

HIS GOOD UNCLE MARK.

For The Public.

To the Editor: It may not be exactly proper for me to do it, but I feel so good I can't help it. I must write to you and tell you how tickled I am to see in the papers that Uncle Mark has got his little subsidy bill through the Senate. As the children say, I'm most tickled to death.

Uncle Mark, you know, means Mark Hanna. He is so good to the boys that work for him, and works so hard in the Senate to get through subsidy bills and other things for the benefit of us poor people, that I must call him Uncle Mark. If there was anything more affectionate or endearing that I could think of I would use it, because there's lots of people that don't appreciate our dear Uncle Mark. There's lots of people that call him names, and say mean things about him, while he's working himself to death there in the foul air of the Senate chamber, digging out subsidy bills, and other sorts of things to take money out of the pockets of the millionaires to help us poor people along. It's dreadful to think how very ungrateful some people are.

I started out to say how tickled I am about the subsidy bill. We will surely have some steamships of our own now. I begin to feel rich already. Before I heard about Uncle Mark's subsidy bill, that gives a substantial donation to people that want to build and sail ships, I was worrying a little bit about how I was going to pay the next month's rent, but that good news took all the worry out of me. Of course if that bill goes through all right, and I think she will, my salary will be raised at once, and the landlord will come down on his rent, and I shall be, as they say, "on Easy street." No doubt of it. And that is what tickles me so. And while I think about it, the telephone girl next door—that sits all day with a collar and martingale on her head, and things buzzing in her ears—feels just as good as I do about it. She don't mind chipping in a little bit from her salary to help Uncle Mark and his poor partners to build a few steamships. She knows what it is to be hard up and out of a job, and sympathizes with the steamships and other people that can't make a living without subsidies and tariffs and such. But I feel too tickled to write any more. Yours respectfully,

J. BIGGLES.

Let Truth and Error grapple. Who ever knew Truth to be worsted in an open fight?—Milton.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

From the Editor of City and State.

Philadelphia, March 17, 1902.

To the Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.—Sir: In your letter of February 17th to Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Chairman of the Senate committee on the Philippines, you treat of charges of cruelty and uncivilized methods of warfare alleged to have been committed under our flag in these islands. In the letter of Gen. Funston, bearing on this subject, which you submit as exhibit "a," together with other kindred reports printed in Senate document 205, City and State is mentioned as the source of one of these charges. I therefore feel justified in openly addressing you as the official head of the war department on a question which I believe to be of the utmost public concern; a question which directly affects the honor and the welfare of the country, and indirectly, but none the less vitally, the progress of true civilization.

I shall first try to state fairly what I conceive to be your position in matters of fact and of policy, and then give in rejoinder my own views on the matter at issue as they have been expressed in the journal referred to by Gen. Funston. I understand your letter to be a distinct, unqualified denial of the charge, which is, in brief, that torture has been used under our flag in the Philippines for the accomplishment of a military purpose. You deny the use of any cruel or uncivilized methods of warfare, in the conflict waged to subdue the Filipino opposition to our sovereignty, more than might be expected to occur in any way, or than might be expected to result in this war where you admit that the cruelties of a semi-barbarous enemy have occasionally provoked our soldiers to acts of unauthorized revenge. This is, I think, a fair interpretation of your position, and of what you would have the country believe to be true. You say that the orders governing our soldiers in the Philippines are the same as those promulgated by President Lincoln to govern our armies in the civil war, and that these rules which have governed our regular and volunteer armies ever since are "the practical and effective guide and rule of conduct to which every officer understands that he must conform." You then call attention, among other things to rule 16, which prohibits "maiming or wounding, except in fight, and torture to extort confession." You say, further, that the war

on the part of the Filipinos has been conducted with the barbarous cruelty common among uncivilized races, and with "general disregard of the rules of civilized warfare." Further, you say that this war has been conducted on our part with "scrupulous regard for the rules of civilized warfare and with careful and genuine consideration for the prisoner, and with humanity never surpassed, if ever equaled in any conflict, worthy only of praise, and reflecting credit on the American people." Almost precisely the opposite of this I believe to be the truth. I believe it upon evidences, which, though moral rather than as yet legal, are so varied and so persistent that their cumulative testimony would produce on a dispassionate mind subjected to them a settled conviction of their essential truth. These evidences, some of which I will present, shut us up, as I claim, to one of two conclusions—either that the charge which I make is true; that torture has been used by us to extort confession at least from April 25, 1900, to August 18, 1901, to an extent sufficient to justify the term of "policy" applied to the "water-cure" torture by one of our officers of high rank serving in the Philippines—or that a conspiracy exists to defame our good name, into which have entered not only common soldiers and subalterns, but officers of high rank and repute, American school-teachers and American censored newspapers published in Manila—for all these are to-day included in the list of those whose moral evidence supports my contention. This latter supposition seems to me incredible, but as I wrote the President on this subject December 27th, it is the only alternative left open to him who denies the substantial truth of the charge. If your statements on the subject are true, how could this term "policy" be used by a man of high character and position, and situated so as to know well what was going on and to be to some degree an eye witness of the horrible results of this degrading and monstrous practice? How could he write a brother officer as follows:

A company of Macabebes enter a town or barrio, catch some man—it matters not whom—ask him if he knows where are any guns, and upon receiving a negative answer, five or six of them throw him down, one holds his head, while others have hold of an arm or a leg. They then proceed to give him the "water-torture," which is the distention of the internal organs with water. After they are distended, a cord is sometimes placed around the body and the water expelled. From what I have heard, it appears to be generally applied, and its use is not confined to one section. Although