

doubting them; and the latter's incredulity will not convince such persons of the falsity of what their friends in the Philippines say. They know, if he does not, that it is within the power of his committee to uncover the facts without first requiring their friends to defy the vengeance of superiors in a country where those superiors have and exercise autocratic power. While no one would insist, upon the basis of these personal letters, that what they say is proved, the letters justify the confidence of those who receive them and they are common enough to have created a sentiment which calls for a Congressional investigation of a searching character.

Is it true, for instance, that the civil governments in Philippine towns are in reality military? Or, is it true that there is a military garrison in these towns and that the Filipino head man of the "civil" government has about as much power as it strikes the fancy of the military officer in command of the garrison to give him? Or, is it true that the local sentiment thus generated is such as to make the perpetuation of military power a necessity? Or, is it true that this quotation from a letter of the kind we have mentioned indicates the character of the American modes of pacification?—

I have picked up a good deal of information from an officer stationed here, and one who has been through the whole thing. Naturally he is no friend to Filipinos, and takes delight now in recalling the verbal orders of Gen. — and men of his stamp, to their officers. Their instructions were not to allow any questions of conscience or ideas of justice to hamper them in their dealings with the Filipinos. Such words were not lost on ambitious young men who wished to place another bar on their shoulder straps. The officer here, my acquaintance, frequently recalls the pleasant days when Capt. — tried his new gatling gun on inoffensive natives and their ponies, or when he blew a few native boats out of Lake —, just to see how well trained his gunners were.

Or, is it true that this quotation from the same letter fairly describes the situation?—

The native found that the easiest way to get along was to pretend friend-

ship until he got an opportunity to do something. He could do little else, since he was burned out and starved; but those who did him evil, foolishly thought he could suddenly come to love them, and so gave him some share in making laws for himself. Naturally, the Filipinos who were elected to office were those who most heartily hated Americans and their ways. And then, when laws were not enacted to conform to American ideals, the Filipino was proclaimed unprogressive and useless.

Or, is it true that this quotation from the same letter is correct in its statements?—

For the last two months the province of Batangas has been in open rebellion. Martial law has been again proclaimed, and is strongly advocated for the whole island. In the provinces of Batangas and Laguna, all the ports are closed and a policy of fire and sword is inaugurated. As I was going to bed the other night, the officer in command brought in an order from Gen. —, of the Division of —, which empowers a post commander or one of his officers to do as he may wish to do—anything, in fact, that may tend to bring peace about rapidly. This may be a better policy than letting the war drag on for a dozen years, but will it bring the right kind of peace?

And what about the truth of the next quotation? Is the case at all typical?—

There is a native presidente or cabeza, who has the name of ruler. But the real rulers are the two military officers. The presidente must stand, hat in hand, and take their orders—or insults, just as they fancy. Neither is too well educated; and these years of war, burning huts and swearing at unruly soldiers, leaves them with the ethics of a ward heeler. These two men can practically do as they will. Comparatively speaking, they are not bad. In fact, they have been exceptionally kind to me. But their behavior is very strange, and I cannot overlook it. They take their carbines, as the notion strikes them, and go out to shoot dogs and pigs, on the owners' very door steps, at times within ten feet of his children. In explanation they say that the conquered have no rights. Conduct of this sort caused the deplorable massacre in the island of Samar. The commanding officer in the town of Balangiga ordered the presidente of the place to cut the weeds about the town. I can imagine how the order was given. The presidente said, "Yes," and brought on his weed-cutters. Of course, all had bolos to do the work with. In the early morning, when the soldiers were off their guard, the natives closed in on them and began their butchers' work.

Now, I do not commend the action of the dastard presidente; but a little humane treatment would no doubt have prevented this affair.

Finally, is it true that such a condition exists as is described in the following quotation?—

I would send you the papers printed in Manila, but they give no idea of the situation. They merely preach force, force, force, and, occasionally, extermination. The few magazines are no better. I am sending you the "Taft Commission Report." The islands were more pacified when that report was handed in to Congress than they are now.

Other questions, specific as to particular abuses, might be framed upon the basis of this evidently truthful letter (now in our possession) from an intelligently observant American; but the abuses are described so circumstantially that no quotation can be made without exposing the writer, who is still in the Philippines, and subjecting him to the risk of persecution. Enough has been quoted, however, to indicate that the situation in the Philippines is scandalous to the American name, and it is sufficiently definite to enable the Senate committee, if it is searching for the truth and not engaged in whitewashing, to bring the scandalous facts to light or show that they do not exist.

Out of the many bills for suppressing free thought and free speech under pretense of discouraging "anarchy," a bill approved by the House judiciary committee in Congress has been framed. It is known as the Ray bill. This bill defines an "anarchist" as a person who advocates the murder of governmental officers, or a "person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all organized government." If one murderous "anarchist" can by one murder induce legislative bodies to outlaw everyone who disbelieves in organized government, how long will it be before some murderer calling himself a Jeffersonian or Jacksonian democrat or a Lincoln republican may induce such bodies to outlaw everyone

who believes in restraining government at all? Is government so sacred a thing that it must neither be opposed nor disbelieved in?

A grim satire upon the thoughtless hate and reckless ignorance with which congressmen are proposing to make laws to suppress anarchy, occurred at Minneapolis shortly after the assassination of President McKinley. One Samuel Hogan, the prototype of our numerous brood of anarchy suppressors in Congress, asked Peter Kolik if he was an anarchist. Kolik replied in the affirmative, and Hogan shot him. This was Hogan's crude conception of what is now a dominant idea in Congress and the White House. But it turned out that Kolik had misunderstood the question. He thought Hogan had asked him if he was an organist, and being one he answered Yes. So Hogan went for three years to the penitentiary for inability to distinguish an anarchist from an organist. But why? There is no more difference between anarchists and organists than there is between some anarchists and other anarchists. Yet our congressmen propose to lump all anarchists together as bad men.

The Hoganistic schemes for putting down anarchy go either too far or not far enough. If anarchists are bad men, simply because they are anarchists, why limit repressive laws to them? They are only one of several kinds of bad men, and we ought to put down all kinds. The greater includes the less, and "bad man" needs to be defined no more than "anarchist" does. If everyone knows what "anarchist" means, surely everyone must know what "bad man" means. Distinctions being unimportant, the job of putting down the whole bad class by law is easy. President Roosevelt and congress could do it. They need only to enact a simple law declaring (1) that all bad persons who are not already in this country shall be kept out; (2) that all bad persons who are already in this country shall be forced to leave; and (3) that absolute jurisdiction over bad persons shall be vested in the Federal courts. Why distinguish minor

points? A bad man is a bad man; and with such a law no bad man of any kind could escape. Anarchists would be swept in with the rest. And who could object to it. Only anarchists and other bad men; and bad men have no rights that good men in Congress and the White House or anywhere else are bound to respect. This free country is not for the bad. It is for the good.

We confess, however, that there might be political danger in enacting so sweeping and indefinite a law. Good men might get caught in the net by mistake, even as the good organist was mistaken for a bad anarchist by the good Hogan. And if enough good men did scent danger they might repudiate the "bad man" law and put its authors out of office. The same thing would be true of an anarchist law. Such a catastrophe did happen to the good Federalist politicians 100 years ago when they enacted the alien and sedition laws. It might happen again, even to such particularly good men as those who enact anarchy laws now. The trouble about all legislation of this dangerously sweeping kind is that the good people may at any unexpected time scent danger to themselves. These rampageous anti-anarchism congressmen who are setting snares for people who are not even anarchists, unless Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln were, would be wise to note Kipling's warning:

Pleasant it is for little tin gods
When great Jove nods;
But little tin gods make their little mistakes
In missing the hour when great Jove wakes.

One member of the House judiciary committee has displayed exceptional courage and more than ordinary statesmanship by submitting a minority report on the so-called anarchist bill, a bill which is in fact the first step in the direction of creating in this country the crime of "lese majesty." It proposes to differentiate the crime of attempts at murdering presidents from attempts at murdering ordinary citizens. To this feature of the bill the congressman in question, Mr.

Lanham, of Texas, objects. He denies "the proposition that one honest and law-abiding man's life is any more sacred than that of another."

Senator Spooner has proposed a bill apportioning representation in congress to the number of male adults who are not for any cause except conviction for crime denied the suffrage. An ideal bill would be broader. It would make representation depend upon the number of voters. The disfranchised of any state, no matter what the cause, should not be counted in estimating the basis of representation. But Senator Spooner's bill is a vast improvement upon the bills, obviously aimed only at the South, which withdraw from the basis of representation only disfranchised Negroes. It would accomplish the legitimate purpose of those bills, while treating all the states and all races and conditions of men alike.

The attitude of the administration with reference to the letter of Gen. Pearson, if correctly reflected by the administration press, is not of a kind to inspire confidence in its neutrality in the British-Boer war. Gen. Pearson has written the President, positively asserting that—

the port of New Orleans is being made the basis of military operations, and the port and waters used for the purpose of the renewal and augmentation of military supplies for the British army, for use in South Africa and against the Burghers in South Africa; that—

at the port of Chalmette, a few miles below the city of New Orleans, a British post has been established, and men and soldiers are there assembled, and are there daily engaged in warlike operations, and are there for the purpose of the renewal and augmentation of military supplies, and for the recruitment of men;

that—

the attention of the courts has been called and an appeal made to them; and the United States circuit court, for the Eastern district of Louisiana, in the case of Pearson against Parson, 108 Federal Reporter, page 461, declared that this matter was not in the cognizance of the court, expressly declaring that the matter was one that "can be