

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1902.

Number 202.

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 column of last page.

It is to be hoped, and in ordinary circumstances might be generally believed, that the Senate committee on the Philippines, which is now investigating the situation in those islands, intends to make its investigation thorough; but the attitude of Mr. Lodge, the chairman of that committee, is not well calculated to foster such a belief.

When Mr. Hoar proposed this investigation by a special committee, Mr. Lodge objected. Nor did he rest his objection alone upon the ground that a special committee would be unnecessary because the standing committee was capable of making the investigation. He intimated very strongly, also, that no investigation at all was needed. His language was—"If the senate think we ought to investigate some of the disputed questions of the past, to which my colleague has referred, of the necessity of which, I will frankly say I am not convinced, I think" the standing "committee is fit to do it." Now, the "disputed questions of the past" are vital factors in an understanding of the situation at present. That the American people may understand why the Filipinos are virtually a unit against American sovereignty, as they are now conceded to be, some, at least, of the "disputed questions of the past" must be searchingly inquired into and the truth about them established.

It must be ascertained, for one thing, whether there was a de facto Filipino government at the time of the American purchase of sovereignty from a displaced de jure government.

For another, it must be ascertained whether the hostile assertion of that beclouded title to sovereignty was the real cause of the war which for three years has devastated the islands. It must be ascertained, also, whether the Americans have authorized the barbarous "water treatment" for the discovery of concealed weapons; whether savage tribes have been employed by the Americans to cope with the civilized Filipinos, after the fashion of the British in this country a century and a quarter ago; whether a reconcentrado policy has been adopted by the Americans, after the fashion of Weyler in Cuba at the close of the last century, and with what effect in the way of weakening "the enemy" with hunger and disease; and whether the Americans have introduced systematic prostitution, fostered drunkenness, murdered prisoners, refused quarter in battle, and wantonly destroyed villages. These are some of the "disputed questions of the past" which any investigation worthy the name must put at rest.

But Mr. Lodge, when interrogated upon the subject by a constituent of high standing in his community, the Rev. C. F. Dole, really emphasizes his conviction that no such investigation is necessary. The correspondence appeared in the Boston Herald of February 2. Replying to Mr. Dole, Mr. Lodge says that everything relating to our operations in the Philippines has been freely published by the war department; that he does not believe that any cruelty is practiced; that he doubts the reports to the contrary, and will continue to doubt "such charges without proof;" and that his committee "stands ready at any time to investigate any specific act of wrongdoing," but that "it is impossible for the committee to investigate vague rumors or stories told

by persons who will not allow their names to be declared and who furnish no facts as to the time, place or participants in the alleged abuse." That is the attitude of a man who, unless he is anxious to conceal the facts, is incompetent for the post of chairman of a committee of investigation. The function of such a committee is not to try issues brought before it, as courts do, but to take the initiative. It is not relieved of this duty by the fact that the war department has published reports, made by the very men who are accused of responsibility for the scandals demanding investigation, and who have not been subjected to cross examination. It is not relieved because the chairman doubts the scandalous rumors. It is not relieved because the rumors are "without proof;" on the contrary, its duty is therefore all the more imperative to find proof itself, of either the truth or the falsity of the rumors. Neither is it relieved because the persons who tell these stories withhold their names and the identifying circumstances. Whether their stories be false or true, they could not disclose their names voluntarily without being victimized; and no identification of circumstances could be made without identifying the persons. But of its own initiative, the Senate committee could make an investigation which would disclose names and circumstances without exposing the witnesses to the malice of their superiors. If it neglects to do this, it thereby exhibits incompetency or something worse.

Whoever has had correspondence with private soldiers and other subordinates in the Philippine islands, who have written frankly—but, for obvious reasons, in confidence—of the situation there, has as good reason for believing the stories which the chairman of the Senate committee lightly tosses aside, as Mr. Lodge has for

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