rule.

But here is a Democratic city treasurer who will not recognize the rule.

He actually believed in the practice as well as profession of conducting municipal affairs on a strictly business basis, regardless of partisan politics. On the death of the Republican city treasurer, Mr. Coffinberry was requested by Mayor Johnson to take the position for the short time before the election, but declined. At last he accepted and also consented to become the candidate on the Democratic ticket, with the result of his election. During his occupancy of the office by appointment he had an opportunity of studying the manner in which his subordinates discharged their duties. Being satisfied on that point, he now announces that he sees no reason for making any changes, at least for the present. As it is not likely that Republican employes under a Democratic official will make themselves "perniciously active" in politics, but will probably stick faithfully to their duties, the prospects of changes in the immediate future are not as bright as office seekers would have them.

Here we have real civil service reform at last. It is gratifying that it has come under a Democratic administration, for the Democrats have been represented as hungry for spoils and as being even more opposed to the practice of civil service reform than the Republicans—although the local illustrations of Republican practice have not been conspicuous. Mr. Coffinberry is a citizen who loves his party, but who thinks he is doing his party more substantial service by identifying it with honesty and efficiency in the administration of public affairs, and with genuine business principles in municipal government, than by turning out efficient employes, merely because they are Republicans, and filling their places with untried men, merely because they are Democrats who are alleged to have done partisan work.

School Director Cadwallader has taken one important step in the same direction. Instead of following the precedent set by his predecessors, Directors Sargent and Bell, and appointing a skilled partisan politician his secretary, that the construction of a partisan machine might be carried on at school headquarters with every facility at command, he appointed Mr. John M. Siddall, who is without any known experience as a politician, but who has been a hard worker in fields that afford good preparation for the intelligent and efficient discharge of the proper duties of his new position.

Mr. Siddall has been associated with Mr. Cadwallader for some time and they are in thorough accord. The appointment of a secretary was regarded as in some degree an indication of Director Cadwallader's intended course and of his strength of character in view of the influences that would naturally be brought to bear upon him at the outset of his administration. Belief in his purpose to carry out the nonpartisan pledges he gave before election has been materially strengthened by this appointment.

The new departure in the waterworks office by Superintendent Bemis, with the support given Mr. Bemis by the mayor when the issue between the civil service reformer and the politicians was made, was also hope inspiring. . . .

Within the last few days there have been several things tending to make the friends of municipal civil service reform "thank God and take courage."—Editorial in the Plain Dealer of Apr. 12.

BOOK NOTICES.

It is not often that the leading editorials even of a weekly paper, however interesting they may be as they appear, make good reading when gathered together in a book. An exception is "Little Leaders" (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.), by Wm. Morton Payne. Mr. Payne has long been associated with Francis Fisher Browne, editor of the Dial, and these essays are some of the leading editorials he has written for that excellent periodical. Although the Dial is a literary paper, Mr. Payne's reprinted editorials are interesting for other than mere literary reasons. Literature for the barren sake of literature is not a Dial ideal. Besides being charming simply as works of literary art, they are interesting because they also say things worth reading. The spirit is democratic, as is that of the Dial. This in itself lends them interest and power and distinguishes them from much of the literature of the time, which is usually aristocratic, plutocratic or inane. One of Mr. Payne's essays is on "Democracy and Education." It emphasizes the importance of expertism in democracies, for the sake of democracy, but is not sufficiently careful to distinguish the function of the expert—

which is not to direct general policies (expertism in that, being kingcraft), but to manage the details of general policies decided upon by the people. Another of the essays is a common sense repudiation of the undemocratic notion that literary workers should work without pay.

PERIODICALS.

—The reorganization of the American army, by Oswald Garrison Villard, and Pan-American diplomacy, by John W. Foster, are the important political subjects discussed in the April Atlantic.

—Out West for April opens with the first installment of an illustrated story of "The Discovery of Our Pacific Coast." This truly independent, instructive and interesting monthly with the western flavor will again enlarge, with the June number, at the same time increasing its price from \$1 to \$2.

Volume IV of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$2.00, will be ready for delivery about May 1. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, **PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.**

VOLUMES II AND III.

We have on hand a limited number of volumes II and III, bound in the regular half leather style of **THE PUBLIC** at \$2.00 per volume. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

WANTED—Foreman for factory making general Builders' Mill Work, High-Grade Interior Finish, Bank, Office and Store Fixtures. Must have experience and references. Address **J. S. MACLEAN, Columbus, Ohio.**

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.

The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 60c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 128 E. 28th St., New York City.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which **THE PUBLIC** may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. *tf*

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with **THE PUBLIC** will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS.

Annual Subscription	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription	1.00
Quarterly Subscription50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks)10
Single Copies05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
1501 SCHILLER BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of **THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.**

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1268 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

**PEACE OR WAR
IN SOUTH AFRICA.**

This able non-partisan book by a London publisher, A. M. S. Methuen, which was referred to in a note at page 3 of this year's **PUBLIC**,

**WILL BE SENT FREE
TO ANY SUBSCRIBER TO**

THE PUBLIC

on receipt of 5 cents to cover postage and other mailing expenses. Address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL
for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of four weeks for
10 CENTS.