

even by leading Republicans of Ohio to place the state in the Democratic column. But none of that has been the end he has had in view. Even though he has spent several days in each week all through the past winter at the state capital endeavoring to promote equitable taxation laws and to defeat monopoly tax measures, he has done so as mayor of Cleveland, in the interest of Cleveland, and only because taxation in Cleveland is inextricably tangled up with the tax laws of the state. And what he has done and tried to do proceeds from an acute perception and firm grasp of the natural economic and moral laws with reference to principles of government that apply with equal force to one municipality as well as another, to one state as well as another, and to the nation itself as well as to its larger and smaller political divisions.

As to the Springfield Republican's contention that Mayor Johnson does not lay emphasis enough upon imperialism as an isolated issue, the Johnstown Democrat, also an able and tireless adversary of the infamous Philippine policy, offers a complete reply when it says:

His critics need not waste time in worrying over Tom Johnson's queer mental processes. Mr. Johnson's queer mental processes have generally brought him to the sanest possible conclusions; and we suspect they seem queer only to those who are not accustomed to logic that doesn't limp and to reason that doesn't fall into fits of the blind staggers. Mr. Johnson knows whereof he is speaking. He understands, as every single taxpayer understands, that imperialism has but one spur—and that is greed. Imperialism has gone over seas on a piratical war, not for benevolent assimilation, and not even for glory. It has gone for loot. It has gone to grab franchises, to gobble up land, to appropriate valuable natural opportunities, to grasp new privileges and through these to exploit labor. But what would happen to adventurers if here at home a rear fire should be poured in upon the whole fabric of privilege—upon franchises, upon protective tariffs, upon government by injunction, upon the hundred and one devices of greed for robbing labor and limiting its opportunities? Would they waste their time in the Philippines if here at home their base

of supplies were threatened? Would they feel safe in centering their energies on a foreign conquest when the enemy was in their rear cutting them off from their communications and destroying the very citadel of their power? Johnson is right. A war on the imperialists here at home would be the quickest possible means of stopping the infamous attack on liberty in the Philippines.

It must be remembered that when men like Tom L. Johnson refer to economic issues at home as too important to be lost sight of in a conflict over foreign policies, he is not to be put in the same category with men like Senator Gorman, who would make the beef trust a paramount issue. With Gorman any popular issue is a "good enough Morgan until after election;" with Johnson issues are not made to carry elections, but elections are held to settle issues. Gorman is playing politics; Johnson is not. Gorman wants to be president; Johnson wants to be right. When Gorman proposes a policy it is to flatter voters and win offices; when Johnson proposes one it is to promote a principle and win a cause. The man who would make the beef trust the subject of a political issue before election for the sake of partisan success, is so narrow in his statesmanship that he could become an imperialist after election as easily as he could take the oath of office. But a man with the principles, the political acuteness, the democratic sensitiveness, and the public record of Tom L. Johnson, though he declares for the priority of questions of home policy over those of foreign policy, could under no circumstances give countenance to a foreign policy of imperialism. To him democracy is a universal principle, which must indeed be rooted in our domestic policy, but which must also control our foreign policy. The advocate of home rule for Ohio cities, upon grounds of principle, as Mayor Johnson is, could not and would not countenance a colonial system and imperial rule.

Some New York clergymen have broken the conspiracy of silence among "the cloth," regarding the

recent disclosures of American atrocities in the Philippines, and have signed an appeal to their brethren in all denominations throughout the United States to protest against the conditions which these disclosures reveal. Among the clergymen who sign this appeal are C. H. Parkhurst and John C. Bliss, Presbyterian; Robert Collyer, Unitarian; D. W. Couch, Methodist; Eugene G. Fuessle, Evangelical Reform; Conrad E. Hermsstaedt, Moravian; P. F. McSweeney, Roman Catholic; H. Pereira Mendes, orthodox Jewish; John McQuirk, Protestant Episcopal; J. B. Remensnyder, Lutheran, and Henry A. Stimson, Congregational. Joseph R. Duryea declines to sign; but in doing so he explains that his objection is to making "the army bear the blame of an immoral policy of subjugation begun four years ago." We are not altogether out of sympathy with that objection. The American policy of subjugation in the Philippines does demand brutality in the execution, if it is to be executed. If we want the policy we must tolerate the brutality. Subjugation involves all sorts of horrible possibilities. It is no Sunday-school affair. And what can be said for those ministers, of whom there are so many, who not only tolerate the brutality but defend the policy of which it is a natural fruitage? If partisanship in politics and a habit of deference to plutocrats in church pews have left any spark of Christian religion in their souls, how can they read the text of this ministerial appeal from New York without crying out against the whole Philippine iniquity?

The appeal referred to contains numerous extracts from the report of the proceedings of the Senate committee of which Mr. Lodge is chairman. Some of these have been published, but not all of them. Here, for instance, is a description of the water torture, which the imperialist papers characterize as gently as if it were a mild form of infant school hazing:

The Witness—I witnessed quite a number of cases, because I was act-

ing as a sort of an aid to the officer in command of our two companies, Maj. Geary. . . . A man is thrown down on his back and three or four men sit or stand on his arms and legs and hold him down, and either a gun barrel or a rifle barrel or a carbine barrel or a stick as big as a belaying pin is simply thrust into his jaws and his jaws are thrust back, and, if possible, a wooden log or stone is put under his head—under his neck, so he can be held firmly. . . . He is simply held down, and then water is poured onto his face, down his throat and nose from a jar, and that is kept up until the man gives some sign of giving in or becomes unconscious, and when he becomes unconscious he is simply rolled aside and he is allowed to come to. That is as near a description as I think I can give. All the cases were alike I saw on that occasion. . . . A man suffers tremendously; there is no doubt about it. His suffering must be that of a man who is drowning, but who cannot drown. . . . Some men would yield almost instantly, and would not be put through as brutal methods as I have described, while other men would have more courage or, perhaps, would be more ignorant, and they would be put through the stage where they were unconscious or almost drowned. . . . I think the men who were more courageous or perhaps did not have any guns suffered the most. By ignorant I mean that they did not really know anything to tell us.

This torture appears to have been practiced by the Americans or under their authority pretty generally throughout the islands. If it had been in Armenia by the unspeakable Turk, our churches would be thundering their demands for war to make the Turks stop. It remains to be seen whether enough ministers will follow the lead of their courageous but not very numerous New York brethren, who are appealing for their signatures, to make an influential showing in number and professional standing sufficient to oblige the Americans to stop.

In this connection it should be remarked that another ingenious method of torture in vogue in the Philippines for purposes of "pacification" and "benevolent assimilation" was reported in the Washington correspondence of the Chicago Record-Herald, a Republican paper, on the

10th. It is known as the "rope cure;" and, in the complacent language of the Washington correspondent, "for simplicity it is unrivaled." Here is the description, quoted from John Loughran, who had seen it "administered to natives in the islands during the first year of American supremacy" (which was certainly before the natives had been discovered to be a cruel set of people):

A light but strong rope is passed across the throat of the man to be examined. It is crossed behind his back and carried under the armpits, the ends are again brought around the neck and over to the back, turned under the armpits and shoulders, and then the free ends are carried as a girdle around the waist just at the end of the ribs and tied fast and securely. A stick is put through the ropes where they cross between the shoulders and then turned to suit. "Will it make a man talk?" Mr. Loughran was asked. "A wooden Indian would make a speech if you gave him the rope cure," he replied. Mr. Loughran says that this was far more effective than the water cure, which is slow. The rope cure often persuaded a native to reveal the hiding place of his gun, and it did it quickly, because he knew that as soon as he consented to talk the stick would be loosened and would fly back, relieving the agony instantaneously. Of course, if the victim should have a weak heart he might die of shock, but the native Filipino does not seem to be troubled with the malady.

The American pacification of the Philippines is a promising candidate for the place in history of twin horror with the Spanish inquisition.

Another hue and cry over Senator Tillman was raised in the press a few days ago. He had again broken loose on the Negro question. But a comparison of his speech as reported in the Congressional Record, with the daily press reports, affords an excellent example of the unbalanced methods of reporting public matters now in vogue. In what Tillman said there was enough, though barely enough, to justify the sensational reports that went over the wires. On the whole, his speech was able, judicious and well tempered. But Senator McComas had dug up the "bloody shirt" and waved it in Tillman's face, ac-

companied with taunts about the maltreatment of the Negro in the south. It was in answer to this that Tillman furnished his adversaries with further material for campaign documents to be used among Negro voters and hesitating Republicans at the North.

We have had occasion before to criticize Senator Tillman's bitterness of mind toward the American Negro, and those criticisms still stand. But in fact he is no more bitter in that respect than the majority of the people he represents; and they are no more bitter than Northerners who go South to live. Southerners often say that the Northern man who settles there comes to have the same repugnance to the Negro race that they have, and this is true. In both cases the repugnance is due to a feeling, active in the South and latent in the North, that white men are superior beings whom black men were born to serve—precisely the same feeling that white rich men in the North have for all poor men, that the Hohenzollerns of Germany have for the common man of every shade. Tillman's distinction is that he is perfectly candid in dealing with the question. He makes no pretense. Thoroughly democratic until he touches the Negro question, he bluntly renounces his democracy when he does touch it.

But suppose that Tillman's attitude toward the Negro is as bad or worse than that of Lodge and Roosevelt and Root and the rest toward the Filipinos. What of it, so far as the Philippine question is concerned? That question rests upon its own facts and not upon Tillman's ideas of white domination in the South. No matter how reprehensibly wrong Tillman may be on the Negro question, that cannot make the administration policy right on the Philippine question. "You're another" may be good invective, but it is bad argument. Tillman himself made this clear enough in his speech in question. For partisan purposes Republican senators had goaded him