

and would afford to Cuba all the commercial benefits which are being now so vociferously demanded for that infant republic. "Abolish the whole sugar tariff!" should be the platform of every newspaper that is not subsidized by the protected sugar interests, and of every congressman who honestly aims to represent all the people in their common interests, and not the special interests of a favored few.

An acrimonious discussion took place in the Senate on the 26th, over a reported interview of Gen. Wheaton's, sent to the American press in a dispatch from Manila. It was a comment by Gen. Wheaton upon the recent anti-imperial speech made in Boston by Mr. Schurman. This speech was especially significant because Mr. Schurman, who is president of Cornell university, was at the head of the first American commission to the Philippines. He had been understood to be opposed to imperialistic expansion, but upon his return was quoted as a convert to the McKinley policy. In his Boston speech referred to above, delivered before the Boston Reform club on the 20th, he was reported as saying that inasmuch as—

both Americans and Filipinos desire the political enfranchisement of the Filipinos, there can be no issue between them except in regard to the time when an independent and sovereign Philippine republic should be established.

In the course of his speech he made this comment upon the American administration in the Philippines:

Those Americans, patriotic but unversed in history, who desire to recreate the Filipinos in their own similitude, will always be able to demonstrate that Oriental clay is still without shape and seemliness in the American potter's hand, and that, for a perfect product, a vessel of honor and glory, the American wheel must be kept going for years, or perhaps for generations, or possibly even for centuries. Heaven save the Filipinos from such an impertinent and meddling earthly creator! The Filipinos are to develop along their own racial lines, not along ours, and it is colossal conceit and impudence to disparage them because they are different from ourselves. Any decent kind of government of the Filipinos, by the Filipinos,

is better than the best possible government of Filipinos by Americans.

He insisted accordingly that—

if the Filipinos are to learn to govern themselves, in the manner of the really free nations, the sooner they get at it the better.

Gen. Wheaton, as reported by Manila dispatches, severely criticized this speech, including the anti-imperialist senators in his strictures, and it was for that criticism, Gen. Wheaton now being on military duty in the Philippines, that some senators urged that he be reprimanded, while others, without approving such criticism by military officers, questioned the authenticity of the alleged interview.

Much more important than Gen. Wheaton's military offense, if he committed one, is the condition in the Philippines which one of his reported remarks disclosed. He was quoted by the dispatch as saying that men are now in prison in the Philippines for remarks such as those of Mr. Schurman. Whether Gen. Wheaton actually said this or not is a minor consideration. The vital question is whether the thing itself is true. Are men in prison in the Philippines, by American authority, for advocating Philippine independence as Mr. Schurman did? The probability is that Gen. Wheaton did say this; and, whether he did or not, the probability is that it is true. For the American commission in the Philippines has provided for just such cases. It has promulgated what it calls "an act defining the crimes of treason, insurrection, sedition, conspiracies to commit such crimes, seditious utterances whether written or spoken," etc., which has the force of law in the Philippines wherever the American military arm reaches, whether it has the sanction of any legitimate law-making power or not. This "act" of the American commission provides, among other things—we quote section 10—that—

Until it has been officially proclaimed that a state of war or insurrection against the authority or sovereignty of the United States no longer exists in the Philippine islands, it shall be unlawful for any person to advocate,

orally or by writing or printing or like methods, the independence of the Philippine islands, or their separation from the United States whether by peaceable or forcible means, or to print, publish or circulate any handbill, newspaper, or other publication advocating such independence or separation. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$2,000 and imprisonment not exceeding one year.

With that provision in force in the Philippines, what value is there to the reports we get at intervals to the effect that the islands are "pacified," or soon will be, and that their people are delighted with American sovereignty? Who in any country would not appear to be delighted with foreign subjugation if he could not express, either orally or in writing, a desire for separation from the invading power, even by peaceable means, without incurring a fine of \$2,000 and imprisonment for a year. In a country where such a decree has the force of law, no expressions of dissatisfaction, however intense the longing for independence might be, could come from anyone but insurgents in the field. And no matter from whom they came, the correspondent at Manila, official or private, who should advise the American people of them, would have to be a hero, for even to publish anything advocating separation from the United States, though only to inform the American people, would be a crime under this imperialistic decree. To those innocent-minded persons who suppose that this country is engaged in conferring the boon of American liberty upon the Filipinos, or that our invasion of those islands is welcomed by all but a few "ladrones," or that the complacent dispatches from Manila on that subject are trustworthy, we commend the thoughtful reading of the gag law which Mr. Taft's commission has imposed upon our Filipino subjects, and which is quoted verbatim above. The Wheaton interview, whether authentic or not, has served a good purpose in calling attention in America to the suppression of free speaking and honest reporting at Manila; and we respect-

fully suggest that this, and not the military propriety of Gen. Wheaton's interview, is the really important subject for congressional investigation which the Schurman-Wheaton episode demands.

Gov. Taft's denial of the adoption of Weylerian concentration methods by the Americans in the Philippines, is a striking instance of changing a name without altering the thing. He says that there are no "concentration" camps in the ordinary meaning of the term. Quite the contrary. Nothing has been done but to establish "a dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exists"! Could verbal gymnastics possibly be more gymnastical? Gov. Taft describes precisely what Weyler called "concentration." If that word had been as odorous in Weyler's day in Cuba as it is now, doubtless he himself would have been perfectly willing to adopt instead Gov. Taft's "dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exist." Had he shrunk from doing so it would have been because the description is too faithful to the repugnant facts.

Although the Hoar resolution for a special committee to inquire into the situation in the Philippines, something like the committee on the conduct of the war during our civil strife, has been buried in the pigeon holes of the Senate committee on the Philippines, that standing committee has undertaken the investigation itself. A committee so constituted can hardly be expected to make a thorough investigation. Its chairman is a hide-bound partisan who is thoroughly committed to the imperial programme; and of its 13 members all are Republicans but four — Culbertson, Patterson, Carmack and Rawlins. Four members of the committee opposed the Bacon resolution in 1899 — the resolution which disclaimed any intention to exercise permanent sovereignty over the Philippines. These are Lodge, Allison, Proctor and Burrows. One of the Republic-

an members, Hale, and one Democrat, Rawlins, favored the resolution. The other members were not senators at that time. The investigation should have been submitted to a committee selected with more particular reference to the cross-examining and information-gathering reputations of its members, especially those of the minority. Nevertheless, such qualities may be represented among the minority in the standing committee. With a Republican like Hale, and Democrats like Carmack and Rawlins, to probe the imperialist witnesses and bring forward others, the whole scandalous adventure may yet be properly exposed. If Carmack has the disposition and abilities with which he is credited this is his opportunity.

And now comes Senator Spooner with a broad hint that it is the settled policy of the present administration to buy the lands held by religious orders in the Philippines and sell them at cost to actual settlers. What this implies may be learned by anyone who will read up the history of landgrabbing in the United States by "actual settlers." As a rule, the "actual settler" does the grabbing, and land monopolists on a large scale get the land. Sometimes the monopolists hire the "actual settler" to "settle," and sometimes they let him do his own settling, and then freeze him out. "Freeze-out" is not an apt word for what the American monopolists will do to the "actual settler" in the Philippines, under the administration's Philippine land policy, but the process will not differ much and the result will be the same. It is not a matter of tempera- ture; it is a matter of "push," "pull," "boost," "get there," and "grab."

One of the representatives in congress from California might be called a "representative extraordinary." His name is Kahn—Julius Kahn. He is an immigrant, having been born in Germany; which is good enough reason for his activity in trying to exclude immigration from another country, China; though his principal reason, no doubt, is a demagogic impulse

to make local capital in politics. It is none of this, however, that makes Mr. Kahn so very extraordinary. The remarkable thing about him is his proficiency in "statistics as she is taught." Mr. Kahn is quoted by the Chicago Chronicle of the 21st as saying, in effect, with reference to the Chinese question, that not only all the Chinamen in San Francisco, but more than all, are criminals. He finds that there are usually 25,000 Chinamen in that city, and that within the past 25 years 31,000 have been arraigned in the police courts for minor offenses, from which he draws this remarkably intelligent inference:

These astounding figures show that more than 100 per cent. of the Chinese in San Francisco have been arrested for violation of the law in 20 years. It is difficult to believe that such is the case, but the figures are absolutely accurate. They have been compiled with the greatest care.

Should Mr. Kahn remain in public life, Mr. Carroll D. Wright had better have a care for his statistical laurels.

Our reply (p. 644) to the San Francisco Star relative to Chinese exclusion elicits a somewhat remarkable rejoinder. Referring to our figure of speech in which we likened the claim of our Pacific Coast friends to be allowed to decide the matter for the rest of the nation, because they know the facts, to a plaintiff claiming the right to render a verdict in his own case, it accepts the figure and offers the Pacific Coast objectors as witnesses to the facts, saying: "Only those who know something about the facts can testify." Truly, those who know the facts are proper witnesses, but they are not the only witnesses unless they alone know all the facts; and under all circumstances their testimony is to be taken with caution if they are interested parties, and quite rejected if on cross-examination they break down. Moreover, it is a very long time since witnesses were allowed to decide cases. They may testify but not decide. Our contemporary's next point—it's charge that we resorted to epithets by calling the