

HIS GOOD UNCLE MARK.

For The Public.

To the Editor: It may not be exactly proper for me to do it, but I feel so good I can't help it. I must write to you and tell you how tickled I am to see in the papers that Uncle Mark has got his little subsidy bill through the Senate. As the children say, I'm most tickled to death.

Uncle Mark, you know, means Mark Hanna. He is so good to the boys that work for him, and works so hard in the Senate to get through subsidy bills and other things for the benefit of us poor people, that I must call him Uncle Mark. If there was anything more affectionate or endearing that I could think of I would use it, because there's lots of people that don't appreciate our dear Uncle Mark. There's lots of people that call him names, and say mean things about him, while he's working himself to death there in the foul air of the Senate chamber, digging out subsidy bills, and other sorts of things to take money out of the pockets of the millionaires to help us poor people along. It's dreadful to think how very ungrateful some people are.

I started out to say how tickled I am about the subsidy bill. We will surely have some steamships of our own now. I begin to feel rich already. Before I heard about Uncle Mark's subsidy bill, that gives a substantial donation to people that want to build and sail ships, I was worrying a little bit about how I was going to pay the next month's rent, but that good news took all the worry out of me. Of course if that bill goes through all right, and I think she will, my salary will be raised at once, and the landlord will come down on his rent, and I shall be, as they say, "on Easy street." No doubt of it. And that is what tickles me so. And while I think about it, the telephone girl next door—that sits all day with a collar and martingale on her head, and things buzzing in her ears—feels just as good as I do about it. She don't mind chipping in a little bit from her salary to help Uncle Mark and his poor partners to build a few steamships. She knows what it is to be hard up and out of a job, and sympathizes with the steamships and other people that can't make a living without subsidies and tariffs and such. But I feel too tickled to write any more. Yours respectfully,

J. BIGGLES.

Let Truth and Error grapple. Who ever knew Truth to be worsted in an open fight?—Milton.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

From the Editor of City and State.

Philadelphia, March 17, 1902.

To the Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.—Sir: In your letter of February 17th to Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Chairman of the Senate committee on the Philippines, you treat of charges of cruelty and uncivilized methods of warfare alleged to have been committed under our flag in these islands. In the letter of Gen. Funston, bearing on this subject, which you submit as exhibit "a," together with other kindred reports printed in Senate document 205, City and State is mentioned as the source of one of these charges. I therefore feel justified in openly addressing you as the official head of the war department on a question which I believe to be of the utmost public concern; a question which directly affects the honor and the welfare of the country, and indirectly, but none the less vitally, the progress of true civilization.

I shall first try to state fairly what I conceive to be your position in matters of fact and of policy, and then give in rejoinder my own views on the matter at issue as they have been expressed in the journal referred to by Gen. Funston. I understand your letter to be a distinct, unqualified denial of the charge, which is, in brief, that torture has been used under our flag in the Philippines for the accomplishment of a military purpose. You deny the use of any cruel or uncivilized methods of warfare, in the conflict waged to subdue the Filipino opposition to our sovereignty, more than might be expected to occur in any way, or than might be expected to result in this war where you admit that the cruelties of a semi-barbarous enemy have occasionally provoked our soldiers to acts of unauthorized revenge. This is, I think, a fair interpretation of your position, and of what you would have the country believe to be true. You say that the orders governing our soldiers in the Philippines are the same as those promulgated by President Lincoln to govern our armies in the civil war, and that these rules which have governed our regular and volunteer armies ever since are "the practical and effective guide and rule of conduct to which every officer understands that he must conform." You then call attention, among other things to rule 16, which prohibits "maiming or wounding, except in fight, and torture to extort confession." You say, further, that the war

on the part of the Filipinos has been conducted with the barbarous cruelty common among uncivilized races, and with "general disregard of the rules of civilized warfare." Further, you say that this war has been conducted on our part with "scrupulous regard for the rules of civilized warfare and with careful and genuine consideration for the prisoner, and with humanity never surpassed, if ever equaled in any conflict, worthy only of praise, and reflecting credit on the American people." Almost precisely the opposite of this I believe to be the truth. I believe it upon evidences, which, though moral rather than as yet legal, are so varied and so persistent that their cumulative testimony would produce on a dispassionate mind subjected to them a settled conviction of their essential truth. These evidences, some of which I will present, shut us up, as I claim, to one of two conclusions—either that the charge which I make is true; that torture has been used by us to extort confession at least from April 25, 1900, to August 18, 1901, to an extent sufficient to justify the term of "policy" applied to the "water-cure" torture by one of our officers of high rank serving in the Philippines—or that a conspiracy exists to defame our good name, into which have entered not only common soldiers and subalterns, but officers of high rank and repute, American school-teachers and American censored newspapers published in Manila—for all these are to-day included in the list of those whose moral evidence supports my contention. This latter supposition seems to me incredible, but as I wrote the President on this subject December 27th, it is the only alternative left open to him who denies the substantial truth of the charge. If your statements on the subject are true, how could this term "policy" be used by a man of high character and position, and situated so as to know well what was going on and to be to some degree an eye witness of the horrible results of this degrading and monstrous practice? How could he write a brother officer as follows:

A company of Macabebes enter a town or barrio, catch some man—it matters not whom—ask him if he knows where are any guns, and upon receiving a negative answer, five or six of them throw him down, one holds his head, while others have hold of an arm or a leg. They then proceed to give him the "water-torture," which is the distention of the internal organs with water. After they are distended, a cord is sometimes placed around the body and the water expelled. From what I have heard, it appears to be generally applied, and its use is not confined to one section. Although

it results in the finding of a number of guns, it does us an infinite amount of harm. *Nor are the Macabebes the only ones who use this method of obtaining information.* Personally I have never seen this torture inflicted, nor have I ever knowingly allowed it; but I have seen a victim a few minutes afterward, with his mouth bleeding where it had been cut by a bayonet used to hold the mouth open, and his face bruised where he had been struck by the Macabebes. Add to this the expression of his face, and his evident weakness from torture, and you have a picture which once seen, will not be forgotten. I am not chicken-hearted, but this policy hurts us. Summary executions are, and will be, necessary in a troubled country, and I have no objection to seeing that they are carried out; but I am not used to torture. The Spaniards used the torture of water throughout the islands as a means of obtaining information; but they used it sparingly, and only when it appeared evident that the victim was culpable. Americans seldom do things by halves. We come here and announce our intention of freeing the people from 300 or 400 years of oppression, and say: "We are strong, and powerful, and grand." Then to resort to inquisitorial methods, and use them without discrimination, is unworthy of us, and will recoil on us as a nation.

The foregoing is the sober testimony of an honorable gentleman, a brave and experienced soldier, whose mind and heart both revolt against a hideous and inhuman practice which he sees followed not by Macabebes only, but evidently by Americans as well; not in sudden hot revenge for cruelties of an enemy, but in cold blooded pursuit of a military end. For obvious reasons this witness' name cannot at present be given, but his testimony is none the less convincing on that account. It is vouched for also by Mr. George Kennan, the Siberian traveler and investigator of established reputation. This was published a year ago in *The Outlook*, a paper which has cordially supported the existing Philippine policy—nor has any one ever dared to my knowledge to challenge or disprove this testimony. It is not the gossip of an irresponsible private soldier, but the calm discriminating protest of a high officer. If your statements are correct on this point, which explanation do you give of the report published in the *Manila Times* of August 18, 1901, which recounts operations in Samar and from which I quote as follows:

Finally on June 21 Lieut. Downes and one man were killed and three wounded near Pambahan, in a fight from ambush which evidently had been prepared pursuant to information sent out from Guilan as to Lieut. Downes' movements.

Several prominent Filipinos gave some valuable information as to the instigators of this spy system, and as they had before given information which proved true, the commanding officer thought best to act upon this information. Maj. John J. O'Connell,

First Infantry of Gussie expedition fame, who arrived on the scene about this time as commanding officer, said that a good shaking up all around would be good. That "he wanted no traitors around him." Therefore all the suspected were given a "dose" of the "water-cure," which proved effectual in bringing to light the guilty. These were locked up in prison.

The prime mover in the affair was discovered to be the president of the Pueblo San Esteban Austria.

The foregoing is an excellent illustration of what seems to me the real truth. We have used this torture not to be cruel or for revenge, but because we have found it a convenient way to get important information. Indeed Gov. Taft has admitted in substance what you deny and I claim, "water torture" and "unnecessary killings," but he speaks of them as "strictly forbidden." How strictly? To a degree that those indulging in them are punished, whether they be our own officers or our savage Macabebe allies, the use of which opens us to the rebuke Lord Chatham gave Great Britain when she employed similar means against us in the revolutionary war? Hardly so, it would seem, as I wrote Assistant Adjutant Gen. Andrews inquiring whether Maj. O'Connell had been court-martialed for his alleged offense. I got no answer to this question. I received a courteous letter calling my attention to your communication on the general subject to the Senate. In this I find no record of inquiry into this case, but I do find the full report of the case of Lieut. Hagedorn, who, under somewhat similar circumstances, used what must have been in the tropics an excruciating torture. Three Filipinos, from whom he wished to extort information, were put in the stocks, fed on salt fish and deprived of water for 48 hours. The lieutenant reports with evident pride to his superior officer that "this diet had excellent results," for it forced the victims to give the desired information. Was the officer punished for his "use of torture to extort confession" forbidden by the rules and which you say are "the practical and effective guide" under which our army operates in the Philippines? His superior officer, Col. Hood, as your report shows, commended him for "energetic" and valuable service in the pacification of this district," stated that he had acted in "the best interests of the service even if mistakenly," and recommended that no further action be taken in the case.

Now my inference is (and I ask you and the public if it is not a fair one) that if an officer who used the salt fish and no-water torture is not punished, but generally commended,

while another whose use of the water-torture is openly published by a censored newspaper in the city where our military headquarters exist, is not court-martialed, that "the constant and effective presence of prohibition, precept and discipline" which you assert has been maintained against the use of torture, or other cruelties inflicted on the natives, is not such as you have imagined and declared it to be; that it exists on paper, but not in practice. I think that the statement published in the *Kansas City Journal* of March 10th, from W. H. Clark, a returned soldier of the Eighteenth United States infantry, gives a fair picture of the truth:

The water-cure has been administered to thousands of natives in the Philippines, at least in Panay. . . . We did not do it in the spirit of malevolence . . . but the water-cure is the quickest remedy for non-communicativeness and mendacity which has yet been discovered in the Philippines. It is probably a relic of the Spanish inquisition.

When asked whether the treatment was fatal this witness said:

Well, they usually get sick and some of them never recover from their sickness. Of course we never tortured any Filipinos to death, but the only way to get along with them is to administer the water-cure. I have seen kerosene and cocoanut oil used instead of water, but the effect is the same.

This witness, while he strongly confirms by his testimony my charge, later on praises, as you do, the "general humanity" of our soldiers. Of course, the question of "humanity" depends on one's point of view. But what this and so many others describe is inconsistent with "humanity" as you, I presume, and Americans generally understand the term.

Gen. Funston brands as an "atrocious lie" the statement made on the authority of a soldier in his command, by a Philippine correspondent of *The State*, of South Carolina, to the effect that this soldier had assisted at 160 applications of this "water-cure" torture, all but 26 of which resulted fatally. This correspondent speaks of this torture as a "favorite" one with us for extracting information. This coincides with Clark's testimony and others. Unless a very large number of our people have falsified, whose position and past reputation would forbid that supposition, we certainly have shown ourselves extremely fond of it. But who is the correspondent who quoted the soldier in Gen. Funston's command? Is he a responsible person? The editor of *The State*

writes me that he is Mr. R. D. Epps, a teacher in the Philippines, chosen by the state superintendent of education in South Carolina, at the request of the Washington authorities. This man wrote, as the editor of The State points out, "from the American army standpoint, not from that of Filipinos or anti-Imperialists, and he was "evidently in sympathy with the measures adopted." He does not vouch for the precise mortality produced on the Filipinos by the use of the water-torture. That may or may not be correct. That is not the vital point. The testimony falls generally in line with that given by many others. Nor is the claim made that Gen. Funston ordered this. It would naturally result from just such orders as have been issued and just such campaigns as we know have been carried on in Samar by Gen. Smith and Gen. Bell in Batangas. Gen. Hughes in his testimony before the Senate committee (which is so interesting and important that I wish it might have been given fully to the public) admits that our campaign in Samar each year got "stiffer," that we were conducting what could not be called "civilized warfare." Gen. Hughes testifies that he had at one time as many as "120 commands in the field." "Each commander under general restrictions had authority to act for himself;" that new commanders would come into the field and start in to conduct their work much "easier" than the old ones, "they would come into the country with their ideas of *civilized warfare, and were allowed to get their lesson.* (Italics mine.) Do you dispute the correctness of Gen. Hughes' testimony given reservedly and with caution, lest he should tell more than was expedient? If not, then your published statement is incorrect and seriously misleading. Mr. Stephen Bonsall, the returned correspondent, throws further light on the dark chapter of our operations in Samar to add fresh force to Gen. Hughes' testimony. He says in the Boston Transcript, March 10:

During my stay in Samar the only prisoners that were made so far as I know were taken by Waller's command, and I heard this act criticised by the higher officers as a mistake which they believed he would not repeat when better acquainted with the conditions in Samar. . . . If on their march Waller and his men shot any natives they met, their action would be fully covered by the general orders of Gen. Smith. (Italics mine.)

But were the Filipinos as cruel and uncivilized in warfare as your unqualified declarations on the subject warrants us to believe? I think a careful

examination of the facts will show that until our attacks on their organized government broke it down, and compelled disorganized and guerrilla warfare, they generally treated prisoners well. Great praise has been given to Aguinaldo for "his humanity in war." Wilcox and Sargeant in their trip through Luzon, on Admiral Dewey's behalf, in the autumn of 1898, reported not only general peace and order but many Spanish prisoners in good condition. If the Filipinos' treatment of prisoners was originally barbarous would Admiral Dewey have permitted, or compelled, the 3,000 Spaniards who surrendered at Subig bay to go into Filipino hands instead of ours? Were not Lieut. Gilmore and his men well treated by Aguinaldo? Would the Spanish Red Cross Society have given Aguinaldo a medal of honor "for humanity in war," which was carried to him by an American gentleman last December, as I happen to know, if he had treated prisoners of the Spanish nation cruelly? Or would Aguinaldo have given food to Gen. Funston and his men when he thought they were hungry prisoners instead of disguised enemies, if his and his people's general practice was one of cruelty to prisoners? Is not this a case where the victor can afford to be, if not generous in judging a fallen foe, at least accurate and just? Who is responsible for the bad change that has come over Filipino warfare in this respect if not ourselves?

I ask, as I draw to a close of this long and wearisome recital of torture and butchery, at which we would stand aghast if it was done by any other nation than our own, do you doubt or will you deny the general truth of the statement recently made in the New York Evening Post by one of our ablest and most reliable Washington correspondents, Mr. Frances E. Leupp, on the authority of a Republican congressman who visited the Philippines last summer. I quote as follows:

But the Filipino is at least in a state of rebellion against the United States authority, and he always will be. You never heard of any disturbance in northern Luzon, and the secret of its pacification is in my opinion, the secret of the pacification of the archipelago. They never rebel in northern Luzon because there isn't anybody there to rebel. That country was marched over and cleaned out in a most resolute manner. *The good Lord in Heaven only knows the number of Filipinos that were put under ground, for our soldiers took no prisoners; they kept no records; they simply swept the country, and wherever or however they came upon a Filipino they killed him. The women and children were spared, and can now be noticed in disproportionate numbers in that part of the island.* (Italics mine.)

. . . . But, as I gauge American sentiments, there was no real opposition to the course pursued by Funston and others in northern Luzon, and there would not be to a similar course in the rest of the archipelago.

It is true the author of this statement, which is but another of the many links in the long chain of moral evidence which proves how different is the condition of our island warfare from what you would lead us to believe, as yet reserves his name. I trust before long he will reveal it; I trust that there may soon come such a quickening of the public conscience over these deeds, useless as they are bloody, Spanish rather than American in their nature, that he and many others like him, who can testify as to the real truth, will come forward and declare it in the presence of all men, and that the country will call them to do so. It is a truth that the American people must know and must ponder. They must ask the persistent question, is it a good tree which bears such corrupt fruit? And what must be its effect on the character and constitution of the nation that feeds upon it?

I had sincerely believed that the American soldier, whose good behavior in China shone so brightly in comparison with the dark deeds committed by the troops of some foreign powers, would have resisted the temptation to fall to the low level of uncivilized warfare. The evidence is convincing, however, that in the Philippines he has not done so. We must all bear the heavy burden of shame brought on us by this fall, but we can best lighten its weight, and hope for a better record in the future, not by denying patent facts, indulging in self-adulation to which we are clearly not entitled, or by trying to distract attention from our own faults by emphasizing the faults of others; but by confessing the plain truth in a manly way. France was sharply criticised, by those nations which consider Anglo-Saxon civilization the foremost leader of human progress, for an alleged attempt in the Dreyfus case to sacrifice exact justice to the reputation of the army. We all saw the specious fallacy that lured men to that attempt, and we cried out; reputation is worthless if the truth and character that should sustain it are gone! The same impartial perspicacity which we of Great Britain and the United States showed then, when a sister nation was threatened with blindness, should be invoked now for our own benefit when a similar affliction threatens us.

No one has a greater respect and admiration than I for the many noble

men who have served their country as privates or officers in our army. Many of my best friends have been among this number. There are among them many who, knowing of these abuses, would gladly have prevented or stopped them if they could. They were largely powerless on account of their position. But I do not see how any true American, knowing and loving the institutions of his country as I do, and knowing these sad facts as I believe I know them, can fail to place on record openly and boldly his protest against practices which inflict a great wrong upon humanity and ourselves. Respectfully,

HERBERT WELSH.

A Scotsman who had been employed nearly all his life in the building of railways in the Highlands of Scotland came to this country in his later years and settled in a new section on the plains of the far west. Soon after his arrival a project came up in his new home for the construction of a railway through the district, and the Scotsman was applied to as a man of experience in such matters.

"Hoot, mon!" said he to the spokesman of the scheme, "ye canna build a railway across this country."

"Why not, Mr. Ferguson?"

"Why not?" he repeated, with an air of effectually settling the whole matter. "Why not! Dae ye no see the country's as flat as a floor, and ye dinna hae any place whatever to run your tunnels through?"—N. Y. Tribune.

Vandever—Any difference between that extra of yours and my earlier edition?

Brinkerhoff—Yes; a small item on the inside of your paper is printed in big, red type on the outside of mine!—Puck.

Here is a little gem clipped from a small boy's essay on parents:

"Parents are things which boys have to look after them. Most girls also have parents. Parents consist of pas and mas. Pas talk a good deal about what they are going to do, but mostly it's the mas that make you mind."—Chicago News.

Of course, when we speak of the tenements breeding vice, we do not refer to well-bred vice.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

Ernest Crosby contributes to the general subject of war and the particular question of imperialism a satire which, if it is open to any criticism at all, sins only against "literature for the sake of literature" in its excessive fidelity to what it satirizes. "Captain Jinks, Hero" (New York and

London: Funk & Wagnall's Company), is the story of a military hero who is as plainly Funston with an infusion of Roosevelt as East Point, where he serves as a cadet, is West Point; as Havilla, where he censors the Declaration of Independence and wins a brigadier generalship by capturing Gomardo by detestable methods in Manila; or as Forslania, where the emperor of Tuntonia horribly exemplifies the theory of one of the Emperor of Germany's speeches that soldiers must shoot their own fathers and mothers if ordered to do so, is China. The story, simply as a narrative of military adventure, is made especially interesting by the lifting of the curtain which enables the reader to look behind the scenes and see how, why, and for whom wars are made. So true is it to the facts of the Spanish-American war, with the Philippine appendix and the diversion into China, that in places it might pass for veritable history; yet the satire is never lost sight of, nor does interest in the moral density and military conscience of the realistic hero ever flag. This is just the kind of book for world-power patriots to read. It is illustrated by Dan Beard, with that artist's well-known genius for interpreting the spirit of his author by means of original conceptions, instead of culling incidents and scenes to portray in common place pictures.

THE CHANGE IN PRICE OF THE PUBLIC,

Already announced to subscribers by circular, will be made with the first issue of the fifth year, namely, April 12, 1902. Beginning with the issue of that date, the price will be as follows:

ANNUALLY.....	\$2.00
SEMI-ANNUALLY.....	1.00
QUARTERLY.....	.50
(50 cents extra per year for postage on foreign subscriptions except to Canada and Mexico.)	
SINGLE COPIES.....	.5
WHOLESALE, per 100 copies.....	\$2.00

\$1.00

Received by us before April 1st PAYS FOR

A New Subscription for One Year, OR FOR A RENEWAL FOR ONE YEAR.

Volume IV of The Public

Will be completed with No. 209, to appear April 5th.

Complete Volumes, including Index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound volumes ordered before April 5 will be ready for delivery about May 1. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. t

The Public

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscriptions, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address: THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. MCELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2364.

LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Cleveland.

SAMUEL DOERFLER,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Fresley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 201-202.
NEW YORK.

THE MULTITUDE MAGAZINE.
The exponent of Imperial Socialism. The domination of the world by the white race united and perfected by socialism. Walter Vrooman, editor. 50c a year. Send 5c for sample copy to 123 E. 28th St., New York City.

For any Book on Earth Old or New Write to H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter, Caneout, Ohio. CATALOGUES FREE.