

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1902.

Number 208.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

World-power patriotism is selfishness magnified.

And just as sure as selfishness reacts in the end disastrously upon the individual self-seeker, so, in the nature of things, must world-power patriotism react disastrously upon the country that fosters it. No country can long retain its own freedom after it goes in for foreign conquest. Imperial sway over distant colonies is the sure forerunner of imperial sway at home.

This assertion, so often made in the way of prophecy with reference to our own colonial ventures, is coming true even faster than could have been feared. For domestic imperialism is expressing itself in the new army bill. Gen. Miles has made this clear. He has made it so clear that even the dupes of the party in power—this party of conquest rampant and trusts triumphant—even the dupes of that party, though fools, may understand it if they will.

Gen. Miles became a witness last week before the Senate committee on military affairs, and as such was under examination by the committee on the subject of the army bill in question, which is now pending in Congress. To appreciate the full force of Gen. Miles's testimony, it must be remembered that this bill was prepared under the direction of the Secretary of War, and is understood to have the President's approval. Gen. Miles described the true character of the bill as a long step in the direction of creating a military despotism, not mere-

ly in the Philippines, but also here at home, when in testifying he said:

It is centralization of the most pronounced type; it augments the power of the staff, and in effect it removes it further from touch with the fighting force of the army. The scheme is revolutionary, casts to the winds the lessons of experience, and abandons methods which successfully carried us through the most memorable war epochs of our history. The proposed plan is but an effort to adopt and foster, in a republican form of government such as ours, a system peculiarly adapted to monarchies having immense standing armies. It would seem to Germanize and Russianize the small army of the United States. . . . It seems to me you are throwing the door wide open for a future autocrat or a military despot. It is not, in my judgment, in accordance with the principle and theory of democratic government, and for the best interests of the army, which has existed more than a hundred years and fulfilled all your requirements, to adopt such a scheme.

Because Gen. Miles gave this pointed testimony, the air is full of rumors (many of them vouched for by press correspondents known to be in good standing at the White House), to the effect that the President contemplates again subjecting Gen. Miles to severe discipline. He seems to regard this clearly privileged testimony as a personal reflection upon the witness' military superiors, which must be punished in true autocratic style. But the personal matter is really of no moment. It makes little difference whether or not Gen. Miles has hurt the feelings of President Roosevelt and his Secretary of War. It makes quite as little whether or not he was guilty of a breach of military discipline in telling the truth when testifying as a witness before a Senate committee. The important question is whether his characterization of the proposed army bill is correct. On that point it is to be observed that while there is much indignation in administration circles over his testi-

mony as a possible breach of discipline, there is no denial of its truth.

If it is a military duty to mislead Senate committees when testifying before them, a breach of which calls for discipline, the military witnesses before Senator Lodge's Philippine committee have conducted themselves on the whole with great military propriety. But in this case the witnesses were complying with the manifest desires of the majority of the committee. The infamy of American rule in the Philippines was to be whitewashed, and the majority of the committee—or, rather, Senator Lodge, for he virtually is the majority—is making a neat job of it.

When Senator Hoar moved for a special Senate committee on the conduct of the war in the Philippines, Mr. Lodge opposed the motion. He objected to having the matter taken out of his own hands as chairman of the standing committee on the Philippines. This was the first indication of the plan, now evident, to make a "whitewash" of the inquiry. And Mr. Hoar, in one of his intermittent fits of weakness, assented. Accordingly, the inquiry was referred to Mr. Lodge's committee.

Then came the next development. None of the minority members of Mr. Lodge's committee being equipped with a ready knowledge of details regarding the American occupation of the Philippines, no thorough cross-examination of Mr. Lodge's military witnesses was likely to be made. To overcome this unfortunate feature of the reference to a standing instead of a special committee, the services of a lawyer of high reputation, who is familiar with the details of the subject under investigation, were offered to the committee; but the majority, led by Mr. Lodge, declined the

offer. There is no reasonable explanation, other than that they wished to conceal rather than to discover the truth.

Another coat of "whitewash" was put on later. The committee had been appointed to initiate inquiries into a condition; but, controlled by the majority, which was in turn controlled by Mr. Lodge, it refused to take the initiative, and assumed to be a sort of court for the trial of issues. To all who suggested lines of inquiry leading apparently to evidence of gross maladministration, it replied in effect: "Bring on your witnesses." And there it stood, and there it stands. This is the policy it still pursues.

Lest, also, the public might learn too much from even the partisan witnesses it calls, witnesses who are themselves implicated in the suspected maladministration, Mr. Lodge's committee excludes all newspaper correspondents except the reporters who represent the three press monopolies of the country—men who are under the orders of monopolist papers. Thus we have a committee which is well organized at the outset for a "whitewash," which declines the aid of a lawyer specially and thoroughly equipped and of high standing, which refuses to investigate by probing impartially for the truth, and which takes care to exclude the public and independent correspondents from its hearings. If these circumstances do not justify the growing suspicion that Mr. Lodge has undertaken a "whitewashing" job it must be because he is another of the immaculates against whom no suspicion may be breathed, under the penalty of blasphemy and treason. If Mr. Lodge really desires to uncover the truth, if he is really willing to end the conspiracy of silence which from the beginning has characterized the Philippine policy, if there is nothing in that policy which the American people may not be allowed to know about, then let him give some earnest at least of his good faith by opening the hearings to the public and af-

fording newspaper facilities not only to the monopoly press associations, but to all news gatherers.

While Mr. Lodge's committee is sedulously engaged in suppressing the facts about the Philippines, the censor at Manilla has incautiously let out a piece of testimony before a court-martial which verifies one of the worst charges that have been made against the American troops in that long suffering archipelago. We refer to the charge that the Americans kill defeated Filipinos instead of taking them prisoners. This has been strenuously denied. And upon being proved in particular instances, the instances have been explained on the ground that the American troops could not always be restrained from retaliating upon the Filipinos for barbarities suffered by their comrades at the hands of Filipinos. But repeatedly the American people have been officially assured that these particular outrages were seldom perpetrated, and then not only without the authority but against the orders of responsible officers. As Secretary Root put it in his report to the Senate: *That the soldiers fighting such an enemy, and with their own eyes witnessing such deeds, should occasionally be regardless of their orders and retaliate by unjust severities is not incredible. . . . [but] . . . A constant and effective pressure of prohibition, precept and discipline has been maintained against them.*

Mr. Root's pronoun "them" related to tortures, but his explanation is typical of the excuses for killing instead of capturing, and of killing after capture. Now, however, thanks to a sleepy censor at Manila, we have positive evidence that this barbarous mode of warfare has been carried on under orders from general officers. It comes out in the trial of Maj. Waller, charged with murdering Filipinos in the island of Samar, and of whom in this connection the unsavory Funston said at a banquet in Chicago, "Bully for him; I am glad he did it!" In Waller's defense Capt. Porter, of the marine corps, who accompanied Waller in his ill-fated expedition into the

interior of the island of Samar, gave testimony on the 24th. The substance of Porter's testimony, as reported on the 25th by the Chicago Inter Ocean, a thick-and-thin Republican paper, is as follows:

Capt. Porter, of the marine corps, who accompanied Maj. Waller on the trip across Samar, continued his testimony. He said that Gen. Smith gave Maj. Waller power of life or death by inference, saying he wanted no prisoners, and that traitors should be punished by death.

Mr. Lodge has glibly offered to examine anonymous witnesses who have written about such barbarities, knowing full well that they could not reveal their identity without being persecuted. But here is a witness who is not anonymous. Capt. Porter is his name, and he says in words that Gen. Smith gave orders to his subordinates to take "no prisoners" but to kill "traitors." Will Senator Lodge bring Capt. Porter, Maj. Waller and Gen. Smith before his committee, and let the public hear them testify? or will he go on with his star chamber job at "whitewashing"?

When the river and harbor plunder bill came up for passage in the House, Congressman Sulzer demanded the yeas and nays, so as to put every member on record. But the spoils had been so judiciously distributed that only three other members supported Mr. Sulzer's demand. Consequently, the constitution making it necessary that one-fifth of the members present shall make the demand in order to give it effect, the yeas and nays were not recorded. When it comes to cutting up river and harbor "pork," most Democratic congressmen are very much like Republican congressmen—they take their share and say nothing.

The much-praised Republican bill to abolish "government by injunction" in the Federal courts has gone into a Republican committee of the Senate and come out with a proviso which not only nullifies the body of the bill but would actually legalize the very judicial innovation at the reversal of which the bill is professed-

ly aimed. The New York Nation says that the bill as amended would make "judicial injunctions against strikes easier rather than more difficult to obtain." It might be argued, however, that the Nation's judgment on this point is not to be trusted since it is now opposed to "government by injunction." Turn, then, to that able and candid plutocratic organ, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle. In its issue of the 22d it speaks of the nullifying amendment as "a very clever and at the same time extremely reassuring act on the part" of the Senate committee, since it "expresses in a brief way and in plain terms just what the law is now"—meaning, of course, just what the innovating "government-by-injunction" judges hold the law to be. Plutocracy is seldom without friends in the right place in an emergency.

Colorado, which is not yet known to have redeemed her good name by punishing the infamous lynching and burning of a Negro, which recently occurred there, has another case of Negro lynching to her discredit. This time the victim, convicted without judge or jury or any other safeguard of innocence, was hanged and shot. Do the authorities of Colorado purpose allowing that crime against public order and the due administration of justice to pass without notice? Or will it punish the anarchists who committed it?

On Tuesday next the people of Chicago are to cast a referendum vote for or against these three important propositions:

Ownership by the city of Chicago of all street railroads within the corporate limits of said city.

Ownership by the city of Chicago of the gas and electric lighting plants. Said plants to furnish all heat and power for public and private use.

The nomination of all candidates for city offices by direct vote of the voters at the primary election to be held for that purpose.

This vote will not be decisive. It can be only advisory. The law-making authorities may adopt or ignore the advice as they please. But it will be no

insignificant factor in determining their action. Should any or all these propositions receive pronounced support at the polls on Tuesday—and all of them deserve to — their legal enactment will be only a matter of a little time. Politicians do respect public opinion when there is no mistaking it. It is important, also, that a large vote should be cast. A small vote would tend for a time to discredit the principle of direct legislation by the people; whereas a large one, whatever the particular result might be, would silence captious objections to that method of holding corrupt legislators and councilmen in check. Whatever, then, may be a voter's opinions on these subjects, he will perform a distinct service to good government by expressing them on this occasion. Each of the three propositions is sound and well worthy the support of all good citizens; and in addition, a vote, even an adverse vote, will count as a fourth civic virtue, because it will tend to foster the saving principle of direct legislation by the people.

THE POLICE "SWEAT BOX."

In the course of an argument in a criminal case in New York last week, the defendant's lawyer raised a point of vital interest to the due administration of criminal justice. He moved the suppression of admissions or confessions that had been made by his client, doing so on the ground that they were made to police detectives in whose custody she was, without any previous warning to her that she need make no statements unless she desired to, and that if she should make any they might be used to convict her.

The motion was granted by Justice Mayer, who said, in making his decision, that he found no warrant in the law for the questioning of a prisoner by a police officer, before the prisoner had been arraigned in court and informed of his legal rights. Had the point been involved, he would doubtless have added that neither is there any warrant for such questioning after arraignment.

Justice Mayer must be a veritable

Daniel come to judgment, for in this decision he has delivered a decisive blow at the police "sweat box" system, which has been practiced for years by the police in all the great cities, and at which, lawless as it manifestly is, judges in the criminal courts have winked.

The extent of this illegal practice may be inferred from the plea of the assistant district attorney to Justice Mayer, in the case alluded to. He urged the judge not to make the decision he did because—

it is going to work the greatest innovation in the system in vogue, not only in the city of New York, but over the entire country. Thousands of cases have been decided in court here on statements made by prisoners to officers before the arraignment in court.

The general nature of this "sweat box" system is well known, yet it is tolerated because its victims are usually friendless persons accused of crime. It is a system of torture applied for the purpose of extorting confessions. Quite candidly and approvingly the Minneapolis Journal described the system at about the time of President McKinley's assassination, and we can do no better than quote that description:

The practice of "torturing" suspected criminals to wring from them information that will lead to the apprehension and punishment of accomplices is followed generally throughout the country and is almost invariably a speedy and satisfactory method, leading in many cases to the discovery of instigators for whose crime their dupes or tools would otherwise have suffered alone.

While admitting that very drastic measures are adopted in the "sweat box" in order to extract a confession from suspects, the police officials seldom divulge the nature of the process employed. There is no set method in use. Each prisoner when taken into the "sweat box" is given different treatment, depending entirely on his temperament and mental condition and the degree of anxiety on the part of the police to make him talk. Often it is only necessary to browbeat and threaten the witness or to harrow his feelings by some of the numberless methods known to an experienced police officer.

But often prisoners are not to be scared by threats or "bulldozing" methods, and when these means fail, torture is used as a last resort. It is applied unflinchingly and relentlessly, and with such severity that the pris-

oner is frequently rendered wild or insane with fear and pain. Human endurance and self-control fail before some of the methods employed. Probably the most common method of forcing confession from unwilling lips is to string the prisoner up by the thumbs. This will fetch the majority of criminals to terms, for the intense pain such treatment induces will subdue the most stubborn spirit.

But if the prisoner maintains his defiance after this torture, the inquisitors are not balked, by any means. There are other more painful tortures, and while they do not rival the methods of the old Spanish inquisition in their cruelty or barbarity, they are just as effective.

Whatever the people may mean by "pincers" can be as well inferred as described. Ordinarily the torture—for it is nothing more—is specially devised to fit the particular case under consideration. If the police are satisfied that any person possesses information which may reveal the principals or participants in a great crime, they will get it and they feel justified in employing any means, no matter how severe and cruel, if it will result in a confession.

When it is considered not only that the tortured prisoners are plied with questions without any notice to them that it is their legal right to make no disclosures, but also that our constitutions forbid unusual punishments and cruelty even to convicted criminals, the utter disregard of law involved in this brutally inquisitorial "sweat box" system cannot but excite the indignation of all men who really respect the law. It is a system which puts the sworn officers of the law who practice it upon the criminal level of the "anarchist" as they describe him.

The police are usually reticent, as the Minneapolis Journal says, about their "sweat box" methods; but from items written by police court reporters, and the disclosures of victims, it is reasonably inferred that there are three degrees. The first degree consists in impressing the prisoner with the idea that he must answer questions whether he wants to or not. This is entirely lawless, as the decision of Judge Mayer now points out. Having so impressed the prisoner, all kinds of ingenious, irritating and confusing questions are asked. Under such an ordeal shrewd and self-governed criminals may come out first best; but the timid, the slow of thought, the unsophisticated and frightened prisoner who is innocent, may very easily be, and he not infre-

quently is, led into a tangle which fixes apparent guilt upon him.

An instance of the first degree in the "sweat box" was given simply as matter of current news not long ago in one of the Chicago papers. The prisoner's name was Thombs. He was in the custody of the police, whose sole duty it was to keep him safely for trial. But they violated their duty and the law by subjecting him to a "sweat box" experience. We quote the report:

For over an hour Thombs was kept under fire. He was told all about how he had abused his wife, Minnie Ristau, and compelled her to work for him and support him. Thombs did not know where the information came from nor how much of it the police had in reserve, and he soon weakened. Then Lieut. Haines switched suddenly and asked Thombs whether he had ever been at Cedar Lake, Ind. The question caught Thombs off his guard and he answered "Yes." Thombs scarcely had made this admission when Lieut. Haines bombarded him with a string of questions in the same line. It was all too rapid for Thombs's slow mind, and apparently without realizing what he said, he told the lieutenant that three years ago, in 1898, he and his "wife" had driven to Cedar Lake together. He declared they had come back together also. Thombs had said too much, and Lieut. Haines could get no further admissions. In the afternoon Capt. Wheeler tried another sweatbox method. Thombs declared at first that he wished to make a statement. When told to go ahead he launched into a tirade on Mrs. Severs, whom he at once connected with the Cedar Lake charge. He asked the police to send for Mrs. Severs and his wife and begged that he be kept at the police station until his brother-in-law could see him. Then Capt. Wheeler began. Thombs's heavy features did not move at first, but soon he began to flinch. Finally the prisoner began to weep, but it was not from grief. The man was racked by rage. "I never abused my wife. I would hang for her if I had to," he shouted. "I love her. I never threatened to throw my baby out of the window. That Severs woman has told you all this, and she is the one that hatched up the Cedar Lake story. Capt. Wheeler ended the interview, and Thombs, with his cloth cap pulled down over his eyes, was handcuffed to a policeman and taken to the county jail. He will not be questioned by the police any further on the Larson murder unless he wishes to confess.

On the following day the police captain who conducted this "sweat

box" proceeding was quoted in the news columns of one of the papers as saying about this case:

It has been the most trying police investigation in the history of the Chicago department. The alleged alibi produced by Thombs upset us and for a few hours the police were lost. But we set about to knock the alibi sky high, and in this we succeeded. Thombs while in my custody put up a defiant air, but I am positive that before his case reaches the grand jury he will break down and confess. He told me on Saturday that all that kept him from making such a confession was the warning of his lawyer.

There is an instance of the first degree. Could anything be more defiant of law? The second and third degrees are known only to police inquisitors and their friendless prisoners. It is generally believed, however, that they consist in physical torture. The second degree is described by some as including sudden and violent changes of temperature, accompanied by probing and confusing questions, until the victim's nervous system gives way and he answers at the will of his official but lawless persecutors. If this fails, the third degree—in which, perhaps, a brilliant light is steadily directed at the victim's eyes, both while he is awake and when he tries to sleep—is resorted to. That there certainly is a "third degree" is fairly evident from the following item in a New York news report in the Chicago Tribune:

The passage of this "third degree" from police headquarters, so far as official support is concerned, took place to-day when Commissioner Partridge and District Attorney Jerome had a conference. The "third degree" is to be left out of the methods of the district attorney's office in preparing prosecutions. While it has never become a habit there, as it was at police headquarters and even at police stations, nevertheless it is not unknown.

In this connection it is as gratifying as unexpected to find one chief of police who has discouraged not only this particular form, but every form, of police lawlessness against the rights of prisoners. We refer to Francis O'Neil, the general superintendent of police of Chicago, who has given evidence on three or four occasions and in as many different ways, of his respect for the law. Last fall he issued an order which is a credit to him and the observance of which would be a credit to any police force that should act in harmony with its

terms and spirit. In this order, dated November 22, 1901, he said:

To All Members of the Force: All police officers should bear in mind that, while it is their duty to suppress crime and arrest and prosecute criminals, they must not resort to illegal means to accomplish desirable results. . . . Policemen cannot afford to ignore the law even for a good purpose.

It is to be hoped that the infamous and lawless "sweat box" system, introduced into this country by the most successfully corrupt chief of police that ever disgraced the New York force, will be abolished. Judges and grand juries, if they would foster popular respect for law, must set about suppressing this official violation of law. Now that one judge has been courageous enough to stamp it with judicial condemnation, there is no excuse for tolerating it. Other judges should denounce it and grand juries should act.

If inquisitorial proceedings are necessary, let them take place only in the presence of a responsible magistrate, as in the courts of first instance in Europe, where the prisoner can have some responsible protection. Let the inquisition be no longer allowed in the inner rooms of irresponsible police detective, where the prisoner has no protection at all and is at the mercy of merciless men.

Of course a law providing for an inquisitorial examination of prisoners charged with crime would be invalid, for under the English and American theory of the administration of justice no man can be compelled to give evidence against himself. But if such proceedings would be without constitutional validity, surrounded as the prisoner would be with judicial safeguards, what shall we say of the same kind of proceedings when they are carried to the extent of cruelty by policemen unchecked by judicial restraints? On what other basis can any man justify lawless proceedings of that sort than that he has turned "anarchist" and cares nothing for the sanctity of law?

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Cincinnati, March 23.

I.

There is in this city a socialist organization which is interesting and significant for many reasons, one of them being that it holds aloof from the fatalistic sectarianism of the socialist parties. It is the Clarion club, the members of which distinguish

themselves as "Clarionets," and its leading spirit is Edward C. Wenning.

The Clarion club meets at Odd Fellows' Temple on the first and third Wednesdays of each month, and during the winter season it offers a public lecture course, in a commodious theater, the course for the present year having closed to-day.

Speaking of this club, one of its leading members describes its internal policy as being very strict, though in a rational and practical sense. "The active member," he says, "besides being a socialist, must be willing to cultivate practical organizational faculties. He must not be an indolent or slipshod socialist, but must learn how an organization should be conducted and how he should conduct himself in relation to the organization of which he has become an integral part." To promote this policy the club sternly insists upon regular attendance, and, unlike most organizations, drops members who become too remiss in that respect. Instead of weakening the club, this strictness appears to strengthen it. Absentee government, one of the weakening evils of club organization, is eliminated.

Another feature of the internal policy of the Clarion club, as explained by the same prominent member, is self-cultivation. "The club does not merely advocate socialism, but advocates rather the study of socialism. It does not seek fanatically to make miscellaneous socialists of outsiders; it seeks to make good socialists of its own members, feeling this to be the best way, in the end, of converting outsiders. Tolerating no proselyting fever, it strives to keep itself free from fanaticism, from sectarianism, from stiff-necked bigotry and from crass partisanship in socialism as in everything else. Though it holds itself faithful to the cause of socialism and to the general socialist movement, feeling and acknowledging its oneness with that, it does not believe it to be to the best interest of the socialist cause at present to cooperate with a socialist party. It believes, both upon local and general considerations, that its higher and better service would, under existing socialist party organizations, be impossible. Looking to the welfare of the socialist cause, and testing the usefulness of socialist parties by that standard, it abstains from blind or indolent partisanship and adopts instead the policy of keeping in touch with the

thought, feeling and sympathy of the masses of the people who are not yet socialists. Its members regard these people as their fellow citizens, as their own brethren, and their burdens and problems as among the burdens and problems of the club. Consequently the club inculcates the policy of helping all the people practically and progressively here and now. It believes in democracy as well as in socialism. It believes in sensible current work, as well as in the ultimate goal. It believes in bridging the way to that goal and not in expecting the people to leap the intervening chasm. And it believes that in this way the goal can be reached more surely and faster than through the existing socialist parties, yet without meanwhile in the slightest degree abandoning the socialist ideal; for it believes that socialism is democratic and that its practical policy should be progressively constructive."

By way of illustrating the methods and spirit of the club, the same leader in its counsels refers to its annual lecture course, saying:

"Here it establishes a platform for public enlightenment, where no one idea, no one creed or doctrine, no offensive or pugilistic party speeches, no shallow or trivial lectures, are in place. Neither is the platform a 'forum' for acrimonious debate or the airing of multifarious views, ignorant and ill digested, on the social problem. On the contrary, well informed and competent thinkers, men and women who are not only sincere but intelligent, and capable of explaining the truth as they see it, are the kind of speakers whom the club seeks for. Their subjects vary and their philosophies may conflict, but it is light upon these varying subjects and an understanding of these divergent philosophies that the public needs."

The Clarion club was formed hardly more than a year ago—December, 1900—but its members claim for it already a gratifying influence, both within and without the city, and both as to quality and lasting effect.

Its directing and voting members must be socialists, but it maintains a roll of associate members to which any one in general sympathy with socialism who approves the methods and desires to aid in the work of the club is admitted.

"Its socialism," says the member already quoted, "is the socialism that

is indigenous to this country, growing out of the conditions here and expressing itself in the American manner. It is a socialism that is obedient to democracy and involves democracy. While at one in many essentials of its philosophy with socialism everywhere, it adopts the distinctly American type of expression, agitation and operation. It rests upon the principle of reciprocal rights and duties, and while it stands for the rights of society, including public ownership of the means of production and distribution and of all other social capital, it stands no less sturdily for the rights of the individual, believing the rights of society and those of the individual to be not antagonistic but interdependent and reciprocal."

The unique feature of the Clarion club, as a socialist organization, according to the same member, is that "it insists upon its members' studying and understanding the fundamental truths of democratic socialism; upon their making this understanding their special duty in the club and their primary obligation to the club; and upon their thereby cultivating a fitness for conducting socialist organization with intelligence and dignity, and qualifying themselves for enlightened citizenship—for taking their place, that is, in society and conscientiously doing their social and civic duties with propriety and effect. It is not the Clarionet's first ambition to run up and down the highways pinning socialist badges upon everyone who will let him, nor to applaud every crude or unintelligent action or step or piece of printing that bears the socialist label."

One significance of this Cincinnati club will be better appreciated, though its members say nothing on that point, when it is understood that both the socialist parties in American politics are dominated by and wedded to the German "scientific" socialism, which repudiates the principle of human rights and definitely aims only to build up and place in political control a class-conscious labor party, proposing then to let fatalistic "evolution go on in its inevitable course."

A socialist movement which diverges from this policy cannot but be welcomed by many who are not socialists as well as by many who are. Whoever hopes and works for better social order, in the belief that moral energy and not fatalistic evolution is the superior social force, that right and not might is the true social ideal, and that laborers are entitled to own as private property the wealth that represents their varying contributions to production, must look with satisfaction upon this Cincinnati movement. And its common sense method of keep-

ing in touch with the common sentiment of the time and taking advantage of opportunities to advance its ultimate purpose, instead of segregating its membership, must appeal to earnest men who are also practical. Of its specific purpose, however, there can be but one opinion among all who have learned to distinguish things that essentially differ. When its members think of labor products being in the category of "social capital," thus confusing the essential and vitally important differences between capital which is artificial and that which is natural, and in consequence propose the public ownership and management of both kinds of capital, they become responsible for a proposition which can neither endure the test of discriminating analysis nor survive a logical comparison with their own fundamental principles.

II.

Another significant institution of Cincinnati, much older and replete with historic experience and suggestiveness, while likewise of universal interest in connection with social questions, is the old Vine street church. As you enter the vestibule your eye catches the inspiring legend, inscribed over the outer door, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," a legend which is peculiarly appropriate to this truly religious temple. No less uplifting are the inscriptions, handsomely lettered upon the inner walls on every side. They are worth quoting as indications of the vital spirituality of this unique Christian church:—

Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.—Jesus.

Our country is the world; our countrymen are mankind.—Garrison.

Life without labor is guilt; labor without art is brutality.—Ruskin.

Far, far beyond our ken, the eternal laws must hold their sway.—Henry George.

The God who gave us life gave us liberty.—Jefferson.

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves.—Lincoln.

He does not really believe his own opinions who dares not give free scope to his opponent.—Wendell Phillips.

He who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the name of goodness, but must explore if it be goodness.—Emerson.

No consecrated absurdity would have stood its ground in this world if the man had not silenced the objections of the child.—Michelet.

He's true to God who is true to Man.—Lowell.

We cannot be saved separately; we must be saved all together.—Tolstoy.

They should be first among all who contribute most by their labor to the good of all.—Mazzini.

Those who make private property of the gift of God, pretend in vain to be innocent.—Pope Gregory the Great.

What does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.—Micah.

It is the evening service which we attend in this historic and inviting sanctuary of the God who reigns on earth as well as in heaven. A spacious low platform, backed by a large organ, with a desk far to one side and a choir

at the other, occupies the rear of the auditorium. As the sound of the organ subsides the pastor advances to the reading desk. There are few of the conventionalities of church service. A prayer when the occasion inspires one, but at other times the scriptural injunction:

When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues. . . . but thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet—

is obeyed. A few announcements, among others a weekly economic class in the Sunday-school room, a daily free kindergarten in another of the church apartments, a fortnightly social gathering, also in the Sunday-school room, at which one learns that dancing is not tabooed. Then a hymn by the choir, one reading from the new testament story of the temptations of the Nazarene, and another from Ernest Crosby's "Plain Talks in Psalm and Parable," and the sermon begins.

The preacher's smooth shaven face reveals a jaw too finely chiseled to be brutal, but massive and firmly set, suggesting extraordinary powers of patient endurance; while all the face above is expressive of the gentleness, charity and unaffected humility which are known to be characteristic of the man. His sermon has been carefully prepared, but is extemporaneous in delivery; and, in spite of flashes of eloquence that thrill the sedate church audience almost to the point of secular applause, the rhetoric and the elocution are so natural that the preacher seems to be conversing earnestly, heart to heart, with each individual listener.

The subject is "The Temptations of Jesus." The miraculous is disregarded, the preacher inferring from the narrative of the temptations that it is an allegorical representation of inward experiences of this great man of Palestine. His abilities were transcendent, and for a time he was popular. Why should he not selfishly conquer the kingdoms of the world? That temptation the narrator had symbolized by the story of the temptation on the mountain top. And then, why not turn his abilities to making wealth? This temptation was symbolized by the taunting challenge, when he was hungry, to turn stones into bread. Once more temptation comes. Alone in his teachings, all the wealthy and learned and respectable saying he was crazy and his own family suspecting it, he began to doubt himself, began to doubt that what he taught was right; and this is symbolized by the challenge to cast himself from the pinnacle on which he stood, and thereby test the genuineness of what he supposed to be his mission. These are the great temptations that come to all men of ability who forsake the good things of this world which they might

have for the asking, and take their stand for righteousness.

It is not strange that the preacher who could make such a sermon is not content to confine his work to a narrow ecclesiastical sphere. It would be as impossible for Herbert S. Bigelow as it was for Henry Ward Beecher. And so we find Mr. Bigelow out among the people, even on political platforms. And just as his predecessors applied the teachings of Jesus to the social and political sin of slavery, so he applies them to the grasping ambitions of imperialism, to the plundering of so-called protection, to extortionate taxation, and to that greatest of all social iniquities—the monopoly by the few of the earth which God made for all.

In this era of the new abolition, there is a peculiar fitness in the occupation of the Vine Street Congregational pulpit by Bigelow, and in the work which that church is doing under his leadership. For the Vine Street Congregational church was born out of the old abolition struggle; it was dedicated to the principle of equal human rights; and for its devotion to that principle then, it suffered the same kind of obloquy that it suffers now for devotion to the same principle; and it suffers it from people of the same class.

This church came into existence when the slavery fight was gathering force. Students in Lane Theological seminary formed a Students' Anti-Slavery league in 1834, which resolved "that it is the duty of slaveholding states to abolish slavery immediately." This movement was promptly rebuked by the pious faculty, in language which is not unfamiliar at the present time in connection with apologies for the vested wrongs of our day. They likened the anti-slavery agitation in the seminary to "whirlwind and lightning," and spoke of such things as explaining why "many of our best citizens are looking upon seminaries as a nuisance more to be dreaded than the cholera and plague." In sympathy with this action on the part of the faculty, the trustees suppressed the Students' Anti-Slavery league; and in consequence 51 students left Lane and went to Oberlin.

In the state of feeling indicated by that incident the Vine Street church of Cincinnati had its birth. It was organized April 9, 1831, as the Sixth Presbyterian church, by 13 men and 7 women, all abolitionists, who seceded from the First Presbyterian church because its pastor, Joshua Wilson, had embarked upon a defense of slavery on scriptural grounds.

The first pastor of the new church was Asa Mahan, an uncompromising abolitionist, who left it in 1835 to become president of Oberlin college. While pastor of the little Vine street

congregation he himself was ostracized by the rest of the Cincinnati clergy, and his little daughters were assailed with volleys of stones in the streets, one of them receiving injuries in that way, at the hands of the pro-slavery mob, from which she never recovered. The Lane seminary authorities urged the church to dismiss Dr. Mahan because "he was a disturber of the peace;" but he was faithfully retained until Oberlin sent for him, and was succeeded by a "disturber" like himself.

In 1846 the church changed its ecclesiastical connection from the Presbyterian to the Congregational. Its membership had risen at that time to 142. The present church site and building were acquired in 1848, and in that year the deliberations of the first evangelical anti-slavery convention ever held in America were conducted in this place, and conducted in peace, the arrangements of a mob to disperse the gathering having miscarried.

The church, now grown to maturity, and thoroughly ambitious as may be inferred from what has been already told, was one of the few religious organizations of the country at that time which did not piously and cordially support the pro-slavery regime, and one of still fewer that gave direct encouragement to the anti-slavery agitation. Among the acts of discipline recorded in its books is an expulsion for slaveholding, one for taking bribes to return runaway slaves, and one for enlisting in the United States army for the invasion of Mexico. Its membership included Levy Coffin, famous as a promoter of the "underground railway," which was the slang name of the system for aiding escaped slaves upon their painful and dangerous journey from the Ohio river up through the state of Ohio to the "Western Reserve" and thence over to Canada and freedom. The church building itself was "unlawfully" used by Coffin, on at least one occasion, as a place for the temporary concealment of what the laws euphemistically described as a "fugitive from service." The congregation had no respect for "property rights" of that kind.

The pastors succeeding Dr. Mahan were H. Norton; Jonathan Blanchard (later president of Knox college), who is described as having "poured the hottest kind of biblical hot shot into the Presbyterian slave ship manned by Dr. Wilson and his pious crew;" Charles Brandon Boynton (afterwards a congressional chaplain and the founder and first president of Howard college); Charles H. Daniels; Josiah Strong, who wrote his famous "Our Country" in the church during his pastorate; William H. Warren; Norman Plass; and the present pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, who came to the church fresh from Lane seminary, in 1886.

Throughout its abolition career this church was looked upon by the comfortable folk and pious, as a nest of troublesome lepers and dangerous vipers. Stones were hurled by mobs at its sacred walls, and its pastors were not only ignored professionally by the other orthodox ministers, but were personally snubbed by them when they met upon the streets.

All this changed when slavery collapsed and it was no longer disreputable to stand up for freedom. As suddenly then as did Saul of Tarsus, but much more discreetly than he, the orthodox ministers of Cincinnati saw a great light, and marched into Freedom's camp behind what they had called "the speckled" Vine street church, with its abolition "lepers" and "vipers" and its "disturbers of the peace."

But it is useless to cry "peace! peace!" when there is no peace. One great iniquity—chattel slavery—had been abolished, and the Vine street church had taken a noble but unpleasant part in the work. Another iniquity now loomed up—the monopoly of the earth, with the economic slavery it produces, more subtle but not less dreadful and pernicious than slavery of the chattel type,—and Vine street church was drafted again into the noble but bitter service. It is to-day repeating, in form somewhat different but in substance the same, its history of half a century ago. This second experience in the perennial struggle for human freedom began soon after the admission of Mr. Bigelow to its pulpit.

Mr. Bigelow came there a conventional minister, quite prepared in all good conscience to obey the injunction so strikingly phrased by the elders of the Negro church in a Southern state, when they admonished their young pastor to "preach Christ and Him crucified, and leave this here complicated question of hen roosts alone." But an impressive experience vitalized his life. With his wife, a graduate of Oberlin and a woman of like devotion to principle and like strength of character with himself, he went to live "among the people," down in the tenement district. His experiences there opened his eyes, and he began to preach against the social iniquity thus unexpectedly revealed. He had gone into the slums to benefit their denizens; but it was he who got the most benefit. Their deplorable condition made him ask its cause; and, from having supposed it was due to their own delinquencies, he discovered that it was due to delinquencies of society. He realized the social maladjustments and awoke to the fact that infidelity was masquerading now, as in the days of his predecessors, in the outer trappings of reli-

gion. A bright light shone before him, and a cross appeared in the sky. The revelation had burst upon the right man. True to the traditions of the church of which he was pastor, this worthy successor of a line of courageous preachers of righteousness, took up the work where they had laid it down.

But now the church turned against him. It took a stand with reference to the new abolition where the First Presbyterian church had stood with reference to the older one. And, curiously enough, considering the history of the church, the first outbreak was over the question of admitting a Negro to membership.

At one of Mr. Moody's revival meetings this Negro had expressed a desire to join a Congregational church, and Mr. Moody referred his name to Mr. Bigelow. The latter called upon the Negro, and, satisfied with his state of mind, arranged to admit him as a member of the Vine street congregation. A vigorous opposition was made at once to taking a man of the old slave race into the church, but enough of the traditions of the organization remained to enable Mr. Bigelow to hold the church true to its original impulse.

The hostility to him grew, however, stimulated as it was not only by this recognition of human equality as to race, but also by his outspoken recognition of human equality as to rights to the earth. It grew so strong that he resigned, with the reservation, though, that he had no desire to leave. He had resigned only to enable the congregation to express itself. By a congregational vote of 80 to 60 he was requested to withdraw his resignation, and, the minority being largely composed of non-attendants, he did so. Then came a series of persecutions, beginning with attempts by the minority to prosecute him for heresy without specific charges, going the length of subjecting him to fears of personal violence and of maliciously assailing him in the newspapers, and ending with an attempt by the church officers to starve him out by withholding his salary.

For months his income was almost nothing, and he and his wife were literally upon the verge of starvation. But her unflinching encouragement and his own will held him steadfast until new officers were elected.

By this time, his courageous preaching, while it had driven many of the old members out and brought many new ones in, had changed the congregation from a wealthy one to a poor one, and nearly five years elapsed before the church again rested upon a satisfactory financial basis.

But the long fight is over now, and few congregations in Cincinnati are on a more secure financial footing than

the Vine street church. In other respects it stands with reference to the other churches as it did in the forties and fifties. It is a despised, hated, feared, but fearless and unswerving pioneer in Christian righteousness. It is led by a pastor, who, like the old pastors, is ostracized by the pastors of the other orthodox churches. And these others, like their predecessors of the abolition era, are "either in open alliance with the plundering powers that be, or are languidly marking time on the green velvet lawns of neutrality."

The spirit in which the work of this church is conducted, a revival of the spirit of liberty in which it was born, may be inferred from what has been told. It is definitely outlined in the following address of the pastor to the public:

It is the aim of this pulpit to teach that the noblest conception of God is that of a father who loves all of His children. It follows that men are brothers and that the fruits of Justice and Love between man and man—nation and nation—are proof of a vital religion. Faith in God involves the belief that there are natural laws touching every part of our life, and that by discovering and obeying these laws men may create the conditions of their own happiness. Bodily disease is an evidence of the violation of natural law—political disease an evidence of the violation of natural law—social disease an evidence of the violation of natural law. We exalt the virtue of open-mindedness, that men may readily accept each new truth that leads to a better understanding of these laws. It is the aim of this pulpit to help men to adjust their life to the righteousness of natural law, that they may become more brotherly, that their politics may be purified, that social conditions may be made more just, that the material as well as the moral—the communal as well as the individual—life may be improved. Liberty, Fraternity, Progress, Justice, Love—these we hope to be the ideals of this church, and we claim for our field of service the entire life of man, believing the highest form of worship to be an intelligent devotion to the good of a World-Wide Humanity.

The church and the pastor of our day that stand for such principles, and with such a history for a background as this church can justly pride itself upon, may feel with certainty, let the temporary obloquy they suffer be what it may, that they are in the van of Christian progress. They are living over again the experiences of the earnest men and women who 70 years ago gave to the Vine street church of Cincinnati, under Mahan and Blanchard and Boynton, the impulse which so far from being spent, has received a new and stronger impetus under the pastorate of Bigelow.

L. F. P.

Tom—Would you call a man who had to black his own shoes a gentleman?

Dick—Lemme see! I'd call that man a gentleman who could black his own shoes without wondering whether a man who had to black his own shoes was a gentleman.—Puck.

NEWS

The South African war continues to be the chief subject of news interest. Gen. Methuen's return after capture by the Boers (p. 791) has been followed by a conference between acting President Schalkburger, of the South African Republic, and Lord Kitchener. It took place at Pretoria and was preliminary to an interview between Schalkburger and President Steyn, of the Orange Free State, which the British ministry had authorized. The significance of this procedure is altogether a matter of conjecture. Nothing authoritative is known about it except that in the British House of Commons on the 25th, Mr. Brodrick, the secretary for war, announced that Mr. Schalkburger had about two weeks before, asked Lord Kitchener for safe conduct through the British lines and back, in order to see Mr. Steyn with reference to possible peace proposals, and that Lord Kitchener, with the consent of the ministry, had granted the request.

As reported by press dispatches from Pretoria, Mr. Schalkburger, F. W. Reitz (ex-secretary of state of the South African Republic), and Commandants Lucas Meyer and Krogh, arrived at Pretoria on the 23d, on a special train from Balmoral, 50 miles to the east, under British escort. They had come into Balmoral from Rhenoster kop, to the north, under flag of truce; and, upon arriving at Pretoria, on the 22d, had held a conference of three hours with Lord Kitchener at his headquarters. Late in the afternoon they took a train under British escort for Kroonstad, in the Orange Free State, where, presumably, they were to meet President Steyn. As yet (March 27) no further news on the subject has been received.

It was understood that an armistice had been arranged pending this interview, but the fact now appears to have been otherwise; for on the 26th Lord Kitchener reported the capture of 135 men of Delarey's command with five field guns and a number of horses and wagons. This was the net result of a combined movement to capture Delarey, similar to the recent unsuccessful one (p. 728) for the capture of DeWet. But like DeWet, Delarey escaped. No details are yet reported except as stated above.

Ireland, as well as South Africa, has become a source of serious trouble to the British ministry. The home rule agitation, which now means not merely Irish autonomy, but separation and an independent government, is reported to have become more menacing than ever before. In the early days of the present session of Parliament, when the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne was under way, John Redmond, the Irish Nationalist leader in Parliament, vigorously attacked the British policy in Ireland. He complained that instead of remedying admitted wrongs the ministry had fallen back on the old methods of coercion, having abolished trial by jury and unjustifiably imprisoned even members of Parliament; and he warned the chief secretary for Ireland, Mr. Wyndham, that he would yet repent his rash refusal to approve the reasonable demands of Ireland in regard to the compulsory sale and purchase of land. Mr. Redmond closed with the declaration that the Irish would never be well affected toward England until they were masters of their own country. Mr. Wyndham replied with an explanation that the ministry had no hope of settling the Irish question and only hoped to do a little toward improving it. As to the land purchase policy, he objected to compulsory sales because they excite litigation; and he assured Parliament that the existing Irish agitation amounted to little. That was on the 23d of January last. The next day T. P. O'Conner, also an Irish Nationalist, supported Redmond in the debate, in a speech in which he asserted that landlordism in Ireland is doomed, and that the present debate marked the beginning of a new epoch in Irish history. The Irish amendment to the address, which formulated the policy of the Irish members, and in support of which this debate occurred, as defeated on the 25th of January by an ordinary ministerial majority. Consequently the Irish land bill, introduced in Parliament by Mr. Wyndham on the 25th, provides only for voluntary sales. There is no compulsory clause. The land commission is authorized to buy the whole or any part of an estate whose owner is willing to sell and to resell it to the tenants, provided three-quarters of the tenants in number assent. In case the landlord desires to live on the estate he may repurchase one-fifth. While the Irish members have not yet opposed this bill, they have notified the minority

that compulsory purchase is the only ultimate solution of the problem.

What gives a menacing aspect to this question, supplemented as it is by demands for independence, is the extensive organization of the United Irish league, of which William Redmond says:

Ireland to-day is united—north, south, east and west—on the platform of the United Irish league, as she was in the days of Parnell in the Land league. . . . The objects of the league are the objects of the Land league—to give the ownership of the farms to the tillers of the soil. We are trying to do away with the renting of the ground. But our great object is not only to free the land, but to free Ireland, to bring about the time when the crimson shadow of the flag of Great Britain will no longer darken the green fields of our land.

Mr. Wyndham has reported that the league is composed of only a few disturbers; but reports of events in Ireland do not confirm that view. On the 30th of January Roscommon county was in a state of open rebellion against paying rent. A month later 40 Roscommon tenants of Lord De Freyne—a landlord who refuses to sell at any price—were evicted by an army of police, and proceedings were pending against many hundreds more, while 15 representative public men had been imprisoned for taking part in political meetings. In other places the league was pushing its agitation so vigorously, though without violent outbreaks, that an independent candidate for a vacancy in the House of Commons for one of the strongholds of the Orangemen of Ulster, a man of radical views on the land question, defeated a Conservative. The Conservatives are usually in such large majority in the district that the seat is seldom contested. That the power of the league is greater than Mr. Wyndham thought appears, also, from the London Times, which, on the 22d, expressed impatience with the ministers for timidity in dealing with the league, and gave warning that it will be perilous for them any longer to shut their eyes to the serious condition in Ireland. The timidity mentioned was an allusion to the action of the ministry a few days ago with reference to the league. It had been proposed in cabinet session to proclaim the league as illegal and to suppress it by force; but on the 11th the cabinet decided that the time had not yet arrived for such a drastic pro-

ceeding. The opinion seems to have prevailed in the cabinet that coercion should be avoided as far as possible until it is seen whether the land purchase bill described above has a tranquilizing effect.

Disturbed feelings among the leading European governments over a variety of complications are apparent. A prospective rising in Macedonia against Turkey; a rebellion in southern China; a belligerent disposition on the part of Japan, now that Great Britain has become her ally for the protection of China; a diplomatic note from Russia nominally approving that alliance but pointedly intimating that she is in alliance with France, also for the protection of China—these rumblings, by all of which Great Britain is affected, as well as by South Africa and Ireland, and which are listened to at Washington with no little concern, are possibly prophetic of an early outbreak of a war of the first magnitude. But as yet they produce only vague unrest.

In the United States the one important event of the week is the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission against collusive railways, for the purpose of putting an end to the prevailing system of rebates on freight charges. When the Commission issued advance sheets of its fifteenth annual report (pp. 677, 781), it thus advised the public that the railroads, both east and west of Chicago, allow to the large packing houses freight rates below published tariff charges, thereby giving to these houses an enormous advantage over their small competitors. Those disclosures have now been followed up by legal proceedings under the direction of W. A. Day, the counsel for the Commission, whom the attorney general has appointed a special United States attorney for the purpose. On the 18th, indictments were found by the Federal grand jury at Louisville, Ky., against the Louisville & Nashville and the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis railways, for making rebates to favored shippers. This action was followed up with injunction suits in the Federal courts in Kansas City and Chicago. The Chicago suits are against the Michigan Central, the Lake Shore & Michigan Southern, the Pennsylvania the Illinois Central, the Chicago & Northwestern, and the Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis roads. On the 23d Judge Grosscup set the hearings

in the Chicago suits for June 9, issuing temporary injunctions meantime restraining each of the roads—

from further acting under and enforcing, or executing in any manner whatever, any agreement to transport over the defendant's railroad, or any part thereof, between the States, any packing-house products, dressed meats, grain, or the products of grain, or any other interstate traffic, at any greater or less rate than the rates named for such service in defendant's established schedule in force on its lines, and, at the time said traffic is transported, on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission; or in any way from departing from their schedule rates in carrying any of the said above products or traffic between the states; and . . . from hereafter agreeing with any shipper or other person to transport such traffic at any other or different rate than such as may be provided for in its schedule as filed and published according to law; and . . . from paying any rebate, or making any concession whatever in defendant's rates and charges, whereby any such traffic transported by said defendant over its railroad, or in respect to any traffic in the transportation of which said defendant may participate, shall be carried by it, in whole or in part, at any rate different from the established rate at the time such traffic shall be transported, then on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission as provided by law.

No injunctions have yet been issued in the Kansas City suits, which were begun on the 21st against the Missouri Pacific, the Chicago & Alton, the Wabash, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, the Burlington, the Rock Island, the Santa Fe, and the Chicago Great Western.

NEWS NOTES.

—Cecil Rhodes died at Cape Town, South Africa, on the 26th.

—At its meeting on the 20th, the Chicago City Council passed resolutions inviting Paul Kruger to visit Chicago.

—Albert T. Patrick, the New York lawyer charged with the murder of William M. Rice, was convicted on the 26th.

—The first free government of Cuba, elected February 24, 1902 (p. 746), is to be inaugurated May 20. The order so directing was issued on the 25th by the American secretary of war, Mr. Root.

—Maj. Gen. Elwell S. Otis, of Philippine war fame, was retired from active service on the 25th. He is succeeded in command of the department of the lakes by Maj. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

—The Colorado legislature adjourned sine die March 22, leaving the Bucklin tax amendment (p. 792) undisturbed. It will be voted upon by the people of the state at the general election next November.

—A. H. Verrill, of New Haven, son of Prof. Verrill, of Yale university, claims to have discovered a method of color photography. The process is chemical instead of mechanical, and is declared to produce marvelously perfect effects. As yet the necessary exposure—30 minutes—is too long to admit of portraiture.

—John Dillon, Irish Nationalist member of the British parliament, was suspended on the 21st for one week, by a vote of 248 to 48, for calling Joseph Chamberlain a "damned liar" on the floor of the House of Commons. Mr. Dillon complains that he lost his temper because the speaker permitted Chamberlain to call the Irish members "traitors."

—The City Council of Chicago adopted resolutions on the 20th inviting the existing street car companies to negotiate for the renewal of franchises, and warning them that if they do not present satisfactory propositions by June 15, 1902, it is the sense of the Council that the attention of capital should be called to the fact that "the city has valuable transportation privileges to dispose of."

—By a vote of 52 to 15 the United States Senate on the 21st passed the Hoar "anarchy" bill, for the protection of the President and his constitutional and statutory successors in office from murderous attempts. It gives jurisdiction over such offenses to the Federal court, and makes unsuccessful as well as successful attempts punishable with death. It also provides for a uniformed bodyguard for the President.

—Charles T. W. Neely, who was extradited to Cuba about a year ago (vol. iii., p. 647-48), charged with postal embezzlements at Havana, has been tried and on the 24th was convicted by the Cuban courts and sentenced to serve ten years' imprisonment and to pay a fine of \$56,701. W. H. Reeves and Estes G. Rathbone were convicted with Neely and subjected to the same sentence, except that Reeves's fine is \$35,516 and Rathbone's \$35,324. Rathbone was at one time an assistant postmaster general of the United States. He charges Gov. Gen. Wood with having ordered his conviction and attributes it to a political conspiracy.

A motion before the City Council of Cleveland on the 24th to reconsider the three-cent carfare ordinance (p. 792) for the purpose of correcting a technical defect, revived the fight against it on the part of the councilmanic friends of the old roads; but the ordinance was reconsidered, properly

amended, and passed by a vote of 18 to 2. Meanwhile, Judge Phillips's decision sustaining an injunction prohibiting the old roads (p. 777) from purchasing frontage consents, had been overruled by the intermediate appellate court, by two judges against the opinion of the third. This decision, however, has no practical effect, the franchise having now been passed.

PRESS OPINIONS.

SHIP SUBSIDY BILL.

Kansas City World (Ind.), Mar. 18.—The business that cannot grow and expand and prosper because trade demands and conditions call for it, is not a good investment for the people of the United States.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Mar. 21.—The argument of the advocates of the ship subsidy bill when reduced to its lowest terms is about as follows: That whereas the Pennsylvania Railroad company subsidized the Republican party in 1886 and again in 1900, it is now the duty and privilege of the Republican party to subsidize the Pennsylvania Railroad company. The exchange of subsidies is a reciprocal and continuing obligation.

Denver Post (Ind.), Mar. 22.—The Middle West and the Rocky Mountain West are not for the measure at all, except by means of the party lash. It is so thoroughly and clearly a proposition assisting the classes as against the masses that there can be no equity or justice in it from almost any point of view other than that of the interested seaboard. . . . Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, stated the exact situation when he said: "In my opinion this subsidy is a gift, and the worst of it is it comes out of the pockets, not of the men who vote to give it, but of the American people."

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), March 18.—Americans have lately invested a good deal of money in steamships and . . . if congress will get down near enough to modern times to permit these Americans to sail their ships under the flag of their country everything needed will come without paying a cent of subsidy to anyone.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), March 18.—The original Hanna subsidy bill was drawn plainly in the interest of the International Navigation company, which is but another name for the Atlantic steamship department of the Pennsylvania Railway company. . . . In the pending Frye subsidy bill an attempt has been made to avoid the odium attached to the Hanna bill. Senator Frye has admitted, however, that the primary and only certain effect of the measure will be to increase the profits and to promote the building of large and fast steamers—that is, ships of which the Pennsylvania railway's vessels are now the leading examples under the American flag.

ANARCHY.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Mar. 24.—There is a question as to whether this bill will not increase the danger to the life of the President. As the law now stands every man is on an equality when his life is attempted. This bill raises the President above the common level, and whenever this is done the anarchist is more determined on destruction than ever. His target is ever the man who is exalted above others. He would come to see in the President some of the elements of a king or emperor.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Mar. 21 (weekly edition).—We must remember in this connection that reputable journals and clergymen openly charged such men as Carl Schurz and Prof. Charles Elliot Norton with being responsible for the murder of President McKinley. Absurd as the charge was, the fact that it was made revealed a

state of opinion peculiar to such a time among a portion of the people. The important question arises whether laws should be passed which could possibly render men like Carl Schurz or Prof. Norton liable to be victimized by a popular frenzy in hours of hysterical excitement.

Chicago Chronicle (cons. Dem.), Mar. 24.—The bill to protect the President, which passed the Senate Friday by a vote approaching unanimity after a debate in the course of which grave senators said some pretty foolish things, is likely to be set down by the historian, if not by the courts, as a product of legislative hysteria. . . . One would think that senators might have regained their composure sufficiently to withhold their approval from a bill which is not necessary for the protection of the chief magistrate, which is highly objectionable in some of its particulars, and which is not at all likely to pass muster in the courts if ever brought to the test.

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), March 18.—Riches can corrupt a legislature—they have done so—but they cannot permanently corrupt a people. Senatorial patronage can make a State legislature subservient. There is not enough of it to influence the action of the people of the smallest State.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Mar. 20.—Election by legislatures has lost its original intent and purpose, and become in the first place a matter of bargain, sale and intrigue in the nomination of members of the legislature, and then very often this is followed by legislative corruption and degradation at the State capital when it comes to the direct election by the members. Elections by these means often place in the Senate wealthy men who could not otherwise have got there, and whose presence in the Senate has won for it the name of the "Millionaire's club." If this method of election is abandoned in favor of that of election by the people it will give merit and capacity the opportunities now denied them.

The Nation (Ind.), Mar. 20.—Various causes have worked together to keep men of training and probity out of public life, and to precipitate that decay of our legislatures which every patriotic thinker deplures; but we are persuaded that nothing has contributed so powerfully and so inevitably to the debasement of these bodies as the principle imbedded in the Constitution which is now being assailed. The contrivance has not only not worked as the founders intended, it has worked in the opposite way. We have never actively favored the complete democratization of Congress as is now proposed. Our hope has been that some recovery might, by unforeseen agencies, qualify the legislatures once more to pick out the flower of the commonwealth to represent statehood in Congress. We are aware that popular election is no safeguard against Quays and Platts. Nevertheless, we cannot share Senator Hoar's alarm at a change in the old order which may, for the reasons just hinted at, prove to be a blessing in disguise.

JOHN P. ALTGELD.

Fairhope (Ala.) Courier (s. t.), Mar. 15.—John P. Altgeld, ex-governor of Illinois, one of the country's truly great men, is dead. He was one of the people's ablest champions, and, like Henry George, died, as he no doubt preferred to die, in the harness.

Bricklayer and Mason (lab.), March.—Perhaps the best hated of our public men, by those who did not understand him, or, understanding him, refused him his due, he was regarded by the many who knew him as a constant friend of the common people.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), March 16.—Since his death much of the rancor of the bitter partisan press of the land has been subordinated to the more honorable desire

of speaking only in praise of the dead. But several of the more uncompromising Republican papers have not hesitated to follow the man into his grave to hurl invectives at his corpse.

The (Nebraska) Central Farmer (Peo.), Mar. 20.—It was fitting that he should die as he had lived, fighting for the down-trodden and oppressed. He was one of the strongest men, in all that word implies, that lived in our time. He never was a trimmer for popular favor. He made public sentiment, but he never floated with the tide. If the public was with him, well and good; if not, he fought the prejudices and passions as well as the reasoning of the public.

The (Chicago) Conservator (Neg.), Mar. 22.—Of peculiar importance was his marked fairness to colored people, for his creed knew no race nor color. He applied his principles to all men, and the fact that one man was black and another white did not prompt him to deviate from the rigid doctrines which he preached. He did not show any special regard for the Negro because he was a Negro, but he did show the most enthusiastic desire to benefit his fellow men regardless of color, and when the Negro happened to be a beneficiary it was to him a source of genuine pleasure.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Mar. 20.—Recently the people have been reading with much interest about the last hours of two notable men. . . . One, a multimillionaire, dreamed of the conquest of a whole continent by the Empire of which he was an influential subject. . . . the other . . . was ever trying to do something for the welfare of the people, even those on a lower level around him. In his career as judge, as statesman, as citizen, his words and acts told of his deep desire to benefit and elevate his fellows. . . . Two men with singularly opposite lives who lived on opposite sides of the globe—Cecil Rhodes and John P. Altgeld.

N. Y. Times (cons. Dem.), March 13.—His very considerable abilities and his power to influence men were, indeed, often if not generally employed in the service of causes to which the majority voice of the American people have denied success. They were bad causes, as such things are reckoned, the attempt to apply unsafe principles dimly reasoned out by ill-balanced and ill-equipped minds. But Altgeld was not consciously the enemy of mankind or a foe to public order. He sincerely desired to see mankind happier. He felt that a great part of his fellow beings were wronged, oppressed and cheated of their just rights. According to his understanding and his lights he tried to restore the equilibrium by exalting the humble and pressing down the mighty.

OHIO POLITICS.

San Francisco Labor Clarion (lab.), Mar. 17.—Tom L. Johnson is Mayor of Cleveland, O. Also he was once a Congressman; but he came out all right. It appears that Johnson is making it exceedingly uncomfortable for corporations and other gents who pursue happiness by grabbing franchises and eluding taxation. Consequently bills have been introduced in the Ohio Legislature to establish boards for nearly every city function, which are to take the city government out of the hands of the contumacious Johnson.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), Mar. 19.—Tom Johnson has once more demonstrated that he is a man who does things. He does not confine his thundering to the index. His performance is equal to his promise. When he goes out to shear he does not come home shorn. The country said he did not mean business when he pledged himself to 3-cent fares. The street car monopolists laughed at his suggestion of operating traction lines on such a basis. They said no one would invest in such an enterprise. But just the same Cleveland is to have 3-cent fares. The ordinance pro-

viding for this great public boon has just passed the Cleveland council; finally and now the great project is in the way of immediate realization. And this is Tom Johnson's way.

IMPERIALISM.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Mar. 21.—By the way, those who are fond of inquiring into the "effect" of the speeches of men like Senator Hoar, Secretary Long and President Schurman on the Filipino insurgents might with advantage stop to ask what the effects of declarations like those of Gen. Otis are likely to be. How do the Filipinos like to hear that they are utterly unfit for freedom, and that indefinite subjection to military despotism is to be their lot? This sort of talk does in truth encourage and incite resistance to American authority. On the other hand, the speeches which plead for justice and freedom and hold out hopes of ultimate independence make for peace and confidence in our good faith and honesty.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official record 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, Mar. 17-22, 1902.

Senate.

Consideration of the ship subsidy bill (S. bill 1348) was resumed on the 17th. Mr. Gallinger (p. 3069), Mr. Patterson (p. 3069), Mr. Money (p. 3070), Mr. Vest (3072), Mr. Harna (p. 3073), Mr. Clay (p. 3073), Mr. Wellington (p. 3075), Mr. Berry (p. 3076), Mr. Perkins (p. 3077), Mr. McLaurin of Mississippi (p. 3077), Mr. Scott (p. 3078) and Mr. Frye (p. 3078) engaging in the debate until three o'clock, the hour set for voting on the bill. The voting began on Mr. Vest's amendment (see p. 3081), which was lost (p. 3082) 48 to 25. A second and third amendment (p. 3083) offered by Mr. Vest were lost (p. 3083) by the same vote. Mr. Teller's amendment (p. 3083) was lost by 47 to 24. Other amendments were lost by about the same vote, while some amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended finally passed (p. 3089) by the vote of 42 to 31. The bill (S. bill No. 3553) for the protection of the President was then taken up for consideration. On this measure Mr. Bacon (p. 3141) was the principal speaker on the 18th, and Mr. Spooner (p. 3186), Mr. Teller (p. 3193), Mr. Hoar (p. 3195), and Mr. Bailey (p. 3196), on the 19th. On the 20th the speakers were Mr. Rawlins (p. 3227), Mr. Mallory (p. 3238), Mr. Hawley (p. 3243), Mr. Nelson (p. 3244), Mr. McCumber (p. 3246), Mr. McCormack (p. 3247), Mr. Money (p. 3246), and Mr. McLaurin of Mississippi (p. 3251); and on the 21st, after the passage of the war revenue repeal bill (H. bill No. 10530) with amendments (pp. 3320, 3321, 3332), and speeches by Mr. Patterson (p. 3322), Mr. Fairbanks (p. 3327), and Mr. Morgan (p. 3333), on the bill for the protection of the President, the latter was passed by a vote of 52 to 15. The Senate then adjourned to the 24th.

House.

On the 17th the House went into committee of the whole for the consideration (p. 3069) of the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. bill No. 12346). Mr. Burton (p. 3090), in charge of the bill, began the debate, and was followed by Mr. Foster (p. 3101), Mr. Reeves (p. 3103), Mr. Candler (p. 3106), and Mr. Cochran (p. 3108). Mr. Hepburn (p. 3152), Mr. Lawrence (p. 3155), Mr. White (p. 3157), Mr. Ball of Texas (p. 3157), Mr. Thompson (p. 3158), and Mr. Burnett (p. 3158) spoke on the 18th; and Mr. Ransdell (p. 3198), Mr. Powers (p. 3198), Mr. Lewis (p. 3199), Mr. Small (p. 3199), Mr. Gaines (pp. 3198, 3210), Mr. Burgess (p. 3201), Mr. Naphean (p. 3204), Mr. Willey (p. 3204), Mr. Greene (p. 3206), Mr. Fitzgerald (p. 3207), Mr. Reeves (p. 3207), and Mr. Tongue (p. 3209), on the 19th. On the 20th the principal speakers were Mr. McLain (p. 3271), Mr. Bellamy (pp. 3276, 3282), Mr. Thomas (p. 3280), Mr. Newlands (p. 3281), Mr. Candler (p. 3286), Mr. Cooper (p. 3289), and Mr. Williams (p. 3294); and on the 21st the committee of the whole, after disposing of a great variety of amendments, reported the bill favorably and the House passed it without a yea and nay vote (p. 3360). Such a vote was demanded

by Mr. Sulzer, but he was supported by only three members. The 22d was devoted almost entirely to the Moss (Republican) vs. Rhea (Democrat) contested election case (p. 3371) from Kentucky.

Record Notes.—The following speeches by the gentlemen named on the respective subjects noted are printed at the pages indicated: Philippine tariff, Representative Green (p. 3061); free rural mail delivery, Representatives Lever (p. 3115), Small (p. 3167), Pearre (p. 3171), Conner (p. 3176), and Blackburn (p. 3230); river and harbor appropriations, Representatives White (p. 3177), Ball (pp. 3218, 3306), Lewis (p. 3222), Napfen (p. 3302), Ransdell (p. 3310), and Burnett (p. 3365); oleomargarine, Representative Davidson (p. 3224).

The following bills of general interest were introduced: Chinese exclusion, Senate bill No. 4174 (p. 3183); reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, House bill No. 12765 (p. 3213).

Correspondence regarding the Federal party in the Philippines, and the text of and signatures to the American petition for a suspension of hostilities, headed by Carl Schurz, are printed at pages 3125-3136.

The rejected Bacon amendments to the bill for the protection of the President appear at pages 3258 and 3334; the rejected Bailey amendment at page 3334; and the rejected Patterson amendment at page 3335.

MISCELLANY

THE DEATH OF EMPIRE.

A Forecast.
For The Public.

Upon a couch of purple Empire lies;
A crown of jewels mocks his ghastly brow;
Hedged by his gilded sycophants, he dies;
Nor arms, nor gold, nor craft shall help him now.
His lined and dreadful face is blank and white.
Swift to engulf him death's dark waters roll;
And through the gathering shadows of the night
An iron tongue affrights his guilty soul.
Toll for the death of Empire! Through the gloom,
Deep and vibrating, speaks the solemn bell
The last dread warning of the coming doom:
His body to the dust; his deeds to hell!
With fell tyrannic hands, he held the sway,
Through many thousand years of blood and crime.
Earth's primal murder marked his natal day,
And Rome's imperial eagle saw his prime.
In vain, the perfect Christ was crucified;
Twisting His teachings with a crafty wit,
Clothed with His creed, His lessons He defied—
A Christian conqueror, and a hypocrite.
He sat with Cyrus at the triumph feast,
Within great Babylon's encircling wall.
He swept with Alexander through the east.
He tramped with Caesar's legions into Gaul.
He ruled with Charlemagne, in purple pride,
From Baltic beaches to the march of Spain.
He made the eastern world a shambles wide;
And piled the bloody heads with Tamerlane.
Toll for the death of Empire! Louder now,
Deep and vibrating speaks the solemn bell.

The sweat of death is heavy on his brow.
His body to the dust; his deeds to hell!

The last and greatest empire of the world,
Turning to tyranny and craft and wrong,
Is down to chaos and confusion hurled;
So feeble in its might, which seemed so strong.

A little people struck the feet of clay—
A little people, great in freedom's name—
And clanging iron, and brass, in pieces lay,
With sword and sceptre, wealth and power and fame.

We thank thee, Lord, that, through thy gentle power,
Thy blood redeemeth us from blood at last.

The hand of time is moving to the hour
When violence and empire shall have passed;

When every conqueror, in his murderous pride,
Shall perish from the land and from the sea;

And every shackle shall be cast aside,
And every conquered people shall be free.

Toll for the death of Empire! Close the eyes
In which the fell despotic flame burns down.

No more the slave shall quail beneath their frown;
No more shall triumph light them. Empire dies!

Toll for the death of Empire! Cleanse the hands;

Oh, wash the fingers, murderously red,
Stained with the blood of patriots foully shed.

Go, free the captive nations from their bands!

Toll for the death of Empire! Shut the lips;
Oh, close the lips, so wicked and so wise—
The cruel, crafty lips, that uttered lies.
How silently they gape in death's eclipse!

Toll for the death of Empire! Lift the head;
Take off the crown of tyranny and fear;
And let no man do honor at the bier.
Ring for the reign of Freedom!

Empire's dead!

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

THE BOY AT THE ROPE.

A bright young Hibernian, who runs an elevator in one of the largest office buildings on Broadway, and is popular with the tenants, has evolved from his experience and troubles—from the latter especially—a set of rules for elevator conduct, that he has posted up where all can see, as they go up and down. It was with the real pride of authorship that he made me a copy of them as they came fresh from his pencil:

Gents will remember that he is not the only pebel on the beech. Somebody else, he likes to stand close to the door as you do.

The man that gets in first wants to go way back and sit down.

Tips not aloud when the boy is on duty. He has an hour each day and can come to your office.

Let ladies git in and out first. But if she can't do that step out of her way and don't make a fuss about it.

If you don't push the buton, don't blame the boy. He can't hear the buzer when it don't buz.

I am not aloud to talk when on duty. So please don't swear at me. I have a sole to save, and want to keep me job.

If the car don't stop where you want, please don't git off when it does stop. I go up again in a minute, and you ride back free.

I am pade to run this. I no all the floors here. I don't no streets and other places all over this end of town.

I want to be friends with all of youse. So be good friends to me.

My name is Michael. Just say Mike; it's easter.

—Jas. H. Kennedy's New York Letter to Cleveland Plain Dealer.

CHANNING ON WAR.

For The Public.

One of the greatest names in American prose literature is that of William E. Channing. The fact of his classification as a great preacher has perhaps operated against his recognition as a great master of prose style, and as a noble and original thinker on other questions than those of theology. It is a pity that a selection of his essays and addresses has not been published in a separate volume. His essay on Napoleon, for example, is a masterpiece. Though written at a time when the noise of the conqueror's career was still echoing through the world, it contains an estimate of the man which has not been equaled in insight and enlightened judgment by any later writers.

No one can read Channing's works to-day without seeing that he was a man far ahead not only of his own time, but of our time. This is shown in his discourse on war, delivered in 1816. It is a brief essay of only 30 pages, yet it contains a complete, sane and satisfactory discussion of the whole subject. It might well be circulated in pamphlet form for modern readers.

I beg leave to quote his injunctions as to wars of conquests:

Let us teach that the brute force and crooked policy which annex a conquest, are infinitely inferior to the wisdom, justice and beneficence, which make a country happy. Let us teach that the honor of a nation consists, not in the forced and reluctant submission of other peoples, but in equal laws and free institutions. Let us never be weary in reprobating that infernal spirit of conquest, by which a nation becomes the terror and abhorrence of the world, and inevitably prepares a tomb, at best a splendid tomb, for its own liberties and prosperity. Nothing has been more common than for nations to imagine themselves great and glorious on the ground of foreign conquest, when at home they have been loaded with chains.

J. H. D.

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

it results in the finding of a number of guns, it does us an infinite amount of harm. *Nor are the Macabebes the only ones who use this method of obtaining information.* Personally I have never seen this torture inflicted, nor have I ever knowingly allowed it; but I have seen a victim a few minutes afterward, with his mouth bleeding where it had been cut by a bayonet used to hold the mouth open, and his face bruised where he had been struck by the Macabebes. Add to this the expression of his face, and his evident weakness from torture, and you have a picture which once seen, will not be forgotten. I am not chicken-hearted, but this policy hurts us. Summary executions are, and will be, necessary in a troubled country, and I have no objection to seeing that they are carried out; but I am not used to torture. The Spaniards used the torture of water throughout the islands as a means of obtaining information; but they used it sparingly, and only when it appeared evident that the victim was culpable. Americans seldom do things by halves. We come here and announce our intention of freeing the people from 300 or 400 years of oppression, and say: "We are strong, and powerful, and grand." Then to resort to inquisitorial methods, and use them without discrimination, is unworthy of us, and will recoil on us as a nation.

The foregoing is the sober testimony of an honorable gentleman, a brave and experienced soldier, whose mind and heart both revolt against a hideous and inhuman practice which he sees followed not by Macabebes only, but evidently by Americans as well; not in sudden hot revenge for cruelties of an enemy, but in cold blooded pursuit of a military end. For obvious reasons this witness' name cannot at present be given, but his testimony is none the less convincing on that account. It is vouched for also by Mr. George Kennan, the Siberian traveler and investigator of established reputation. This was published a year ago in *The Outlook*, a paper which has cordially supported the existing Philippine policy—nor has any one ever dared to my knowledge to challenge or disprove this testimony. It is not the gossip of an irresponsible private soldier, but the calm discriminating protest of a high officer. If your statements are correct on this point, which explanation do you give of the report published in the *Manila Times* of August 18, 1901, which recounts operations in Samar and from which I quote as follows:

Finally on June 21 Lieut. Downes and one man were killed and three wounded near Pambahan, in a fight from ambush which evidently had been prepared pursuant to information sent out from Guilan as to Lieut. Downes' movements.

Several prominent Filipinos gave some valuable information as to the instigators of this spy system, and as they had before given information which proved true, the commanding officer thought best to act upon this information. Maj. John J. O'Connell,

First Infantry of Gussie expedition fame, who arrived on the scene about this time as commanding officer, said that a good shaking up all around would be good. That "he wanted no traitors around him." Therefore all the suspected were given a "dose" of the "water-cure," which proved effectual in bringing to light the guilty. These were locked up in prison.

The prime mover in the affair was discovered to be the president of the Pueblo San Esteban Austria.

The foregoing is an excellent illustration of what seems to me the real truth. We have used this torture not to be cruel or for revenge, but because we have found it a convenient way to get important information. Indeed Gov. Taft has admitted in substance what you deny and I claim, "water torture" and "unnecessary killings," but he speaks of them as "strictly forbidden." How strictly? To a degree that those indulging in them are punished, whether they be our own officers or our savage Macabebe allies, the use of which opens us to the rebuke Lord Chatham gave Great Britain when she employed similar means against us in the revolutionary war? Hardly so, it would seem, as I wrote Assistant Adjutant Gen. Andrews inquiring whether Maj. O'Connell had been court-martialed for his alleged offense. I got no answer to this question. I received a courteous letter calling my attention to your communication on the general subject to the Senate. In this I find no record of inquiry into this case, but I do find the full report of the case of Lieut. Hagedorn, who, under somewhat similar circumstances, used what must have been in the tropics an excruciating torture. Three Filipinos, from whom he wished to extort information, were put in the stocks, fed on salt fish and deprived of water for 48 hours. The lieutenant reports with evident pride to his superior officer that "this diet had excellent results," for it forced the victims to give the desired information. Was the officer punished for his "use of torture to extort confession" forbidden by the rules and which you say are "the practical and effective guide" under which our army operates in the Philippines? His superior officer, Col. Hood, as your report shows, commended him for "energetic" and valuable service in the pacification of this district," stated that he had acted in "the best interests of the service even if mistakenly," and recommended that no further action be taken in the case.

Now my inference is (and I ask you and the public if it is not a fair one) that if an officer who used the salt fish and no-water torture is not punished, but generally commended,

while another whose use of the water-torture is openly published by a censored newspaper in the city where our military headquarters exist, is not court-martialed, that "the constant and effective presence of prohibition, precept and discipline" which you assert has been maintained against the use of torture, or other cruelties inflicted on the natives, is not such as you have imagined and declared it to be; that it exists on paper, but not in practice. I think that the statement published in the *Kansas City Journal* of March 10th, from W. H. Clark, a returned soldier of the Eighteenth United States infantry, gives a fair picture of the truth:

The water-cure has been administered to thousands of natives in the Philippines, at least in Panay. . . . We did not do it in the spirit of malevolence . . . but the water-cure is the quickest remedy for non-communicativeness and mendacity which has yet been discovered in the Philippines. It is probably a relic of the Spanish inquisition.

When asked whether the treatment was fatal this witness said:

Well, they usually get sick and some of them never recover from their sickness. Of course we never tortured any Filipinos to death, but the only way to get along with them is to administer the water-cure. I have seen kerosene and cocoanut oil used instead of water, but the effect is the same.

This witness, while he strongly confirms by his testimony my charge, later on praises, as you do, the "general humanity" of our soldiers. Of course, the question of "humanity" depends on one's point of view. But what this and so many others describe is inconsistent with "humanity" as you, I presume, and Americans generally understand the term.

Gen. Funston brands as an "atrocious lie" the statement made on the authority of a soldier in his command, by a Philippine correspondent of *The State*, of South Carolina, to the effect that this soldier had assisted at 160 applications of this "water-cure" torture, all but 26 of which resulted fatally. This correspondent speaks of this torture as a "favorite" one with us for extracting information. This coincides with Clark's testimony and others. Unless a very large number of our people have falsified, whose position and past reputation would forbid that supposition, we certainly have shown ourselves extremely fond of it. But who is the correspondent who quoted the soldier in Gen. Funston's command? Is he a responsible person? The editor of *The State*

writes me that he is Mr. R. D. Epps, a teacher in the Philippines, chosen by the state superintendent of education in South Carolina, at the request of the Washington authorities. This man wrote, as the editor of The State points out, "from the American army standpoint, not from that of Filipinos or anti-Imperialists, and he was "evidently in sympathy with the measures adopted." He does not vouch for the precise mortality produced on the Filipinos by the use of the water-torture. That may or may not be correct. That is not the vital point. The testimony falls generally in line with that given by many others. Nor is the claim made that Gen. Funston ordered this. It would naturally result from just such orders as have been issued and just such campaigns as we know have been carried on in Samar by Gen. Smith and Gen. Bell in Batangas. Gen. Hughes in his testimony before the Senate committee (which is so interesting and important that I wish it might have been given fully to the public) admits that our campaign in Samar each year got "stiffer," that we were conducting what could not be called "civilized warfare." Gen. Hughes testifies that he had at one time as many as "120 commands in the field." "Each commander under general restrictions had authority to act for himself;" that new commanders would come into the field and start in to conduct their work much "easier" than the old ones, "they would come into the country with their ideas of *civilized warfare, and were allowed to get their lesson.* (Italics mine.) Do you dispute the correctness of Gen. Hughes' testimony given reservedly and with caution, lest he should tell more than was expedient? If not, then your published statement is incorrect and seriously misleading. Mr. Stephen Bonsall, the returned correspondent, throws further light on the dark chapter of our operations in Samar to add fresh force to Gen. Hughes' testimony. He says in the Boston Transcript, March 10:

During my stay in Samar the only prisoners that were made so far as I know were taken by Waller's command, and I heard this act criticised by the higher officers as a mistake which they believed he would not repeat when better acquainted with the conditions in Samar. . . . If on their march Waller and his men shot any natives they met, their action would be fully covered by the general orders of Gen. Smith. (Italics mine.)

But were the Filipinos as cruel and uncivilized in warfare as your unqualified declarations on the subject warrants us to believe? I think a careful

examination of the facts will show that until our attacks on their organized government broke it down, and compelled disorganized and guerrilla warfare, they generally treated prisoners well. Great praise has been given to Aguinaldo for "his humanity in war." Wilcox and Sargeant in their trip through Luzon, on Admiral Dewey's behalf, in the autumn of 1898, reported not only general peace and order but many Spanish prisoners in good condition. If the Filipinos' treatment of prisoners was originally barbarous would Admiral Dewey have permitted, or compelled, the 3,000 Spaniards who surrendered at Subig bay to go into Filipino hands instead of ours? Were not Lieut. Gilmore and his men well treated by Aguinaldo? Would the Spanish Red Cross Society have given Aguinaldo a medal of honor "for humanity in war," which was carried to him by an American gentleman last December, as I happen to know, if he had treated prisoners of the Spanish nation cruelly? Or would Aguinaldo have given food to Gen. Funston and his men when he thought they were hungry prisoners instead of disguised enemies, if his and his people's general practice was one of cruelty to prisoners? Is not this a case where the victor can afford to be, if not generous in judging a fallen foe, at least accurate and just? Who is responsible for the bad change that has come over Filipino warfare in this respect if not ourselves?

I ask, as I draw to a close of this long and wearisome recital of torture and butchery, at which we would stand aghast if it was done by any other nation than our own, do you doubt or will you deny the general truth of the statement recently made in the New York Evening Post by one of our ablest and most reliable Washington correspondents, Mr. Frances E. Leupp, on the authority of a Republican congressman who visited the Philippines last summer. I quote as follows:

But the Filipino is at least in a state of rebellion against the United States authority, and he always will be. You never heard of any disturbance in northern Luzon, and the secret of its pacification is in my opinion, the secret of the pacification of the archipelago. They never rebel in northern Luzon because there isn't anybody there to rebel. That country was marched over and cleaned out in a most resolute manner. *The good Lord in Heaven only knows the number of Filipinos that were put under ground, for our soldiers took no prisoners; they kept no records; they simply swept the country, and wherever or however they came upon a Filipino they killed him. The women and children were spared, and can now be noticed in disproportionate numbers in that part of the island.* (Italics mine.)

. . . . But, as I gauge American sentiments, there was no real opposition to the course pursued by Funston and others in northern Luzon, and there would not be to a similar course in the rest of the archipelago.

It is true the author of this statement, which is but another of the many links in the long chain of moral evidence which proves how different is the condition of our island warfare from what you would lead us to believe, as yet reserves his name. I trust before long he will reveal it; I trust that there may soon come such a quickening of the public conscience over these deeds, useless as they are bloody, Spanish rather than American in their nature, that he and many others like him, who can testify as to the real truth, will come forward and declare it in the presence of all men, and that the country will call them to do so. It is a truth that the American people must know and must ponder. They must ask the persistent question, is it a good tree which bears such corrupt fruit? And what must be its effect on the character and constitution of the nation that feeds upon it?

I had sincerely believed that the American soldier, whose good behavior in China shone so brightly in comparison with the dark deeds committed by the troops of some foreign powers, would have resisted the temptation to fall to the low level of uncivilized warfare. The evidence is convincing, however, that in the Philippines he has not done so. We must all bear the heavy burden of shame brought on us by this fall, but we can best lighten its weight, and hope for a better record in the future, not by denying patent facts, indulging in self-adulation to which we are clearly not entitled, or by trying to distract attention from our own faults by emphasizing the faults of others; but by confessing the plain truth in a manly way. France was sharply criticised, by those nations which consider Anglo-Saxon civilization the foremost leader of human progress, for an alleged attempt in the Dreyfus case to sacrifice exact justice to the reputation of the army. We all saw the specious fallacy that lured men to that attempt, and we cried out; reputation is worthless if the truth and character that should sustain it are gone! The same impartial perspicacity which we of Great Britain and the United States showed then, when a sister nation was threatened with blindness, should be invoked now for our own benefit when a similar affliction threatens us.

No one has a greater respect and admiration than I for the many noble

men who have served their country as privates or officers in our army. Many of my best friends have been among this number. There are among them many who, knowing of these abuses, would gladly have prevented or stopped them if they could. They were largely powerless on account of their position. But I do not see how any true American, knowing and loving the institutions of his country as I do, and knowing these sad facts as I believe I know them, can fail to place on record openly and boldly his protest against practices which inflict a great wrong upon humanity and ourselves. Respectfully,

HERBERT WELSH.

A Scotsman who had been employed nearly all his life in the building of railways in the Highlands of Scotland came to this country in his later years and settled in a new section on the plains of the far west. Soon after his arrival a project came up in his new home for the construction of a railway through the district, and the Scotsman was applied to as a man of experience in such matters.

"Hoot, mon!" said he to the spokesman of the scheme, "ye canna build a railway across this country."

"Why not, Mr. Ferguson?"

"Why not?" he repeated, with an air of effectually settling the whole matter. "Why not! Dae ye no see the country's as flat as a floor, and ye dinna hae any place whatever to run your tunnels through?"—N. Y. Tribune.

Vandever—Any difference between that extra of yours and my earlier edition?

Brinkerhoff—Yes; a small item on the inside of your paper is printed in big, red type on the outside of mine!—Puck.

Here is a little gem clipped from a small boy's essay on parents:

"Parents are things which boys have to look after them. Most girls also have parents. Parents consist of pas and mas. Pas talk a good deal about what they are going to do, but mostly it's the mas that make you mind."—Chicago News.

Of course, when we speak of the tenements breeding vice, we do not refer to well-bred vice.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

Ernest Crosby contributes to the general subject of war and the particular question of imperialism a satire which, if it is open to any criticism at all, sins only against "literature for the sake of literature" in its excessive fidelity to what it satirizes. "Captain Jinks, Hero" (New York and

London: Funk & Wagnall's Company), is the story of a military hero who is as plainly Funston with an infusion of Roosevelt as East Point, where he serves as a cadet, is West Point; as Havilla, where he censors the Declaration of Independence and wins a brigadier generalship by capturing Gomardo by detestable methods in Manila; or as Forslania, where the emperor of Tuntonia horribly exemplifies the theory of one of the Emperor of Germany's speeches that soldiers must shoot their own fathers and mothers if ordered to do so, is China. The story, simply as a narrative of military adventure, is made especially interesting by the lifting of the curtain which enables the reader to look behind the scenes and see how, why, and for whom wars are made. So true is it to the facts of the Spanish-American war, with the Philippine appendix and the diversion into China, that in places it might pass for veritable history; yet the satire is never lost sight of, nor does interest in the moral density and military conscience of the realistic hero ever flag. This is just the kind of book for world-power patriots to read. It is illustrated by Dan Beard, with that artist's well-known genius for interpreting the spirit of his author by means of original conceptions, instead of culling incidents and scenes to portray in common place pictures.

THE CHANGE IN PRICE OF THE PUBLIC,

Already announced to subscribers by circular, will be made with the first issue of the fifth year, namely, April 12, 1902. Beginning with the issue of that date, the price will be as follows:

ANNUALLY.....	\$2.00
SEMI-ANNUALLY.....	1.00
QUARTERLY.....	.50
(50 cents extra per year for postage on foreign subscriptions except to Canada and Mexico.)	
SINGLE COPIES.....	.5
WHOLESALE, per 100 copies.....	\$2.00

\$1.00

Received by us before April 1st PAYS FOR

A New Subscription for One Year, OR FOR A RENEWAL FOR ONE YEAR.

Volume IV of The Public

Will be completed with No. 209, to appear April 5th.

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

Bound volumes ordered before April 5 will be ready for delivery about May 1. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

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. t

The Public

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, 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.

Subscriptions, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address: THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2364.

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

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

Cleveland.

SAMUEL DOERFLER,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 301-302.
NEW YORK.

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. 50c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 123 E. 28th St., New York City.

For any Book on Earth Old or New
Write to H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Cosansont, Ohio.
CATALOGUES FREE.