

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1902.

Number 213.

**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 page.

Gen. Smith's bold confession at his trial in Manila seems to have shocked the American people into a realization of the barbarities which, with their power and in their name, have for three years been committed in the Philippines.

Through his counsel, a colonel in the army, Gen. Smith admitted solemnly in the presence of the court martial—

That he had issued orders to Maj. Waller to kill the natives and burn their homes;

That he had issued orders to make Samar a howling wilderness;

That he had ordered all persons capable of bearing arms to be killed;

And that he had ordered this ruthless killing specifically to include boys above ten years of age.

This was no revelation. The war department had long been in possession of reports revealing a barbaric policy of extermination in the Philippines. But the President, and the Secretary of War, and Senator Lodge with his investigating committee which does anything but investigate, had suppressed the truth. When Gen. Miles characterized the war as having been conducted with "unusual severity," the Secretary of War rebuked him indignantly, not only denying that there had been severity, but insisting that the war had been conducted with marked humanity; and the President gave a sting to his war secretary's rebuke. When Senator Lodge was urged to investigate, and to throw the doors of the committee room open to other correspondents besides those of the three press associations which are committed to imperialism, he

made excuses. If Gen. Smith's blunt confession could have been suppressed it doubtless would have been, judging from the policy of suppression which has prevailed so long. But now that it is out, there are only two things to do. One is to treat the matter as brutal, unmilitary and unusual conduct on the part of an individual officer, and punish him accordingly. The other is to acknowledge frankly that he acted in harmony with the general American military policy in the islands and defend that policy as a necessity.

The first course indicated above cannot be pursued. For a time it was possible to attribute cruelties in the Philippines to individual soldiers, acting without authority and in defiance of order. This was done by both Secretary Root and Senator Lodge. But that time has now passed. With Gardner's report, the disclosures regarding the water torture, the testimony in the Waller case, the confession of Gen. Smith, the scores of letters from as many soldiers serving in different parts of the Philippines (all confirmed in character by these official disclosures), there is no longer room to doubt that the policy of "benevolent assimilation," which is only a euphemistic phrase for subjugate, has become a barbarous war of extermination. If any doubt were still possible it would be wholly removed by the pleas of army officers for the necessity in fighting "a savage foe" to be savage. This, evidently, is the plea upon which Gen. Smith relies. And it is the plea which, sooner or later, the Roosevelt administration must adopt unless it puts a new interpretation upon the McKinley policy of "benevolent assimilation."

There is neither sense nor fairness

in trying to fix the responsibility for cruelty and butchery in the Philippines upon individual officers and soldiers. The Chicago Tribune, a Republican paper, is right when it says:

The "boys in blue"—or in khaki, as the case may be—are not fighting on their own hook, but are carrying out the policy of the United States government. . . .

And Congressman Williams, of Mississippi, was right when on the floor of the House he endorsed the denunciations made by the Republican member from Pennsylvania, Mr. Sibley, but said:

I am a little afraid that he does not strike the evil in the right quarter. It is the system which should be struck at, not the man who unconsciously carries out the spirit of the system. Wherever there is a war of conquest against a weak and inferior colored people deeds of brutality naturally occur. The chief danger is not the injury to the weak race, but that the temptation to tyranny will react upon the strong race and make brutes of its soldiers. For that reason such wars should be avoided. .

Gen. Smith, Maj. Waller, and all the rest, from every private who has applied the water torture down to Funston, have been carrying out the policy of the American government. Doubtless the government would like to subjugate without torture, without devastation, without extermination, without the indiscriminate killing of men, women and children. But that cannot be done. Gen. Smith and his revolting confession, with all it implies, are the natural fruits of "benevolent assimilation." You cannot conquer a spirited people without resorting to torture and devastation, nor succeed until you exterminate them. Rome never could, Spain never did, Great Britain never has, the United States never can. If the policy of subjugation which McKinley bequeathed us is to be carried out, the horrible methods with which Gen.

Smith has shocked us must be endured.

Some attempts are being made to create an impression that these barbarities are in retaliation, the idea being that we must fight savages savagely. But we have no call to fight savages 10,000 miles from our borders, across a trackless ocean. They were leaving us alone; we had only to leave them alone. Much less have we such a call, when the indisputable fact is considered that these savages were our friends and would have continued so had not President McKinley wantonly made war upon them by proclaiming American sovereignty over their land. Even if we had a call to fight these distant savages, how should we excuse our own savagery? How could we justify ourselves for resorting to torture upon the plea that they have used torture? Torture is terrible to the body and mind of the tortured; but it is damning to the character of those who torture. Not merely do we harm these people when we torture them, we degrade ourselves. Moreover, they are not savages. In 1897, John Barrett, the American minister to Siam, wrote in the *North American Review*:

It is a mistake to suppose the Philippines are the home of barbarous, uncivilized tribes. Manila was the seat of colleges, observatories and technical schools before Chicago was founded; roads to all points of the compass had been constructed by the friars in Luzon before there was a paved street in the vicinity of the site of Franklin square in New York; and devoted padres had carried the gospel to the heart of the tropical jungle before the Pilgrim Fathers landed at Plymouth Rock. Except in wild portions of the interior and in distant unexplored islands, a considerable proportion of the inhabitants can read and write.

Furthermore, the Filipinos did not begin the barbarities against which it is now asserted that the Americans are retaliating. Throughout the early part of the war the testimony was unanimous that the Filipinos treated Americans kindly. It was not so unanimous that the Americans treated them kindly. Down as late as the period of the capture of Aguinaldo, a chivalrous spirit characterized

them. Even Funston has admitted that while laying his Pinkertonian trap for Aguinaldo, the latter, when he supposed that Funston was a prisoner in the hands of Filipino soldiers, provided hospitably for his wants. If the Filipinos have resorted to cruelties, they have a far better case than we, on the plea of retaliation, as Gen. Otis himself would probably testify if questioned closely.

In an article in *Gunton's Magazine*, Mr. Schurman, the head of President McKinley's first commission to the Philippines, has something important to say of the people whose flourishing and peaceful republic was ruthlessly destroyed by command of President McKinley in his proclamation of American sovereignty, promulgated six weeks before the outbreak of February, 1899. Among other important things Mr. Schurman writes:

The civilized and Christianized democracy of Luzon and the Visayas desire independence. They are fairly entitled to it, and, united as they now are, I think they might very soon be safely intrusted with it. In their educated men, as thorough gentlemen as one meets in Europe and America, this democracy of 6,500,000 Christians has its foreordained leaders.

When the true character of the Filipinos and of their assassinated republic come to be known, and the true history of the American war in the Philippines has been written, self-respecting Americans will blush for their country. Mr. Schurman is already contributing to this realization, and the atrocious behavior of the American invaders of the islands is helping him.

They are trying to prove before the Gen. Smith court-martial that a Filipino general ordered the use by his troops of poisoned spears. This is to justify the extermination, even down to children of ten, which Gen. Smith ordered in Samar. The evidence consists in testimony that the order is in the Filipino general's handwriting. Such evidence—especially at Manila, but more especially under the American military regime there, and most especially since the Funston exploit,—should be received

with great caution. It was upon a forged order, it will be remembered, a forged order purporting to have been signed by a Filipino general, that Funston obtained access to Aguinaldo and was enabled by kidnaping him to achieve a brigadier general's straps and pay. That forgery was perpetrated by American military men at Manila, and was so cleverly executed that it deceived even Aguinaldo. Why may not the poisoned spear order, also purporting to have been signed by a Filipino general, be likewise a clever forgery by American military men at Manila? Of course it is severe upon American military men to suspect them of so despicable a thing as forgery, but they themselves have invited the suspicion. Gen. Funston has publicly boasted of his share in one of these forgeries, and Gen. MacArthur is envious enough to claim the dubious honor. He says it was he, and not Funston, who put up the job on Aguinaldo. There may be a military difference between forging a paper in order to kidnap the leader of the Filipinos, and forging one in order to give them a bad name by way of excuse for torturing and slaughtering their people and turning their country into a howling wilderness. But forgery is forgery, and mere civilians must be excused if, failing to distinguish the difference, they are suspicious of Filipino military orders which might have been as easily forged by American military men at Manila as the one that confessedly and boastfully was so forged.

The speech of Senator Patterson, of Colorado, on the disgraceful exploit whereby the unsavory Funston won his commission as brigadier general, ought to be read far and wide. It is a calm arraignment, fortified with authorities, which reduces Funston to an irreducible minimum. The occasion of Senator Patterson's speech was an interview sent out by Funston, in which he said that President Roosevelt had approved heartily his New York Lotus club speech, and was very anxious to have

him go to Boston on the invitation of Senator Lodge and make the same speech there. This was the speech in which Funston excited the Lotus eaters to cheers by suggesting that American anti-imperialists ought to be hanged. He says now that the suggestion was wholly abstract—quite Pickwickian; but it certainly had in it much of the spirit of the hangman. In the interview which Senator Patterson took for his text, Funston defended his method of capturing Aguinaldo as being within the rules of honorable warfare. It was to that point that Senator Patterson mainly addressed his speech; and when he finished, Funston's military crime had been laid bare. The speech appears in full at page 3,550 of the Congressional Record of March 27.

Gen. Sir Robert Stewart, the British military officer in charge of the "commercial" shipments of mules from the British army station at New Orleans, on board British transports, to the seat of war in South Africa, seems to have the proper notion about the matter. In an interview with a Chicago paper this week, while a guest at the Auditorium Annex, he said:

Mules will continue to be shipped to South Africa as long as the almighty dollar rules America. England is not at all alarmed over the investigation at New Orleans. There is no denying that mules and horses are shipped to South Africa by our government, and it is nonsense to talk of stopping it.

Gen. Sir Robert Stewart is not very complimentary, but he apparently understands the weakness of the nation of whose people the British government buys mules and horses.

The Nebraska Independent, of Lincoln, propounds a question which it says its editor has asked—

a thousand times of single taxers, and while he stands ready to be convinced, not one of them ever attempted to make reply.

The Independent's single tax acquaintances must be exceptionally reticent, or else the Independent's editor is not quite so open to conviction

as he thinks. This is the question in substance, for the Independent does not put it in question form:

Since the community or population gives value to everything, why is it not right to tax all values given by the community to the full amount, if it is right to tax to the full amount the value given by the community to land?

The Independent is confused by elliptical forms of expression. In the first place, the phrase "to tax values," is simply a short cut for expressing the idea of taxing in proportion to values. Values themselves are not taxed. Men are taxed. Values are only a basis of tax measurement; the question being whether we shall tax men in proportion only to their land values or to their other values. Again, when it is said that the community gives value to land, but that individual producers give value to such things as houses and merchandise, what is meant and what is by all students of the subject readily understood, might be fully expressed like this: The community alone gives value to land, since the thing to which that value attaches exists without human production; but the community and the individual producer together give value to such things as merchandise and houses, since value could not attach to them unless individuals produced them, value having no faculty for attaching itself to impossible things. In the case of land, the only factor is the value-producing power—the community; hence it is proper to say that the community gives value to land. No other thought is involved. But in the case of such things as merchandise and houses, there are two factors,—the value-producing factor, which is the community; and the house- or merchandise- or other wealth-producing factor, which comprehends only the workers who bring forth those things. And inasmuch as the wealth-producing factor is the prime factor—it alone making it possible for merchandise values, house values and other wealth values to exist,—we may with entire propriety speak elliptically of such values

as labor values. That is the principal thought involved. Consequently we say "labor values" in contradistinction to "land values." The reason why it is right to tax in proportion to land values, and not in proportion to labor values, though neither would exist but for society, is that the owners of land values neither cause them nor produce the thing to which they attach, the values being caused by society, and the thing, the land, being a common inheritance; whereas the owners of labor values (unless they have by force or fraud or laws of privilege—which are in the last analysis chiefly laws fostering land monopoly—unjustly acquired them from the producers) do produce the class of things to which those values attach, and without their having done so values would to that extent not exist. In its nature a tax in proportion to land values is a tax on monopoly, while a tax in proportion to labor values is a tax on labor

In common thought, air and light are supposed to have no value, and are not regarded as commodities at all. We speak of land as a commodity and know that it has varying values according to locality. And so accustomed are we to regarding it as a commodity that there seems to be no incongruity of suggestion in the phrase "my land," or "your land," as there would be in "my sunlight" or "your sunlight," "my air," or "your air," though private property in air or sunlight is essentially no more absurd than private property in land, all being common gifts. Nevertheless, air and sunlight are in fact private property and are valuable, as occasional instances of ownership remind us. One instance was recently reported by a New York paper. An unusually low structure, the Speyer building, is to be erected at Pine and Nassau streets, New York. As soon as it became certain that this low building would be a permanency, the adjoining lot, theretofore of equal value, was sold for \$75,000 more than