

THE WEEKLY PRESS FORUM.

Wymore (Neb.) Arbor State: Imperialism knows no law but the law of might. It breaks every other law, human and divine.

Rockville (Ind.) Tribune: Teacher of Rhetoric—"Name some notable example of irony." Bright Pupil—"The republican platform on trusts."

Guthrie (Okl.) State Register: The ship owner is the active voice and the farmer is the passive. The one wants subsidy and the other is wanted to subsidize.

Vandalia (Mo.) Mail and Express: Grover Cleveland writes beautifully about how to kill ducks, but it is the beef trust that needs killing at the present writing.

Broken Bow (Neb.) Beacon: The "water cure" is a part of the plan of "benevolent assimilation." It is a very great exhibition of Christian charity and fraternal affection.

Athens (O.) Journal: The tax on hides should be repealed as well as the tax on beef. The laboringman could carry his untaxed dinner pail with freer gait if he should walk on untaxed sole-leather.

Hastings (Neb.) Democrat: Do not place man in authority to act for you, unless you know that he represents what you do and that he will act as you wish him to. Look out for republicanized democrats and populists.

Anna (Ill.) Democrat: Captain Clark cannot see King Neddy coronated because he hasn't got the stuff to pay the bill. It is well enough that he is not going, because he doesn't belong in the envoy class, anyhow. He is a hero.

Warsaw (Mo.) Enterprise: Inheritances go to people who have not earned them and inheritance taxation lightens the burdens of all taxpayers. Inheritance taxation and income taxation are among the fairest methods of providing for public expenses.

Durango (Colo.) Democrat: The price of silver, when over two-thirds of the world's inhabitants are silver using, shows how thoroughly the money power has us grabbed. We must have an open door and tariff for trust products, but not a decent show for our mines.

Greensburg (Pa.) Democrat: The "full dinner pail," promised the laboringman by the republican orators and organs two years ago, has proven to be a delusion. The laboringman can secure a "full dinner pail" under trust control, but to do so he must be satisfied with an empty pocketbook.

Benton (Mo.) Record: Talk about civilization, Christianity, the millennium and all the rest of it, but the opening years of the twentieth century have witnessed deeds perpetrated by the self-styled leaders of the world's progress such as we pretend to shudder at in tales of the middle ages.

Wayne (Neb.) Democrat: Can there any longer be a doubt as to the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon over the supine and indolent Latin? What, for instance, are the puny performances of Don Valeriano Weyler as compared with all-conquering achievements of Gen. "H. R." Smith of "howling wilderness" celebrity.

Ackley (Ia.) World: General Smith admits that he gave his subordinate officers and men orders to "kill all over ten" and to "make the island of Samar a howling wilderness." Isn't it about time some good American missionary was going to the Philippines to convert the savages in the American army to the methods of civilized beings when dealing with an enemy?

Rochester (Pa.) Commoner: President Roosevelt, Secretary Root and his subordinates and the imperialist organs have been convicted of double dealing and deception in their efforts to conceal the Philippine brutality. But, like all things evil, their fraud and deception proved a dismal failure.

Urbana (O.) Democrat: Oh, yes, the end of the so-called war is at hand and peace in the Philippines is just in sight, but it is the peace of the grave. When all the people above ten years of age have been murdered and all their property burned of course there is peace and quiet, in that part of the country.

Buffalo (Mo.) Record: We venture to say if the American people would give expression to their feeling regardless of partisanship, they would overwhelmingly say, cease trying to conquer a people to whom you dare not read the Declaration of Independence lest it increase their desire for liberty and love for freedom.

Eddyville (Ky.) Tale of Two Cities: It will be months before it can be known whether the administration is fighting or bluffing the beef trust, in the federal courts, but the democrats in congress have asked the republicans to join with them in bringing the trust to its knees at once, by repealing the duty on imported meat.

Connersville (Ind.) Examiner: If the Filipinos are such a bad lot that an American army officer issues orders to kill all the inhabitants over ten and make the island a howling wilderness, what business has this government there? Does it want to murder all the people in order to come into possession of a howling wilderness?

Long Island (Kas.) Leader: Everything in the Philippines is again reported "quiet," since the killing of one officer and four men and the wounding of four other officers and twenty-seven men, of the American forces, in the capture of Fort Moro, in the island of Mindanao. The "quiet" secured in the Philippines is of the expensive kind.

Durango (Colo.) Democrat: Roosevelt is now confronted with several very humiliating facts as to the English army posts in this country. The New York World has the letters and documents and there is now no escape. Secretary Hay and the nation's executive are no doubt aware of the wrong and outrage practiced upon the liberty-loving Boers.

Lincoln (Ill.) Times: Are the Filipinos human beings? If so, why treat them like dogs? They have longing for independence the same as we, and they have the same right to enjoy it, and we have no right to kill them for this God-given desire. This administration ought to tremble with fear in the face of this Godless war. "Thou shalt not kill" came from the heart of our God, and applies with as much force to Roosevelt as to Czolgosz.

Paris (Mo.) Mercury: "For the good of the army" is a new cry in this land of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. One would think that he had been suddenly transported into militarized France or soldier-ridden Germany to hear this strange prattle. "For the good of the army" murder must be hushed, torture condoned and freedom subverted. It was the cry against Dreyfus, and has helped throttle justice and liberty from Romulus to Roosevelt. "For the good of the people" is a halting phrase in these days when the jingoes are trying to stir up military ardor over the butchery in the Philippines.

(Continued on Page 12.)

THE PHILIPPINES AGAIN

Jacob Gould Schurman
in New York Independent.

There is always something new from Africa," was the Old World saying. In our New World we have, since 1898, been continually having something new from the Philippines. Besides the developments in the investigations conducted by the senate Philippine committee, which would be more satisfactory to the impartial investigator if they could be divorced from partisan politics, we have had in rapid succession within the last few weeks the Gardener report, the charges made in the Waller trial, the horrible admission of General Smith's counsel, the testimony concerning the torturing of Filipinos by Americans, and the outbreak of hostilities with some of the Mohammedan tribes on the southern coast of the great island of Mindanao. The editor of the Independent has done me the honor of asking my opinion regarding the effect which the most recent developments in the Philippine situation will have, or should have, on the general Philippine policy of the United States.

Now, replying to that question, I think it will be well to begin with the recent fighting between our troops and the Moros. Every nation is bound to protect its citizens and soldiers and to demand reparation when they are attacked or murdered. There seems to be no doubt that one or more Americans were killed by Moros. If no satisfaction were offered, if the act were not disavowed, both the honor of our flag and the safety of our people would seem to call for punishment, and among communities tribally organized, as all the Mohammedan and heathen peoples of Mindanao are, that punishment might from their point of view be as properly corporate as individual—might, that is to say, fall with equal justice either upon the personal offender or the tribe or clan to which he belonged. The punitive expedition dispatched by the American officer in command against the Dattos and members of the guilty tribes was in itself considered no improper proceeding. And if we were not responsible for any prior provocation, I do not see that the course finally adopted is fairly open to criticism. Our soldiers and officials in the Philippines must be protected so long as we keep them there, and if their conduct squares with our statutes, with the commandments of morality, the rules of war and the laws of nations, we must protect them even at the cost of further war.

But I fear that we may have been guilty of the original provocation which ended in murderous retaliation. I have read in the newspapers an order issued by the officer in command requiring our troops to explore the country of the Mohammedan chieftains concerned. Now these chieftains never recognized Spanish authority beyond the coast line. Even in the island of Sulu (Jolo) the Spaniard had no footing except in the little walled coast town of the same name. With that exception the island was governed by the sultan and his dattos as though Spaniards had never landed on its shores. As inheritors of Spanish sovereignty we have no rights other than those which Spain enjoyed. Why then should we send exploring expeditions among the Lake Moros in the interior of Mindanao? Have we not enough on our hands already, even if we have the right, which I do not concede, to force the Mohammedan and heathen chieftains to receive expeditions whom they will certainly regard as enemies coming to spy out and probably take forcible possession of their lands? As we have lived in peace since 1899 with the fierce and dangerous people of those southern Philippine islands by respecting their wishes and making amicable agreements with them, by whose authority

is this policy to be reversed? Does the president, does congress, does the American nation desire a more extensive jurisdiction in the Philippines and a more intensive control over those autonomous and practically independent million or two Mohammedans and heathen in Mindanao, Sulu and Palawan? I have heard nothing of it. Why, then, should any American officer in the Philippines have power to plunge us into a bloody and inhuman war by forcible entry into domains over which (if we are technically sovereign) our sovereignty amounts actually to the most shadowy suzerainty? I remember vividly the expression of haughty pride with which the sultan of Sulu recounted to me in 1899 the victories which his people had won over Spain, compelling her, as he said, to pay them tribute. For in his estimate at any rate the annual allowance paid to him and his dattos by Spain was not in the nature of salary to a subordinate, but of tribute to a proved superior. Certainly he was supreme in his own dominions. And the majority of the chieftains in Mindanao had probably never heard of Spain. Why force upon them a knowledge of Spain's successor in the sovereignty of the archipelago by what they will regard as an unlawful invasion of their territories? Thanks to the cautious and far-seeing wisdom of President Roosevelt the danger of a Mohammedan conflagration, which was imminent a few days ago, has perhaps passed away. But the possibility of its recurrence should be prevented. Our people are sick of bloodshed in the Philippines. If the Moros are stirred up it will be a bloody business for us. Let us cry halt to the explorer and exploiter.

In Luzon and the Visayas, whose 6,500,000 people are civilized and Christianized, tribal organization has disappeared, and the inhabitants having been long governed by Spanish soldiers, civilians and priests, they were, when Spain withdrew in 1898, without native leaders—a sheer democracy absolutely unorganized. There the United States found no recognized power to deal with, for Aguinaldo was a usurper and strong only (as it seemed) among the Tagalogs. Had there been native potentates, whose rule had been sanctioned by time and solidified by the acquiescence of the people, it would have been possible to substitute mutual agreements for the arbitrament of the sword, to which Aguinaldo appealed. But the tribal organization which Spanish power had destroyed in Luzon and the Visayas, where Spanish power was effective, still survived in the southern islands, where Spanish power had been merely nominal.

Perhaps I may be allowed to say here that I was the first American official to visit those regions, and, as I have elsewhere reported, I arranged on behalf of the president of the United States for the renewal with the sultan of Sulu of the so-called "treaty" under the terms of which he had lived with Spain; and in cabling the result to Washington I recommended the extension of this policy of friendly agreements to all the sultans and dattos of Mindanao, Sulu and Palawan. A month later the execution of this policy was entrusted to General Bates, who pursued the work with admirable skill and excellent results. A similar course had been adopted by Great Britain in her dealings with the kindred sultans of the Malayan Federated States many years before, and the brilliant success attending it had become a commonplace of oriental history. Now I ask with the deepest concern whether an arrangement which has the warrant of historical experience, which is adapted to the

(Continued on Page Nine.)