

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1902.

Number 214.

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.

President Roosevelt has given out the refrain for the imperialists' Philippine song, and all the imperial songsters have begun to sing it. Though not what you might callegant, it is up to the vaudeville grade, and fairly expressive of the kind of demagoguery for which its distinguished author is noted. Driven to the verge of desperation by the revolting exposures of the past week or two, Mr. Roosevelt breaks through his unwonted reserve, grits his teeth, and defiantly shouts: "The flag will stay put!"

An American general may order the indiscriminate killing of everybody over ten years of age in the distant foreign country he is invading, but "the flag will stay put." He may order devastation by fire and sword until the land he would seize is a howling wilderness, but "the flag will stay put." Prisoners may be shot off hand by order of an American military officer of low degree, but "the flag will stay put." Natives of the invaded country may be systematically tortured by American soldiers to make them treacherous to their country and kin, but "the flag will stay put." A thriving little republic in the East may have been throttled by an outgrown republic in the West, but "the flag will stay put." Its territory may be parceled out to foreign syndicate makers and land grabbers, but "the flag will stay put." A band of freebooters in control of the American government may laugh American ideals to scorn, but "the flag will stay put." The United States may be doing in the Philippines to-day what Great Britain tried to do in the

American colonies in "the days that tried men's souls," but "the flag will stay put." All is well, though the devil reigns, provided "the flag stays put."

It is a singular coincidence that President Roosevelt should have chosen for the display of his cheap demagoguery a meeting of descendants of revolutionary patriots; and more singular still that they should have applauded his nominally patriotic but truly traitorous sentiment—traitorous because it sets the flag against the principles which the flag symbolizes. For these revolutionary descendants are supposed to be concerned in perpetuating memories of a conflict wonderfully like that in the Philippines, in which their forefathers were on the other side. Had there been a meeting of descendants of the British and Hessians of 1776, Mr. Roosevelt's speech would have been in perfect keeping with the occasion, and the applause that greeted it would have been appropriate. But a meeting of descendants of the American patriots of 1776!

Why, they were the Filipinos of their time. Their land was invaded; their homes were burned; their country was devastated by British soldiers and they were slandered by British statesmen, as the Philippine islands now are invaded and Filipino homes are burned and the country devastated by American soldiery while the Filipino people are slandered by American statesmen. The American patriots were fighting for independence, as the Filipino is; and Great Britain was trying to hold their land as dependent colonies, as the United States is now trying to hold the Philippines. What George III. and Lord North were to the progenitors of these degenerate "Sons of

the American Revolution," so are President Roosevelt and Senator Lodge to the Filipino patriots; and as the savage Indians and the ruthless Hessians employed by the British were to the former, such to the latter are the savage Macabebes employed by the Americans, and the callous American soldiers who torture and kill their prisoners. History fails, however, to name an officer in the British attempt at American subjugation, to compare with the Gen. Smith who has won abhorrent notoriety in the American attempt at Philippine subjugation. Yet an American president turns from this significant analogy in his nation's history, hides that nation's shame behind the folds of its flag, and, worse than all, thereby evokes the applause of "sons" of our Revolution!

President Roosevelt's slangy refrain is taken up in scholarly phrase by Senator Lodge. Until now this later Lord North had been content to listen contemptuously to the condemnatory speeches of Democratic senators, while he suppressed the facts his committee had been appointed to discover. But so many facts, and such ugly facts, have thrust themselves upon the committee and squeezed through its carefully guarded enclosures to the public, that he, in common with the President, feels the necessity of going upon the defensive. Contemptuous silence no longer avails. And, in imitation of the President, he simply holds up the flag defiantly. They are like the committee that decorated a rural school house for Washington's birthday. When the orator asked, dramatically, "Why is that flag hanging there to-day?" one of the little boys who had seen the committee at work and understood the true motive for some of the patriotic decoration, exclaimed: "Please,

sir, it's to hide the dirt on the wall!" That is precisely the reason why the flag is flaunted now. What the secretive investigating committee of the Senate could not do by suppression, the flag and a choice assortment of patriotic epithets are expected to do by intimidation.

One of the characteristic things about the Philippine controversy has been the disposition on the part of the imperialists not only to suppress testimony calculated to open up sources of information, but to fill the record with one-sided stories. The most remarkable instance of this is the publication by the war department a few days ago, of documents alleged to indicate that Aguinaldo began the present war, while the Senate "investigating" committee refuses to allow him to be a witness. The Lodge-Roosevelt-Root coterie patterns after the judge who always disliked hearing both sides of a case because it confused him. But even without Aguinaldo's testimony, an unbiased mind cannot be influenced by these documents. To begin with, they purport to be in Aguinaldo's handwriting. Since forgery is one of the arts of war practiced and defended by American military officers in the Philippines, the genuineness of the handwriting comes at once into serious question. And suspicion is not allayed by the fact that the documents are said to have been captured by Gen. Funston. But even if the documents prove, in spite of these questionable circumstances, to be genuine, they cannot cast the onus of beginning the war upon Aguinaldo or his government. For they bear date as late as January, 1899. If the war had opened in February, when the fighting began, they might have some significance, if not forged. But the beginning of the war antedates the beginning of the fighting by several weeks. War was declared by the president of the United States as early as December, 1898. This is the record evidence. When President McKinley, by his proclamation of that time, asserted American sovereignty over the

Philippine archipelago and announced his intention of enforcing his proclamation with arms, he virtually declared war against the Filipino republic, which was then, and this also is record evidence, peaceably governing everywhere in the Christian islands except in Manila. Whatever the Filipinos did between then and the outbreak of hostilities was purely defensive. Responsibility for beginning the war in January, 1899, cannot be placed upon Aguinaldo and his followers so long as American official documents exist which prove that it was begun by Mr. McKinley in December, 1898.

The meat trust prosecution suggests to the Red Wing Argus, that watchful and bright Democratic weekly of Minnesota, the advisability of utilizing the "water cure," as discovered and applied by Americans in the Philippines, for domestic purposes. Since much difficulty is experienced in getting evidence against the trust, owing to the secretiveness of its members, the Argus asks—

Well, then, why not try the water cure?

Witnesses from the Philippines say it is harmless and refreshing. When they suspected natives of having guns, they applied it, and, they add, "we got the guns" The government suspects these men of using instruments of warfare against the people of the United States, but the evidence is concealed. Imagine one of Knox's lieutenants coming in to report: "We applied the water cure," and grinning, "we got the evidence."

You can't imagine it; it is unthinkable? Thank God it is unthinkable. And yet the police in the large cities use daily devices of that sort, what they call the sweat-box method, against vulgar criminals. Where they know a man is guilty, but have no evidence, where they suspect he is guilty, where they believe he ought to be guilty if he isn't, they put him in the sweat box. Wherein is it worse before the law to apply the sweat box method to Morgan or Rockefeller or Armour or Swift, than to Red Leary or Six-Fingered Jake? Are they not equal before the law, are they not presumed to be innocent until they are proved guilty?

If the gravity of the offense is to measure the severity of the means employed to gain evidence, the argument is all on the side of applying it to the

conspirators, against the people. Red Leary snatches a pocketbook; the beef trust takes the meat out of the mouths of whole communities. Six-Fingered Jake pilfers a handkerchief; the great robbers loot a continent.

Out of all the futile fuss in connection with the prosecution of the beef trust, one encouraging fact emerges. The officers of the government announce their intention of proving that for many years the trust has enjoyed an almost prohibitory advantage under secret rebate agreements with the railroads. The existence of these agreements has been disclosed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which attributes to them the very possibility of the trust. And the commission is right. It is by means of monopoly privileges, held directly as in the case of railroads and other owners of valuable public franchises, or held indirectly as in the case of the meat trust under secret contracts with railroads, that trusts can exist. That is the key to the whole trust problem. No oppressive trust can be made by combinations of competitive businesses. If such combinations were to become dictatorial, they would be met at once by new competitors. But when combinations include special privileges, created by law, then competition is checked and ceases to have its normal power of regulating business. If the attorney general has in good faith set about exposing the privileges which the meat trust enjoys, his success in the court may be followed by the collapse of the trust. But, unless it can be deprived of special privileges, any court victory he may gain will be barren.

While the United States Senate pigeon holes the proposed constitutional amendment for the election of senators by popular vote, the people of Oregon are about to test a device for effecting the same object without the consent of the federal government. A recent law of that state provides that any state convention may make a nomination for United States senator, and that such nominee shall be entitled to have his name on the