

at page 329 and written long before a single American soldier had put foot on Philippine soil:

I have the honor to report that since our squadron destroyed the Spanish fleet on May 1, the insurgent forces have been most active and almost uniformly successful in their many encounters with the crown forces of Spain. . . . The insurgents have defeated the Spaniards at all points except at fort near Matate, and hold not only North Luzon to the suburbs of Manila, but Batanyes province also and the bay coast entire, save the city of Manila. . . . Manila is hemmed in.

Of that situation, Gen. Otis himself reported at page 13 of his report of "military operations and civil affairs in the Philippine islands" for 1899. He said:

For three and one-half months Admiral Dewey with his squadron and the insurgents on land had kept Manila tightly bottled.

With the Spaniards—virtually the whole Spanish army of the Philippines—thus driven into Manila by the Filipino army, and held there "tightly bottled," by Dewey on the water side and Aguinaldo on the land side, before any American troops had arrived, is it strange that Aguinaldo regarded his army as acting in friendly cooperation with the Americans? Our own officers certainly viewed the matter in that light. When Commander Bradford, of the American navy, testified as an expert on military law before the American peace commissioners at Paris regarding Aguinaldo's operations, his reply to a hypothetical question was this (see same Senate document, pages 488 and 489):

We become responsible for everything he has done, he is our ally, and we are bound to protect him.

So long as all that evidence remains in existence undisputed, why pettifog about the question of an alliance at the capture of Manila? That Aguinaldo was an ally of the American navy in bottling the Spaniards up in Manila is an unavoidable inference from the undisputed and indisputable facts.

With perfidy toward an ally, then,—a contemptible ally, if you like, but one whose aid we solicited and accepted—and with unprovoked hostility toward a young republic—only "a little brown man's" republic to be sure, but one which preserved the peace, gave token of prosperity, inspired the devotion of its people and command-

ed the respect of our own investigators,—with this perfidy and unprovoked hostility toward those people, who were entitled rather to our gratitude and our encouragement, we, as a nation, asserted our absolute sovereignty over their country and drove them in self-defense to war. This wanton war of our own making has lasted three years and more, and without being yet ended, has forced upon us the additional stigma of resorting, upon the plea of "military necessity," to methods which even our own generals, while excusing them, characterize as uncivilized.

The quiet and orderly life of an unoffending people, which our naval cadet, Sargent, observed, has been broken up, and northern Luzon, through which he and Paymaster Wilcox traveled with safety and from which they carried pleasing memories, has been laid waste. The latest dispatches assure us that in all this region peace again prevails. But now it is the peace of the graveyard. Why have we caused this misery? Why have we devastated this country? Why have we remorselessly slaughtered thousands upon thousands of its inhabitants, not only in unequal battle, but also in cold blood after captures? Why have we tortured prisoners to extort information? Why have some of our generals commanded their subordinates to make no prisoners, but to kill all natives over ten years of age? Why do we carry on this contest which breeds inhumanity even in the hearts of the humane? Is it because those people resist our assumption of sovereignty? Then why did we assert and why do we endeavor to maintain that power over an alien and unwilling people 10,000 miles away from our shores? Is it for their good, for their benevolent assimilation? From the President down, we all know that that is not the reason.

One of the real reasons was given by Gen. MacArthur to the Senate committee on the 8th, when, as reported by the Chicago Inter Ocean, a Republican paper, he mixed in with a lot of benevolent phrases and some fantastic evolutionary speculations, a declaration that—

the possession, the permanent possession of the Philippine archipelago, is not only of supreme importance, but absolutely essential to American interests.

That is one of the unvarnished reasons; and the others are like it, only on a smaller scale. Since the

islands are rich in natural wealth, American "interests" want a chance at the grab. To satisfy those interests, with their greed for gain and lust of power that outrun satisfaction and surpass understanding, we have placed our nation in the pillory, self-convicted of perfidy to an ally, of making a war of conquest upon a weak and friendly people, and of waging the war with a degree of cruelty and inhumanity that forces our own military officers to admit, even if cautiously, that it cannot be called civilized. How much longer shall this republic so stultify its own best ideals?

NEWS

The Philippine question has suddenly loomed up like a portentous shadow over the field of American politics, in consequence of some startling disclosures with reference to American barbarities in the islands.

One of these disclosures is the astounding verdict of the court-martial at Manila in the Waller case. The principal evidence in this case, as far as reported, was outlined last week (p. 9), but at that time no verdict had been reached. Maj. Waller was upon trial for murdering natives. He admitted that he had commanded the execution of natives without trial, in the island of Samar, and that 11 had been shot upon his order; but he defended the act upon the ground that it was in accordance with orders from his superior, Gen. Smith, and in conformity to military usage. The verdict was reached on the 12th, after half an hour's deliberation; and on the 13th it was publicly announced that the court-martial, by a vote of 11 to 2, had acquitted the accused officer. As reported by the Manila dispatches, the verdict was to the effect that, in giving orders for the killing of natives, Maj. Waller had acted "in accordance with the rules of war, the orders of his superior, and the military necessities of the situation."

The revelations of the Waller court-martial were nearly coincident with the disclosure of an official report giving similar indications of severity in dealing with natives in the Philippines. This report came first to public notice, though only vaguely, on the 29th of March, when President

Roosevelt sent to the House of Representatives, at its request, the papers bearing on an application by Gen. Miles to be assigned to duty in the Philippines. In Gen. Miles's letter making that application, dated February 17, 1902, he referred to the long drawn out Philippine war, and characterized it as having "been conducted with marked severity." The secretary of war answered on the 5th of March, denying the application and closing with the assertion that—it is not the fact that the warfare in the Philippines has been conducted with marked severity; on the contrary, the warfare has been conducted with marked humanity and magnanimity on the part of the United States army. Replying to the secretary, on the 24th of March, Gen. Miles said upon this point:

It is proper to say that I had in mind such information as was conveyed in the letter of Gov. Wm. H. Taft, addressed to the honorable secretary, dated Washington, February 7, 1902, as well as other communications that have been referred to these headquarters or received by me.

The identity of the documents thus alluded to by Gen. Miles was fixed by the secretary of war in his response of March 25, when he wrote that Gen. Miles's allusion was to a report by the civil governor of the Province of Tayabas, received February 7, 1902, and which had been forwarded February 19th to Gen. Chaffee with instructions to investigate, and if the statements were found to be true to adopt disciplinary measures. The secretary rebuked Gen. Miles for assuming the truth of these charges before they had been investigated. On the 7th of April this long withheld Tabayas report was made a subject of inquiry in the Senate committee on the Philippines, the Democratic members calling attention to the fact that although Gov. Taft had been testifying for three weeks, and had been instructed to furnish the committee with copies of reports received by him from civil governors, and had submitted favorable reports, he had held back a damaging one. A resolution was consequently adopted calling directly upon the secretary of war to produce this report; and on the 10th it was produced, and for the first time made public.

The report in question, dated December 16, 1901, and made by Maj. Cornelius Gardner, formerly of the United States regular army but now civil governor of the Province of Tabayas in the Philippines, advises

the early concentration of the troops in one or two garrisons, if the friendliness of the inhabitants is desired. That a friendly sentiment has existed he avers, explaining that he is in touch with the people, "having visited all the pueblos one or more times and having lived with them in their homes." But, he continues—

of late, by reason of the conduct of the troops, such as the extensive burning of the barrios in trying to lay waste the country so that the insurgents cannot occupy it, the torturing of natives by so-called water-cure and other methods in order to obtain information, the harsh treatment of natives generally, and the failure of inexperienced, lately appointed lieutenants commanding posts to distinguish between those who are friendly and those unfriendly and to treat every native as if he were, whether or no, an insurrecto at heart—this favorable sentiment above referred to is being fast destroyed and a deep hatred toward us engendered. If these things need be done they had best be done by native troops, so that the people of the United States will not be credited therewith.

Hardly had the significance of the Gardner report and the Waller verdict reached the public when two witnesses gave shocking testimony before the Senate committee with reference to the "water cure" treatment. One of them was Charles S. Riley, of Northampton, Mass., formerly a sergeant in the 26th volunteer infantry. The other was Wm. L. Smith, of Athol, Mass., formerly a private in Co. M. of the same regiment. Mr. Riley testified that he had witnessed an application of the "water cure" at Igaras, in the province of Iloilo, November 27, 1900. It was administered to the presidente of the town, a man 40 years of age. The object of the torture was to extort information. It was twice applied. The first time the water from a 100-gallon tank was turned into the victim's mouth, he lying prostrate and his mouth being forcibly held open, until he gave the desired information. The second time a syringe was inserted in his mouth and another in his nose, the two syringes taking water from a 5-gallon can. With the man held down upon his back streams of water were in this manner pumped into him, and to make the torture more effective salt was thrown into the water. The confession thus extorted was to the effect that the presidente, while ostensibly friendly to the United States, was in reality a captain in the Filipino

army and that his policemen were soldiers. For that reason the American troops arrested him and burned the town. The other witness, Mr. Smith, corroborated this testimony and gave also a similar account of the application of the "water cure" to two policemen at Igaras. He explained moreover that the management of the torture was in the hands of a squad detailed for the purpose from the 18th regular infantry and known as "the water cure detail." In describing the burning of Igaras (a town of about 10,000) by the American troops, he said that the inhabitants generally escaped only with the clothes they wore. Both witnesses gave the names of the officers under whose direction the torture was inflicted and the burning done. They were Capt. Glenn and Lieut. Conger, of the regular army, and Dr. Lyons, an assistant surgeon.

The President and the secretary of war are credited by the Washington dispatches of the 15th with having in consequence of these revolting revelations, "taken hold of the army scandals in the Philippines with a vigor and directness which cannot fail to punish the offenders of the past and prevent a repetition of similar offenses in the future." Direct orders have been given to Gen. Chaffee to have Gen. Smith court-martialed if such testimony was given at the Waller trial as is reported in the news dispatches, namely, that Gen. Smith ordered indiscriminate slaughter. As to Conger, Glenn and Lyons, a court-martial has been ordered to sit in San Francisco to try them for their cruelty at Igaras. It is to sit in San Francisco because Conger and Lyons are both in this country. Glenn, who is still in the Philippines, and all witnesses still there, are ordered to be sent home at once.

Gen. Chaffee reported officially on the 16th that Gen. Malvar, the last of the important Filipino generals, had surrendered unconditionally the day before, thus terminating armed resistance to the United States in the department of North Philippines. At the same time he advised the President of the necessity of sending a large force to the island of Mindanao and stated that he was fitting out an expedition of 1,200 men, which is to leave for Mindanao about the 27th.

Passing on from the American war in the Philippines to the similar Brit-