

tion to men who make honest arguments and appeal to reason and justice, but it has a definite significance, meaning one who appeals to the passion and prejudice of the so-called "lower classes." But what opprobrious word fits the case of the pettefogger, sometimes in a professor's gown, who appeals to the pride and the cupidity of the rich and powerful class by telling them that they are enjoying the rewards of superior virtues? This sort of appeal is on a moral level with the virtuous solicitude of the protected baron who, securely entrenched in his law-created privileges, exhorts the common people to be self-reliant, independent, and to scorn government aids to prosperity.

VI.

It is charged, as an objection to the Declaration, that it was an echo of Rousseau, that its defenders were doctrinaires, and their expositions were imitations of the "cheap pseudo classicisms of the French revolution."

It is true that Rousseau did say some things very like those afterwards taught by the Revolutionary fathers. It is also true that the "social compact" theory, upon which Rousseau built his system, has long ago been exploded by political philosophers. Yet Rousseau perceived and expressed some truths in which the French revolutionists and the American revolutionists alike found their inspiration. None of those, however, was the first to give them voice. They all got their second hand from the greatest of all teachers of equality, the Author of the Sermon on the Mount. Before that expounder of natural equality, how flimsy and contemptible become all the conventional artifices by which men claim superiority to each other! How unsubstantial the superior "rights" and higher "obligations" and "duties", under cover of which they plunder and oppress each other!

The ideal of human relations which He set before mankind was taken up by our fathers and translated—imperfectly, it may be—into the language of politics, and thus aroused our people to power and achievement as none on earth was ever aroused before. The ideal, even as apprehended by the fathers, has never been re-

alized, nor anything near it. It has only been at a long distance approached. But the ideal has done the work, and it will be a sad day for us when we return to the old and outgrown notions of inequality and dependence which it displaced.

However, every generation has its quibblers, its pseudo thinkers, who formulate their little objections to the laws of God, their points of agreement in their vacuous principles, and call their conclusions "the trend of thought."

JOHN TURNER WHITE.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New Orleans, April 25.—Striking as the contrast was in many respects, there was one point of likeness between the two large national conventions that have recently met in New Orleans. However much subsidiary talk there may have been in each, each was dominated by one thought. The convention of women was not more distinctly concerned with the one question of suffrage than was the convention of manufacturers with the one question of union labor. Mr. Parry set the keynote in his vigorous presidential address, and the convention could not get away from it. It was in the air.

President Parry's address had been printed and circulated among the members some time before the convention met, and this fact had the effect of concentrating the attention of delegates upon the question. It is evident that he intended that it should do so. Any reader of his address can see that he is one who faces issues and leaves compromises to others. Nor was there much spirit of compromise in the convention. It is true that the resolutions were directed against what was termed the vicious elements in unionism, but it was not hard to read between the lines that pretty near anything was vicious except an innocuous organization for mutual improvement and education. Emphasis was laid on the part of Mr. Carroll D. Wright's address in which he said that some of the methods of unionism were "damnable," and great interest was shown in the reported formation of a union of non-unionists to protect themselves from the "damnable" oppression of union labor.

If there was much opposition to the prevailing spirit of the convention, it did not make itself manifest. It is not unlikely that there was more than

appeared, and there were doubtless some who would have advised more conciliatory measures, if they had not felt that their opposition would be useless. The only notable effort was that of Mayor Jones, and this had no effect upon the convention. In fact the convention refused to listen to him. He was so constantly interrupted by motions and calls of question, that he said but little, and soon good-humoredly took his seat. As one looks back upon the episode, it seems that perhaps Mayor Jones began unfortunately. Had he started by speaking directly of the unwisdom of the proposed resolution as a declaration of war between capital and labor, and of the probable injury of such a resolution to the association itself, perhaps he might at the last have got a hearing for the noble words of peace, good-will and the golden rule with which he sought to begin. It is true that from his point of view these thoughts were pertinent, and to an interrupter who demanded that he speak to the question, he quickly retorted that the question was one of humanity, yet it was evident that the convention would not listen.

Tense as the situation was, with President Parry on his feet, Mayor Jones attempting to speak, and two or three members making motions, I could not keep from being amused at a man who sat near me on the outskirts of the seats. He was laughing to split his sides, not aloud of course, but to himself, and in the midst of his laughter he kept slapping his knee and saying: "Jones wants to tell 'em the golden rule, and they don't want to hear anything about the golden rule. They—don't—want—to—hear—the golden—rule." He could hardly get the words out for laughing. A veritable modern Democritus, he seemed to be talking to no one in particular, and was enjoying the fun all to himself.

But this laughing philosopher could not banish thoughts of awful seriousness. During an hour or two of that morning session there must have been more than one who felt, perhaps more intensely than ever before, the presence of an irrepressible conflict—a conflict having its origin in injustice and leading to evils on both sides.

Irrepressible as it seems at times, may not the conflict yet be averted? Has not civilization, through its turmoils and past conflicts, advanced far enough to make a peaceful forward movement in the evolution of social conditions? Can we not look deep enough below the surface to see that the spirit of special privilege and mo-

nopoly, which maintains the unjust advantage of some over others, and the appropriation by some of what belongs to all—is both the evil genius of capital and the destruction of labor? Will not the voters of America rise up and destroy this undemocratic inequality which is the arch-enemy of industrial peace? These were the solemn questions that came to my mind as I left the convention hall that morning.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Apr. 30.

When Gen. Miles returned on the 16th of February from a five months' trip around the world (vol. v., p. 730), he brought with him a report of his inspection of the American army in the Philippines. This report was formally made on the 19th of February, but its publication was withheld (p. 34) by the War Department until the 27th of April, when it was for the first time given to the public. It is of special interest and value because of its candid disclosure of cruelties committed upon Filipinos by Americans in authority in the Philippines. Accompanying the report is an unofficial statement of the Department to the effect that the Secretary of War has held such reports to be confidential, in order that the officer making them might be free to comment as he desired, but as it was learned that Gen. Miles had no objection this report is made public.

Gen. Miles says that in going from Colamba to Batangas in November last he noticed that the country appeared devastated and that the people were much depressed. At Lipa a party of citizens, headed by the acting president, met him and stated that they desired to make complaint of harsh treatment of the people of that community, saying that they had been concentrated in towns and had suffered great indignities; that 15 of their people had been tortured by what is known as the water torture; and that one man, a highly respected citizen, aged 65 years, named Vincente Luna, while suffering from the effects of the torture and unconsciousness, was dragged from his house, which had been set on fire, and was burned to death. They stated that these atrocities were commit-

ted by a company of scouts under command of Lieut. Hennessey, and that their people had been crowded into towns, 600 being confined in one building. A doctor of the party said he was ready to testify that some of the 600 died from suffocation. Gen. Miles says he looked at the building, which was one story in height, 18 or 20 feet wide, and possibly, 60 or 70 feet long. Referring then to other cases, Gen. Miles says that on the island of Cebu it was reported and published in November, 1902, that two officers—Capt. Samuels, Forty-fourth infantry, United States volunteers, and Lieut. Feeter, Nineteenth infantry—had committed similar atrocities upon the people of that island. He also states that it was reported to him that at Laoag, on the island of Luzon, two natives were whipped to death. At Tacloban, Leyte, it was reported that Maj. Glenn ordered Lieut. Caulfield, Philippine scouts, to take eight prisoners out into the country, and that if they did not guide him to the camp of the insurgent Quison he was not to bring them back. It was stated that the men were taken out and that they either did not or could not do as directed. One of the men who had a son among the scouts was spared; but the others were separated into two parties numbering three or four, and while tied together were all murdered by being shot or bayoneted, some being in a kneeling position at that time. The pretense was made that they were killed while attempting to escape, but so far as Gen. Miles could learn no official report was ever made of the circumstance. These facts had been reported to Gen. Miles by Maj. Watts, who investigated the case. Besides Lieut. Caulfield, Civilian Scouts Ramos, Preston, Corn and McKeen were participants in the crime. At Calbayog, Samar, it was reported to the general that several men in that district had undergone the water torture. He saw three who had been subjected to this treatment. One was the president of the town, Mr. Rozales, who showed him long, deep scars on his arm, which he said were caused by the cords with which he was bound. The second man was Jose Borja. The third was Padre Jose Diaznes, who stated that he was one of three priests who had been subjected to torture by troops under the command of Lieut. Gaujot. Tenth cavalry; that his front teeth had been knocked out, and that he was otherwise maltreated. It was fur-

ther stated that these priests were taken out to be killed, and were saved only by the prompt action of Maj. Carrington, First infantry, who sent for them. Lieut. Gaujot was tried, pleaded guilty, and was given the trivial sentence of three months' suspension from command, forfeiting \$50 per month for the same period. His pleading guilty kept all the facts and circumstances from being developed. It appears furthermore that Maj. Glenn, Lieut. Conger and a party of assistants and native scouts were moved from place to place for the purpose of extorting statements by means of torture. This party became notorious as "Glenn's brigade." Commenting upon these reports, Gen. Miles intimates that it was hardly possible for subordinate officers to be engaged in such acts without the personal knowledge of the general upon whose staff they were serving at the time—namely: Brig. Gen. Hughes. He (Gen. Miles) was informed that it was common talk, at the places where officers congregated, that such transactions had been carried on, either with the connivance or approval of certain commanding officers; though he acquits several of responsibility, including, Gens. Lawton, Wade, Sumner, Lee and Baldwin. With certain officers he found the impression to prevail that such acts were justifiable, and to correct that impression and prevent the possibility of such acts being committed in the future he addressed to the division commander a letter of instructions in which he called attention to the reports of atrocities and directed that all orders or circulars of personal instruction which might inspire or encourage any act of cruelty be annulled, observing therein that "the excuse that the unusual conditions justify the measures herein condemned is without foundation." Gen. Miles directs attention, too, to the acts of reconcentration by Gen. Bell and condemns them as being in direct violation of law. He says that the law was violated also in the handling of rice, which the people who were in the concentration camps as prisoners of war were compelled to buy at a large profit. He characterizes this as unprecedented, and speaks of the magnitude of the transactions, which involved 21,000,000 pounds of rice and other supplies at a cost of \$306,320. This thriftiness was disapproved by a division commander, who turned the matter over to the civil