

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1902.

The Week.

In substituting its own bill for the Senate measure for protecting the President and punishing anarchists, the House has been well advised. The terms of the Senate bill are less carefully guarded, from a legal point of view, than those of the House; and the proposal to make even an attempt upon the life of the President punishable with death is one to which American penal laws will probably not long, if ever, give place. As a deterrent it would be, from the nature of the case, valueless. So would be the provisions against the immigration and naturalization of anarchists, which are contained, to nearly the same effect, in both bills. The Senate bill, however, takes the palm for absurdity in the clause providing a bodyguard for the President, consisting of a detail from the regular army. This would be exceedingly distasteful to any conceivable President; most of all, one would say, to Mr. Roosevelt. Certainly, it would take an active and well-mounted bodyguard to attend him. "They'll have fleet steeds that follow," he would say, Lochinvar-like, as he set off for his daily cross-country. The House very properly refused to agree to anything like a Swiss Guard at the White House.

The conclusion of the debate on the Philippine bill in the Senate was darkened by a tale of torture quite as horrible as the acts of Major Waller and the orders of "Hell-Roaring Jake." Just before the vote was to be taken on the bill, Senator Culberson said that he had been trying to secure the passage of a resolution calling for copies of charges preferred by Private Andrew K. Weir of the Fourth Cavalry against Lieut. Arnold and Sergeant Edwards of that regiment, but that action on the resolution had been deferred from day to day, at the instance of Senators Spooner and Lodge, who desired to know first whether a court-martial had been ordered in the case. Mr. Culberson had got tired waiting for other Senators to satisfy their private curiosity, and accordingly had procured for himself a copy of the charges of Private Weir, and also a copy of a report made thereon by Capt. P. W. West of the Fifth Cavalry as Inspector-General of the Department of Northern Luzon. These papers he sent to the Secretary's desk to be read. Before they were read Senator Lodge desired to know how they came into Senator Culberson's possession, but was not enlightened.

Capt. West's report was dated August 27, 1901. The question naturally arises, Where has this report been kept during the past ten months? After the reading had been concluded, Senator Beveridge desired to know where Senator Culberson had obtained it. The latter declined to gratify his curiosity. Then Mr. Beveridge asked the frank question whether these two papers had been obtained, either directly or indirectly, from Gen. Miles. As Senator Culberson made no answer, Beveridge added, "That is all," conveying the idea that the culprit had been discovered at last. And it seems to be the prevailing notion in high quarters that the first thing to be done is to punish the Commanding General of the Army if it shall be found that he divulged these shocking facts. The men who practised these horrible atrocities may or may not be punished; the man or men who concealed the facts will certainly not be punished; but if it can be shown that Gen. Miles either gave out or connived at giving out this damning report, then we may see discipline exercised upon him at all events.

The charges of Private Weir were embraced in a letter dated April 10, 1901, and addressed to the writer's uncle (name not given). It began by saying that the writer thought that the army had been sent to the Philippines to represent law and civilization, and he wanted to know whether the Constitution of the United States and international law did not prohibit torture. He said that he had been an unwilling witness to torture inflicted by an officer on captured insurgents, and that he told this officer that, if he did not stop it, he should report him to higher authority; that the officer replied that he would stop it, for which reason he (Weir) did not report the facts that he had witnessed. But he had learned that the officer had not kept his promise, but "was doing the same or even worse every day." He then proceeded to tell what he had witnessed. A prisoner was captured, from whom the officer (Lieut. Arnold) desired to obtain information. So he told Sergeant Edwards to take the man and get what information he could out of him. Edwards took the man and asked him what he knew. The man replied that he had no information to give. So Edwards caused him to be stripped naked, and laid on his back. Then the "water cure" was administered to him, and while he was undergoing this, he was whipped and beaten unmercifully. He was then stood up and "asked to confess." As he did not do so, he was beaten and clubbed again, and strung up by the thumbs, and, while so held up, was beaten again. As this treatment was ineffective, the man

was strung up by the neck. At this point, Private Weir went to Lieut. Arnold and told him what Edwards was doing, and remonstrated against such practices. Arnold became very angry, and threatened him with court-martial for insubordination. He said: "When I give a man to Sergeant Edwards, I want information; I do not know how he gets it, but he gets it any way." He said that "these people," meaning the Filipinos, "should not be treated as human beings." Mr. Weir told of other cases of torture inflicted by Arnold, even worse than the one here described, but these other cases had not been personally witnessed by Weir. The charges against Arnold were inquired into by Capt. West, whose report concluded with the words: "I believe that a thorough investigation into this matter will substantiate the charges made by Private Weir."

The growth of Imperialist opinion on the water cure is practically complete with the testimony of Major Glenn before the court-martial which is trying him on charges of cruelty to the natives. Major Glenn declares that the notorious "water cure," to which he had submitted himself for experimental purposes, is by no means painful, and only slightly uncomfortable. The criticism that it has received is therefore unwarranted. Thus is a torture described in the old histories of the Inquisition reduced to a humane expedient for getting information. To this complexion are its apologists come. There was a time, not a year ago, when the fact that a native torture was being employed by Americans in the Philippines was indignantly denied. Next, in the face of overwhelming evidence, it was admitted that sporadic instances of torture had occurred under circumstances of extreme provocation. So far no one doubted that to undergo this "cure" was an awful experience, and it was only the other day, though the correspondent of a society paper had given some hint of this view, that the innocuous and possibly beneficent effect of having some gallons of water poured into one was fully set forth by Major Glenn. Thus a fact once denied, then grudgingly admitted, is at last explained away. But is it, until we know first how far Major Glenn is correctly reported, and next how crucial was his experiment of the cure? The German spas recognize cures and half-cures. Did Major Glenn's physician hold his pulse so that the water might be administered until the heart was on the point of stopping from the pressure of the distended stomach? Did Major Glenn try dirty water, which in one of the recent trials was recommended as efficacious where clean water had

failed? These are some of the things one would wish to know before adopting the water cure as a harmless and hygienic recreation. One must hope that Major Glenn has been misreported, for the army at least should be free from the cant of the "benevolent assimilators."

We are in receipt of a pathetic appeal from brothers of the press in Manila. The editors and proprietors of the *Manila Freedom*—so named, we believe, from its policy of making free with all the good things in the Philippines—inform us that they have been arrested by the Philippine Commission for "scurrilous libel and sedition," and that "the liberty of the press in these islands" is endangered. It seems that *Freedom* accused the Commissioners of various rather vague offences, such as appointing Filipino rascals to office instead of Americans down on their luck, of having "press agents" to place Government "advertising patronage" where it would do the most good—not in *Freedom*, we'll be bound—and, in general, undertaking "too much work." Simply for this the arrests followed, and the alarmed editors ask the press of the United States to come to their rescue. For our part, we must decline. These newspaper gentlemen are merely getting a useful experience of what military government is. They were perfectly willing and even anxious to have its severities fall upon 10,000,000 natives, and now they are offered a taste of it themselves. In this we see rather a case of poetic justice than of outrage, and as for "liberty" in the Philippines, it remains just where it was—namely, in the hand of the General commanding.

Before our benevolent assimilators leave off rejoicing over the strength of "Expansionist sentiment" on the Pacific Coast, they should note the language in which that sentiment is locally expressed. The *Portland Oregonian*, for example, frankly said on the eve of the election that the "policy of National Expansion" was simply one of "business sense," with an eye to the "great gain" which was to be had from the "exploitation of the lands of the Pacific." But this is nothing compared with the *San Francisco Argonaut*. That truly Imperialistic newspaper feels that "the talk about benevolent assimilation is insufferable cant," and lays down the true doctrine of Expansion as follows:

"We do not want the Filipinos. We want the Philippines. The islands are enormously rich. But, unfortunately, they are infested by Filipinos. There are many millions of them there, and it is to be feared that their extinction will be slow. . . . The development of the islands cannot be successfully done while the Filipinos are there. Therefore the more of them killed the better."

We like such frankness, and could wish there were more of it. The *Argonaut*

is to be commended for "stripping," as it says, "all hypocritical verbiage from national declarations." It is aware that "certain excellent gentlemen now in Congress" would repudiate its sentiments as "brutal." But its retort is unanswerable: "*We are only saying what they are doing.*"

Custom requires that the Democratic State Convention held midway in a Presidential term shall "reaffirm" the National platform upon which the party had made its campaign two years before. Thus, the Indiana Convention of 1898 declared that "we reaffirm and emphasize the platform adopted by the National Democratic Convention of 1896 at Chicago," and also that "we express our undiminished confidence in William Jennings Bryan, our peerless leader in the National campaign of 1896." The Bryanites at Indianapolis last week therefore had on their side the argument that to "reaffirm" the Kansas City platform of 1900 would be the natural thing, and that a refusal to do so would be interpreted as a rebuke to Bryan. The opponents of Bryan accepted this issue and carried the day, forcing the adoption of a set of resolutions which contain no reference whatever to either the platform or the candidate of the last National Convention. In other words, the party wipes the slate clean and takes a fresh start. The platform adopted is noteworthy for the ingenious device by which the old silver issue is discarded. The Convention at the corresponding time in 1898 declared that "we are in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the existing ratio of 16 to 1, without the aid or consent of any other nation." This year's platform "recognizes as an economic fact the increase of standard money, arising from the vastly increased production of gold from our own and foreign mines, as a demonstration of the truth of the quantitative theory of money," and says not a word about silver.

The plank on the tariff issue is brief, but it packs the whole logic of the situation in this compact statement: "We denounce the Dingley Tariff Law as the breeder of Trusts, and demand that tariff duties shall be levied for the purpose of revenue only, and limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered." Clear and definite also is the declaration of principles regarding the Philippines. After condemning the policy of the Republican Administration as having "embroiled the republic in an unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of its noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-

American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government," the resolution on this subject proceeds:

"The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperilling our form of government; and, as we are not willing to surrender our civilization to convert the republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to assist the Filipinos to establish for themselves an independent government, protecting them from outside interference, and securing to this country such commercial and naval rights and advantages as would be just and fully and fairly protect American interests."

Texas has been a stronghold of Bryanism and silverism, and it is therefore significant that the Democratic Congressional convention in the Fifth District of that State was as silent about both as the Democratic convention in Indiana. It seems to have been a representative body, and its platform lays chief stress upon the question of the tariff and Imperialism. "We denounce the Dingley Tariff Law as the breeder of Trusts," it says, "and demand that tariff duties shall be levied for the purposes of revenue only, and limited to the needs of the Government honestly and economically administered." The Philippine policy of the present Administration is denounced, and what is favored in its stead is set forth in the identical phraseology of the Indiana platform above quoted. Finally, these Texas Democrats declare that "we believe that the question of Imperialism and the Trust-breeding tariff should be the paramount issues in the next national campaign."

There is no place where small favors are more gratefully received than at the New York Custom-house, and Secretary Shaw has deserved well of everybody by facilitating the delivery of express parcels and liberalizing the system of making individual payments at the customs. The plan is a very simple one. The express companies keep at the Sub-Treasury a daily deposit large enough to cover all possible duties on the consignments of that day. The Collector simply draws upon this deposit the amount of the duty as soon as it has been properly assessed. The express companies may also act as agents for individuals. Thus it is possible for an incoming tourist to turn over his baggage to an express company immediately after the examination. This saves considerable delay at a time when delay is particularly vexatious, and will undoubtedly be a more satisfactory arrangement than can be made with a Custom-house broker. The saving of time on express packages is expected to be eight or ten days. Secretary Shaw again deserves credit for removing obstacles to traffic which have grown up in the customs service, and especially,

for doing everything in his power to make the first landing of a guest or the return of a native something less than a punishment for foreign birth or absenteeism.

For the first time in its century and a half of existence, Princeton chooses a layman for its President. This marks the final step in that secularization of the American college of which Prof. A. B. Hart writes in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* for June: "Whatever might be thought on that subject by the President of Bowdoin, or Dartmouth, or Amherst, or Wesleyan, or Chicago, there is no doubt that the layman is now preferred for such appointments; nor that the dominie has ceased to be the typical teacher and guide of academic youth. . . . The community of college graduates, and their associates throughout the country, seem convinced that the educational side of a university is best cared for by the trained educator." Every word of that description might be applied to the President-elect of Princeton University, and it might be added that, besides the catholic sympathies and knowledge of affairs which are implied in the title "educator," he bears a high reputation as a brilliant investigator of problems of politics and government, and holds an honorable position in American letters as a judicious essayist. It is very rarely the case that the candidate for a university presidency can show so complete and convincing a register of qualifications, and it was this obvious fitness of Dr. Woodrow Wilson which made it possible for an old president to step out and for a new one to be appointed the same day—a case unparalleled in recent times—without so much as causing a proper feeling of surprise. President Patton's resignation was also of an unusual kind. Leaving in the full vigor of middle life, with health and popularity unimpaired, he resigns a charge which he has administered with indubitable success, because he feels the call of his old studies, and because he realizes that a man of different training may more advantageously utilize the prosperity which he has done so much to procure.

Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest are repeating with great rapidity the history of the winning of our West. The problem of absorbing the Galicians, Russians, and other refractory races is specifically Canadian, but the remarkable influx of American settlers in these regions must affect both Canada and ourselves. As yet we have no accurate statistics of this agrarian invasion, but some idea of its significance may be gained from the following figures. In the years 1899-1901 the total immigration from America to Canada was, re-

spectively, 11,945, 15,500, and 17,987. By June 1 of the present year the Great Northern Railroad alone had carried 25,000 immigrants into Manitoba. While some of these were taken directly from the incoming steamers, many were either American-born or thoroughly Americanized. This cannot continue without producing its effect upon the relations of the two countries. The United States cannot wholly repudiate her children who have taken up Canadian farms and accepted Canadian citizenship. A constant social interchange and common agricultural interests in the Northwest will more and more reduce the boundary to its definition as an "imaginary line." The palpable "Chinese wall" now absurdly maintained between Canada and this country will never seem quite so absurd as it does where it prevents John Smith of North Dakota from selling surplus produce to or buying it from John Smith, jr., of Manitoba.

The reported combination of several British steamship companies, including the Cunard, Allan, Castle, and Elder-Dempster Lines, has the similitude of truth. The law of self-preservation requires the companies not included in the Morgan combination to take common action, since it would be possible for the combination to coerce them one by one, as it did perhaps coerce the German lines. Naturally, the outside concerns think that they must hang together, unless they would hang separately. The question of most importance to them is whether they can secure railway connections on this side of the water to offset a possible combination of the East and West trunk lines in the United States with the steamship consolidation. If the shipping syndicate should be able to offer a preferential rate from the Western grain fields to English ports which the other steamships could not match, the latter would be at the mercy of the former. Hence we are not surprised to hear that the Cunard Company and its allies are looking to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a resource in the event of an adverse railway combination. The Canadian Pacific could tap the wheat-fields of the Red River valley, and even if it did not itself carry much wheat to the seaboard, it could put a strong curb on the competing American lines. There is talk also of a British Government subsidy to the opposition line; but such a thing is most unlikely. The two combinations, if there are two, must work out their problems for the present without Government interference. Meanwhile a new factor will appear upon the scene before long. The private shipping that has been employed in connection with the Boer war, estimated at two million tons, will presently be released, and will be looking for freights elsewhere. It will find employment partly in the North Atlantic, and its influence in the

coming struggle will be not inconsiderable.

The new British Ambassador, the Hon. Michael Herbert, is comparatively unknown beyond the British Foreign Office. So was Lord Pauncefoot at the time of his appointment to Washington. One may assume that, like his predecessor, the new Ambassador will be a working, not a talking diplomat, seeking to win confidence rather than the reputation for brilliancy. His training is of the most thoroughgoing, and he comes with the prestige of long service in the most highly organized diplomatic corps of our day. This training produces men of the office rather than men of the platform. In fact, no other diplomatic service than our own could permit itself such a succession of salient personalities as the American representatives at the Court of St. James. Lowell, Phelps, Bayard, Hay, and Choate were free to do an amount of speechmaking that would have infallibly terminated the career of a European diplomat. We believe—where our selections have been carefully made, as for England—it has been a fortunate dispensation that has given us not diplomats, but engaging excursionists in diplomacy; since the expansiveness that our Ministers at London now are required to maintain has generally brought them a sound personal popularity which has been more valuable than the treaties they have negotiated.

The difficulties attending the abolition of sugar bounties in Germany have culminated in a project to make the sugar industry a Government monopoly. There are other state monopolies in the Old World. Tobacco and friction matches, for example, are monopolies in France, and Bismarck tried in vain to create a tobacco monopoly in Germany. These, however, are monopolies for public revenue. They are not assumed by the Government to enable individuals to dispose of a losing business. Such would seem to be the aim of the proposed Government sugar monopoly. The export bounty on German sugar is of two kinds. It consists, in part, of the excess of rebate paid by the Treasury over the internal tax collected on the beet roots, and in part of the cartel, which enables the sugar manufacturers to charge higher prices to buyers for domestic consumption than to exporters. This is made possible by the tariff on sugar of foreign production. The abolition of all bounties on exports has been decreed by the Brussels Convention, to take effect in the autumn of 1903. What to do with the property nursed into life by this hot-house treatment is a puzzle on all hands. Apparently, the owners have conceived the plan of unloading it upon the taxpayers, and very likely they will succeed.

OVERLOADING THE PRESIDENT.

The ill-advised attempt to induce President Roosevelt to intervene in the coal strike was but the latest of many recent symptoms of an unhappy political tendency: we mean the resort to the President in every time of trouble. Whether the difficulty be industrial or political, regional or national, small or great, we run with it to the White House in childlike confidence, or else in weak dependence. We are coming to think of the Chief Executive as if he combined in himself the attributes of an Oriental King and a mediæval monarch—as if he were a Solomon to decide all our controversies, and a Louis to decree righteous judgment from a “bed of justice.”

Congress inclines more and more to call upon the President to cut its Gordian knots for it. Is it a question of wisely choosing the route for an Isthmian canal? Senator Hoar introduces a bill to leave the matter wholly to the President. Do legislators find it a hard task to draw a bill for reciprocity with Cuba in such a way as to cut off the Sugar Trust from all benefit? Senator Spooner would refer it to the President. Let him execute a law which it passes the wit of the Senate to frame. Or is the rebate plan to be adopted, and is the objection made that the money voted might not go to deserving Cubans? Put it all in the President's hands, urges Senator Burrows; he will see to it that our dole reaches only the right persons. Allah is great, and the President is his prophet!

We consider this increasing willingness limply to lean upon the President as most mistaken and perverse. It is bad for him, and bad for us. It injures his office, while changing it and impairing its true efficiency; and, on the other hand, it cuts the nerve of self-help and initiative among the people, and enables Congress to dodge and shift where it should debate and decide. The Presidency is already overburdened. If the strain of responsibility which it imposes was so great in Jefferson's day that he cried out at the “splendid misery” of his office, what would he say to the daily besetment and besieging of our later dwellers in the White House? In mercy to our chosen chief we should spare him these added cares. Besides the danger of breaking him down physically, we expose him to the more serious danger of a day so devastated by intruders and a night so spent in consultations that he has no time to think, no leisure to clarify his mind, and form his convictions, in the larger matters of national policy to which his best strength ought to be given. Burke warned us that “they who always labor can have no true judgment”; and our growing habit of invading the White House on every occasion and with all possible forms of business, tends directly to degrade our Presidents to the level of his

men who “exhaust their attention, burn out their candles, and are left in the dark.”

What alarm this magnifying of the President would have struck to the hearts of the framers of our Constitution, need not be said. They lived in the remembrance and shadow of the time when the people's representatives resolved that “the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.” To them, our present-day adulation of the President, and turning over to him of power after power of the state, would have seemed the entering upon a path at the end of which is the figure of a “man on horse-back.” Frankly, we do not now fear that traditional shape of dread. What we are afraid of is, not a man on horse-back, but a man in his private office dictated to by politicians. They, of course, are really aiming to add to their own power, under pretence of exalting the President's. When they induce Congress to “leave it all to the President,” they expect, in their secret hearts, that he will, in turn, leave it all to them. Not tyranny, but corruption, is our most threatening foe; and there is no instrument of corruption like a President wielding the vast and abdicated powers of Congress in a way to suit the schemes of party bosses. The practice got a great impetus under Mr. McKinley. That it has been continued with his successor, shows that the party managers have as yet found no reason to be dissatisfied with their plan of usurping power by ostensibly giving it to another.

By this repeated reference of controverted matters to the President, Congress advertises its own humiliation, and writes itself down as either too lazy or too stupid to do its proper work. What are legislators there for but to legislate? It is the President's business simply to execute the laws which they enact. Is it pretended that he is a fountain of supernatural and unfailing wisdom? Would he, for example, in the choice of a canal route, have a particle of information or expert advice not freely at the service of Congress? Everybody knows that he would not. What he would do, if Congress were to put the responsibility upon him, would simply be to turn to those skilled investigators whose report is before both houses. But if that is the right thing for him to do, why do they not do it? Will they confess themselves either shirks or incompetents? Their proposed action speaks ominously of a deepening disinclination for the serious work of legislation, for that forging of laws in the heat of debate and under the hammer of argument, which has been the glorious tradition of Parliament and Congress. Are we grown so weary of the burdens of liberty that we must make haste to shift them to other shoulders?

Nor can we omit to mention the par-

tisan aspect of the matter. To call upon the President as the *deus ex machina* is, just now, a pretty obvious scheme of the Republican leaders in Congress to get their party out of a scrape. It is torn to pieces over Cuba. It is discordant about the Isthmian Canal. So the managers blandly propose to the Democrats to pass along both questions to the Great Father in the White House. But the Democrats ought to fight the plan, tooth and nail. As it stands, it is a partisan manoeuvre. It is designed to free the Republican party from an irksome responsibility, and, at the same time, to give it, through a back-door use of the Presidency, the prestige and advantage which it is not able to win by intelligent legislation in Congress. Let the thing be squarely stated. If the Republican party is not able to make the laws which it has promised and undertaken to pass, and for enacting which it has an ample majority in both houses of Congress, let the disgraceful confession be openly made. To hide behind President Roosevelt's coat-tails the party should be ashamed to attempt, and its opponents should die in their tracks before allowing it.

THE HOUSE PHILIPPINE BILL.

The most important action to be taken by Congress during the remainder of the session will be the disposition of the measures for the civil government of the Philippine Islands. The chief point of difference between the House and Senate bills is that the former provides for an actual beginning of Philippine self-government, while the latter merely continues the present régime of conquest and subjugation. A notable impulse was given on Saturday last to the measure proposed by the House by the publication of a dispatch from Acting Governor Wright, saying that the archipelago is now pacified, and that no reasons exist why civil government should not be established in all the provinces except the Moro country. By the phrase civil government he meant municipal as distinguished from military government in the provinces; but if pacification has been secured, the same reasons which point to withdrawal of military rule are potent for the beginning of representative government on a larger scale. The Senate bill provides for nothing but the taking of a census, and the extension of local municipal government “so far and so fast as communities in such civil divisions are capable, fit, and ready for the same.”

The authority of Gov. Taft has been given distinctly in favor of the House bill. In an article written by him and published in the *Outlook* of May 31 he says:

“We of the Commission are very earnest and sincere in our hope that at least the provision for the election of the legislative assembly and of the two delegates con-