

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 2, 1903.

Number 265.

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 page.

Gen. Miles's report of American atrocities in the Philippines is calculated to do more for the honor of the army than all the suppressions by Secretary Root's war department and all the whitewashing by Senator Lodge's star chamber committee.

Gen. Miles does the army the service of exposing the villainies of its unworthy officers, with a view to having their villainy distinguished from its honor; whereas Lodge and Root, having identified the atrocious conduct of some army officers with the army's honor, as if those two things were one, have weakly tried to shield the former from exposure on pretense of saving the latter from disgrace.

The only disgrace that attaches either to the American army or to the American people, in connection with atrocities the previous reports of which Gen. Miles so plainly confirms, is in consequence not of the shameful acts but of their official and popular condonation. No one is responsible for the crimes of another, though his own agent, except as he makes them his own by approval or concealment, and to this sensible rule neither governments nor peoples are exceptions. Unhappily, however, that is what the War Department and Lodge's senatorial committee have done. They have approved or concealed. It might be said, also, that a majority of the American people also have done this, were it not for the fact that they have acted without knowledge, hav-

ing been misguided by our trusted public servants at Washington.

The Chicago Record-Herald (a leading independent Republican paper) truly says, in an editorial of its issue of the 28th on the subject of American outrages in the Philippines:

From first to last the government has not dealt frankly with the people on this subject. It began with censored dispatches; it purposely withheld reports that were finally forced from it; there are other reports that it has never published; there is continual complaint about the impossibility of getting at things in the War Department. What the baffled investigators and the people actually do get is the self-puffery of officials and a jingo commendation of the country and the army all in overwrought superlatives. . . . On the subject of the press dispatches we speak with absolute certainty when we say that the policy of the War Department was to suppress news, and it was in no position to affect a superior virtue when the subsequent charges of suppression were made. On the contrary, it was distinctly under suspicion, and the unwilling way in which it dribbled out documents to the Senate had a bad look. Manifestly such facts cannot be overthrown by the superlatives which sound like cheap rodomontade. The whole policy of suppression has been wrong in principle; it has resulted in wrong to this people and to the Filipinos; it is likely to prove wrong in the long run as a matter of political expediency. . . .

The report by Gen. Miles was itself suppressed for more than two months. Though it went to the war department February 19, it was not given out until April 27; and then it was forced out. The official explanation of this suppression is ridiculous. Because army inspection reports are usually withheld from publication lest the inspecting officer might fear the effects upon himself of being too candid, therefore—behold the "therefore"—therefore Gen. Miles's report was withheld. Think of it! One can conceive of a

timidity on the part of inspecting officers in reporting conditions for which officers of higher grade might be accountable, and to that extent there is good reason for the rule; but what has the military head of the army to fear? Who could punish him—the Secretary of War always excepted—for making over-candid reports? Bosh! The report was evidently withheld for no such reason. It was withheld for the same reason that other reports exposing the wickedness of our Philippine invasion have been withheld; namely, to conceal the shameful facts.

When the Miles report is at last forced into the light, by repeated demands from all quarters, some of Miles's subordinates do not show the least fear of making candid, not to say disrespectful, utterances regarding Gen. Miles, their military superior. The whole thing shows how unwelcome Miles's report was at the War Department, and foreshadows the strenuous inattention its horrible revelations are to receive at the hands of the Administration.

One of the excuses thrust forward now, in premature explanation of the manifest intention of the War Department to take no steps to save the honor of the army from the disgrace which must attach to it if Gen. Miles's revelations are ignored and the cruel wretches who wear American shoulder straps go unpunished, is that all the events Gen. Miles describes have been investigated and disposed of by court-martials. So much the worse. These court-martials, taking their cue from Lodge's committee, have simply turned themselves into whitewashing commis-

sions. Compare the crimes now exposed, with the court-martial verdicts, and say, if you can, that the honor of the army has been vindicated by the verdicts. Is it not rather that the villainy of some of its unworthy officers has been concealed and condoned? Take, for instance, one of these court-martial cases that came under Gen. Miles's attention and which he mentions in his report. A lieutenant with a squad of cavalry had tortured three priests. For this the lieutenant was court-martialed. He pleaded guilty, thus keeping the facts out of the record, and was sentenced to a fine of \$150 and suspension from command for three months. Other instances are abundant without reference to Gen. Miles's report. What officer of the American army has been punished by court-martial with any severity, for cruelty to Filipinos? None. Yet the fact of cruelty on an extensive scale is now at last conceded. The plea is no longer "the general issue;" it is "confession and avoidance" now.

The determination of the War Department to shield favorites from punishment is illustrated by the decision of the Secretary of War in the Funston case. Gen. Funston is circumstantially charged with participating in the atrocious barbarities which are now conceded to have marked the progress of the American invasion of the Philippines. The names of witnesses have been given, and the War Department has been appealed to to make an investigation. But not only has the Secretary been deaf to these appeals, but when Gen. Funston himself requested a court of inquiry the Secretary denied the request. Funston had been directly asked to make this request, for his own vindication if the charges are untrue. In view of the damning character of the testimony, together with the action of the Department, there is fair room for suspicion that when Funston requested the inquiry he knew his request would be refused.

Be that as it may, the refusal distinctly shows that the Department does not intend to allow the facts to come out. The Secretary's specific reason, that court-martial inquiry has already been made in the Philippines, appears flimsy enough in the face of the now notorious fact that Philippine court-martials are little if anything better than whitewashing affairs.

In connection with the Funston matter, Herbert Welsh, of Philadelphia, has challenged the Secretary of War to summon a court at which any witnesses that Gen. Funston desires shall be produced, but before which also certain other witnesses shall be summoned to appear, namely: Col. Edward C. Little, of Abilene, Kan., who organized the Twentieth Kansas; Lieut. John F. Hall, of the Twentieth Kansas, and William Moore, of Aliceville, Kan., who was ordered by Col. Metcalf, says Mr. Welsh, "to shoot a prisoner at Calocan, on his knees, begging piteously for mercy, and who refused." Though such a court, if not packed, or if held in the open, would vindicate Gen. Funston, if he really is innocent of participation in the army crimes in the Philippines, it is not at all likely that it will be summoned. Regarding Philippine atrocities, the Administration is as ill-naturedly fearful as the old country justice, of being confused by hearing both sides.

The utter worthlessness of the court-martial investigations which the Secretary of War makes his excuse for refusing further inquiry into the Funston case is shown by Col. Crowder's well-known report in the Putnam case. In the course of a military investigation a private soldier of the name of Putnam had admitted that he assisted in murdering Filipino prisoners of war. Upon learning of this admission Gen. Otis instructed Col. Crowder, the judge advocate, to institute court-martial proceedings against Putnam, and this was Crowder's official response:

The offense of Private Putnam, if

he has committed one, is manslaughter. His only defense would be a lawful order of his superior officer. If put on trial, it is probable that acts would develop implicating many others. I doubt the propriety of his trial and am of the opinion that considerations of public policy, sufficiently grave to silence every other demand, require that no further action be taken in this case.

That reply, accepted as it was by Gen. Otis and acquiesced in by the Secretary of War himself, casts grave suspicion upon all the Philippine court-martial proceedings. If fears of "implicating many others" could be regarded as justifying the authorities in refraining from prosecuting a private soldier who had solemnly confessed to murdering prisoners of war, the same fears may well have induced the suppression of evidence in other cases in which also "many others" might have been implicated.

The wholesome riot in the lower House of the Illinois legislature has resulted in no little illumination upon the ups and downs among Republican ring politicians in the legislature. The chairman of the House committee on municipal corporations has confessed before the investigating committee that a plan was on foot to defeat all traction legislation. Had Stewart been elected mayor of Chicago last month the plan would undoubtedly have carried. But Harrison's election so emboldened the Democratic members and so aggravated the anti-Lorimer Republicans, that a combination between them has produced a gratifying miscarriage of the plan. Pursuant to this plan, the Mueller bill was passed by the Senate, and the Lindly bill was thrust upon the House. But for the riot the latter would have been recorded in the house as passed, and, neither house receding, there would have been no legislation on the subject at all. But the ring could not muster a clear majority in the lower House, so the Speaker defied the constitution by ignoring constitutional demands for roll calls, and attempted to gavel the Lindly bill through. This produced the ca-