

# 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