

should admonish public officials everywhere that the day of five-cent fares is passing, and that extensions of franchises with higher than three-cent fares may be justly regarded as conclusive evidence of official corruption.

On the subject of the Chicago municipal election, Gov. Altgeld published an able letter last Sunday, in which he exposed the administrative weakness of the present city administration, with the directness and incisiveness that characterize all his utterances. At first Mr. Harrison expressed his inclination to laugh at the Altgeld letter rather than answer it. But better advice prevailed, and he made a formal response. We trust that democrats who still assume Harrison's fidelity to their party will read his letter, whether they read Altgeld's or not. To read it with intelligence and without coming to the conclusion we expressed last week, namely, that Harrison had less than no interest in Bryan's election, is, it seems to us, almost impossible. Of course, he does not admit Altgeld's charges. But with respect to his political manipulations, everybody familiar with Cook county politics suspects at least that Altgeld is right when he says that "if Mr. Harrison is elected Mr. Lorimer will be the supreme boss of the republican party for the next two years and the democrats will be traded off at all elections except the city elections." In other words, Harrison's faction of the democratic party and Lorimer's faction of the republican party, swap county offices for city offices—Harrison getting the latter and Lorimer the former. The only way to break up this game, injurious alike to the city of Chicago and to the genuine democracy of the city, of the state and even of the nation, is to turn Harrison's faction out of the city hall. That is the necessary first step to any substantial civic reform in Chicago.

Much has been said in condemnation of the new ballot law of Mary-

land as a method of suppressing the negro vote of that state. That this is its purpose is doubtless true. Senator Gorman would hardly be suspected of a legitimate purpose in anything political. For that reason the democrats who voted against the bill, explaining that they were unwilling to disfranchise negroes, deserve especial commendation for their democratic intentions. Nevertheless, the law in itself, so far at any rate as the disfranchising clause is concerned, is not only legitimate but desirable. It abolishes the party column on the Australian ballot, and requires the names of candidates to be printed in alphabetical order. Consequently, no one can vote with effect unless he can read well enough to pick out the name of the person he wishes to vote for. If this disfranchises anyone, he ought to be disfranchised; and whether white man or black man makes no difference. It is not even an educational test, except incidentally. While we do not believe in educational tests, we do believe that the prescribed ballot should be of the kind required by the Maryland law, which follows that of Massachusetts. It should be in such form as to demand of the voter some intelligent act of choice when he comes to the polls. If in doing this it imposes incidentally the requirement of sufficient book education to enable the voter to distinguish one printed name from another, that is not an objection. When Maryland republicans complain of this desirable ballot reform as a scheme to disfranchise negroes, they expose themselves as more solicitous for their own privilege of voting negroes than for the negroes' privilege of voting.

Considerable uneasiness has been caused by the action of the Pennsylvania legislature and governor in enacting a law—"the ripper bill"—which arbitrarily deposes the elected mayors of three cities, and empowers the governor to appoint in their place "recorders" with authority to remove all heads of departments and to

fill the vacancies. Such legislation is, of course, utterly destructive of local self-government, and may well excite an uneasy feeling. The Outlook refers to it as carrying to a "startling extreme" the "present reactionary tendency to deprive cities of self-government." But the Outlook is not in an advantageous position to protest. Local self-government is a political principle, by assailing which the Outlook has encouraged just such legislation as what it now complains of. To oppose that principle fundamentally in one application, as the Outlook has done with reference to the Philippine subjugation, is in effect to oppose it in all applications. The people of Pittsburgh, Scranton and Allegheny have no more right, upon any principle, to complain of Senator Quay's process of benevolent assimilation than the Filipinos have to complain of Mr. McKinley's.

In the work of George Kennan, the famous investigator of Russian modes of governmental "benevolence," whom the Outlook commissioned to write up the Philippine question, the Outlook management must have suffered some from a sense of disappointment. Although it placed Mr. Kennan in a journalistic straight-jacket, it could not wholly suppress the terrible truth about the Philippines. In his paper on present conditions and possible courses of action in the archipelago, published in the Outlook on the 9th, Mr. Kennan was restricted, it seems, "to plans and suggestions based on the existing state of affairs, without reference to the manner in which such state of affairs has been brought about." For a religious paper, those were, under the circumstances, rather worldly instructions. They rendered it, as Mr. Kennan writes, "unnecessary, if not impossible, to treat the subject fully from the ethical point of view." For, as he adds, and as ought to be obvious, "our duty, and consequently our proper policy, depend very largely upon the morality and justice of the acts by which, historically, the exist-

ing situation has been created." Restricted thus by his instructions, Mr. Kennan refrains from dealing with the question of the moral and legal validity of the American title to the Philippines; but his views of the situation even as it is are not reassuring either to the American conscience or to American expectations.

To begin with, Mr. Kennan finds that we must stay in the Philippines, and must exercise there the powers of government—with emphasis upon "must"—for a term of years, at a cost to us of "perhaps, some thousands of lives and tens of millions of dollars." His estimate of the army needed for this purpose and this indefinite period is from 50,000 to 60,000 men. It is with reference, however, to that behavior of our government which has turned our one-time Filipino friends into implacable foes that Mr. Kennan's paper is most suggestive. At the same time it is shocking. To quote him—

We have offered them many verbal assurances of benevolent intention; but, at the same time, we have killed their unresisting wounded; we hold 1,500 or 2,000 of them in prison; we have established at Guam a penal colony for their leaders; and we are now resorting, directly or indirectly, to old Spanish inquisitorial methods, such as the "water torture," in order to compel silent prisoners to speak or reluctant witnesses to testify. That the present generation of Filipinos will forget these things is hardly to be expected. . . . It is painful and humiliating to have to confess that in some of our dealings with the Filipinos we seem to be following more or less closely the example of Spain. We have established a penal colony; we burn native villages near which there has been an ambush or an attack by insurgent guerrillas; we kill the wounded; we resort to torture as a means of obtaining information; and in private letters from two officers of the regular army in the Philippines I find the prediction that in certain provinces we shall probably have to resort to the method of reconcentration practiced by Gen. Weyler in Cuba.

"'War,' perhaps, 'is hell,' as Gen. Sherman said," comments Mr. Kennan; "but it need not be hell with Spanish improvements." These

quotations, let it be remembered, are published in an imperialist magazine from the pen of its own chosen commissioner. Are Americans yet ashamed of the Philippine situation? Or have they got piously used to it?

It will be remembered that during the winter Gen. MacArthur deported a young man, George T. Rice, from Manila to the United States for publishing libels of an "incendiary" character and "menacing to the military situation." When Mr. Rice arrived in San Francisco that vigilant democratic democrat of a weekly newspaper, the *Star*, secured from him the facts in the case, which it has published in its issue of the 16th. The story is long and circumstantial, but is intensely interesting. And as a concrete instance it throws more light than any amount of general description could upon the Cossack methods of government that now prevail in the Philippines under the "starry flag of freedom."

Mr. Rice was editor of a maritime paper. In that capacity he rightly regarded it as his duty to criticise a military officer who, as a custom-house official, was derelict in duty. The criticism were based upon complaints of sea captains and merchants who had business with the custom-house and were insulted and defrauded. Rice verified the complaints. They extended from insolence and official neglect to official malfeasance. The subject of these criticisms resented them by arbitrarily forbidding the editor access to the public office and the public reports in his charge. That was a further malfeasance, and Mr. Rice exposed it. Then Gen. MacArthur took the matter up. But instead of investigating Rice's circumstantial charges against the officer, MacArthur allowed his secretary to browbeat Rice. A pretense of investigating the delinquent official was made, but it was a star chamber proceeding. Rice was not allowed to confront the accused, nor to examine the record, and re-

spectable witnesses, business houses whose names he furnished to substantiate his charges, were not examined.

Having in this primitive fashion whitewashed their associate upon the military records, the military authorities tried to frighten Rice into putting on an extra coat in his paper. They summoned him to headquarters, where Lieut. Col. Crowder (MacArthur's secretary) subjected him to the following imperious interview:

Crowder—Don't you think you are wrong in this matter?

Rice—No, sir.

C.—Then you still think you are right?

R.—Yes, sir; I know I am.

C.—I am sorry for you, young man; if you still persist in saying you are right, my orders are from Gen. MacArthur to deport you.

R.—If you will give me a fair trial in court I can prove that I am right.

C.—Under martial law such characters as you receive no trial. We have not the time.

R.—Can I see the evidence in the investigation which you claim proves my charges false?

C.—No; the investigation was placed in competent hands and does not need your approval. Your statements have been proven to our satisfaction to be without foundation and you will be deported as an incendiary character and a menace to the military situation. You are too young to let go on slandering men of honesty and capability, and I consider your character as having fallen to its lowest level. In writing and publishing such articles you endanger the foundation of our military system. Such conduct as this I consider equal to traitorism.

R.—So far as being a traitor, I have served my country in the field for over a year, and never had my love of country so much as questioned, while you have never been under fire and never expect to be, and you dare question my patriotism! I have more patriotism to the square inch than you have in your whole carcass.

C.—Be careful; a few more words and I will put you in Bilibid! [the jail.]

R.—Put me there! I would rather be an honest prisoner than be a craven and deny the truth through fear of your power.

The order for deportation was then issued. While this was in Lieut. Col. Crowder's hands he said:

The military governor [MacArthur] directs me to ask you that if your conduct is satisfactory up to the time of