

Student Work

12-1-1974

The Omaha World-Herald and the Philippine insurrection: A study in anti-imperialism

James M. Bechtel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Bechtel, James M., "The Omaha World-Herald and the Philippine insurrection: A study in anti-imperialism" (1974). *Student Work*. 3137.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3137>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD AND THE PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION:
A STUDY IN ANTI-IMPERIALISM

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of History

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

James M. Bechtel

December, 1974

16152-33*

UMI Number: EP74536

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74536

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Graduate Committee

Name	Department
Ch. Ford Anderson	Phil & Rec
William C. Pratt	History

H. A. Palstrom
Chairman

December 2, 1974
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction .	
II.	1899 .	16
III.	1900	35
IV.	The End of the Insurrection	62
V.	Conclusion: The Anti-Imperialism of the <u>World-Herald</u> .	84
VI.	Bibliography	93

. Introduction

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, Spain's overseas empire was crumbling. After ten years of warfare (1868-1878) Cuba had again submitted to uneasy Spanish control but the world-wide depression of 1893, combined with the devastating effects on Cuba's economy of the United States tariff of 1894, increased unrest to the point where armed revolt broke out again in February of 1895.¹

The response of the new Captain-General of Cuba, Don Valeriano Weyler, was particularly brutal. The Cubans were herded into "reconcentration" camps in which tens of thousands died of neglect. On December 6, 1897, President McKinley told Congress that such a pacification program "was not civilized warfare. It was extermination."²

The Philippine Islands (where Weyler had been Governor-General from 1888 to 1891) were the subject of far less attention even though there too a revolt was in progress. In December of 1896 the Spanish had executed the brilliant Jose Rizal,

¹Ernest R. May, Imperial Democracy: The Emergence of America as a Great Power (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961), pp. 69, 115; H. Wayne Morgan, America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), pp. 4-5. Hereafter: May, Imperial Democracy; Morgan, Road to Empire.

²Quoted in Morgan, Road to Empire, p. 8. Also: May, Imperial Democracy, p. 78. On the situation in Cuba, see U.S. Congress, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1898-1899 (55th Cong., 3d Sess., Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1901), pp. 558-750. Hereafter: Foreign Relations, with date.

whose 1887 novel, Noli Me Tangere, had sparked a nationalist movement. Rizal's execution led the secret organization known as the Katipunan to engage in open revolt; by the end of the year Emilio Aguinaldo had emerged as the leader of the insurrectionary movement. In great need of troops in Cuba, the Spanish came to terms with the Filipinos. In the Treaty of Biac-Na-Bato of December 1897, the Spanish promised reforms and gave four hundred thousand pesos to the nationalist leaders, who went into exile in Hong Kong. There, Aguinaldo kept the fund intact. In the event that the Spanish did not carry out the promised reforms, Aguinaldo would use the money to buy arms for a renewed insurrection.³

In America, the attention of the "yellow press" focussed on the war in Cuba. Under increasing pressure to intervene and end Spain's Cuban dilemma for her, particularly after the De Lome affair and the destruction of the U.S.S. Maine in February, President McKinley issued a virtual ultimatum to Spain. The new Sagasta Ministry in Spain was, however, under equally intense pressure not to succumb to American demands to negotiate with the rebels. But the Spanish were unable to obtain firm promises of support from other European nations, and unwilling to risk war alone, gave in to the President's demands.

³General Emilio Aguinaldo, with V. A. Pacis, A Second Look at America (New York: Speller, 1957), pp. 20-31; W. Cameron Forbes, The Philippine Islands (2 vols.; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928), II, 52-60; U.S. Congress, First Philippine Commission Report, 1899 (56th Cong., 1st Sess., 4 vols.; Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1899-1900), I, 169-71; IV, 395-97. Hereafter: Aguinaldo, Second Look; Forbes, The Philippine Islands; and Philippine Commission, with date.

On April 9, they offered the Cuban rebels an armistice and promised reforms. It was too late, though. On April 11, with Congress and the public clamoring for action, McKinley asked for authority to end Cuba's agony. Congress responded by recognizing Cuban independence and authorizing armed action to attain it.⁴

The expansion of American power across the Pacific that resulted from the Spanish-American War was the result of numerous and complex forces: "Manifest Destiny," a "psychic crisis" brought on by the closing of the frontier, the growing pressure for trade outlets, a century of involvement in Asia, racial and religious attitudes toward Asia, the overproduction theory of capitalism's cycles of crises, and the expansionist outlook of key men in government and business. The interaction of all these forces produced imperialism, the most visible manifestation of which was the forcible acquisition of territory: the Philippines.⁵

The arguments offered for the acquisition of the Philippines

⁴Margaret Leech, In the Days of McKinley (New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 150-200. Hereafter: Leech, McKinley. May, Imperial Democracy, pp. 148-77, emphasizes diplomacy. For the De Lome letter and the Maine, see Foreign Relations, 1898-1899, pp. 1007-8, 10024-46; for the President's message of April 11, pp. 750-60; on war with Spain, pp. 762-84.

⁵A recent survey and synthesis is: Robert Healy, U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970). Hereafter: Healy, Expansionism. Used here, "imperialism" and "anti-imperialism" will refer to the specific American movements of 1898-1902, centering on the issue of war in the Philippines. "Expansionism" is a broader term, not necessarily involving colonies.

were in the mainstream of "Manifest Destiny," the ideology of American expansionism. Viewed in this light imperialism was not an aberration but the transoceanic extension of traditional westward expansion, for the arguments of the imperialists fell into the traditional categories advanced for American expansion.⁶

"Geographical predestination," for example, originally applied to Florida, was extended to the Philippines a century later on the grounds that the oceans no longer separated nations but joined them, as the Rockies joined the two halves of North America.⁷ The "proper use of the soil," originally applied to the Indians, was extended to the Filipinos on the grounds that industrial people displace agriculturists, economic investment being a superior use of the "soil" (i.e. of resources).⁸ "Extending the area of freedom" linked expansion with democracy from Jefferson's time to McKinley's.⁹ "Self-defense," "natural growth" and "natural right" are among other examples of the many arguments with long lineages enlisted in the imperialist cause. Imperialist arguments were also bolstered by European examples and influence, and by the rise of evolutionary thought.¹⁰

⁶See Albert K. Weinberg, Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935). Hereafter: Weinberg, Manifest Destiny.

⁷Ibid., pp. 68-69.

⁸Ibid., pp. 94-97.

⁹Ibid., pp. 100-29. Jacob Schurmann, first Philippine Commissioner, said "American sovereignty was only another name for the liberty of Filipinos" (p. 295).

¹⁰Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, pp. 395, 218, 34; Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought (Rev. ed.; New York: Beacon Press, 1955); Healy, Expansionism, passim.

That these arguments were revived with vigor in the 1890s was due to the widespread feeling of impending crisis engendered by the "closing of the frontier" (as defined by the 1890 census) and the depression of 1893. This "psychic crisis" resulted in a general aggressiveness on the part of reformers of all persuasions. Both expansionists and their opponents pursued their goals with great energy, convinced that America stood at an important crossroads.¹¹

Regarding the domestic economic crisis, a minority viewpoint held that underconsumption was to blame, and advocated an increase in purchasing power (inflation), but the majority believed that capitalism's chief problem was overproduction; that the accumulation of surpluses brought on unemployment, and they advocated, necessarily, market expansion as the cure.¹²

In other words, the chaotic conditions brought on by overproduction could have been alleviated by an increase in effective

¹¹Richard Hofstadter, "Manifest Destiny and the Philippines," in Daniel Aaron, ed., America in Crisis (New York: Knopf, 1952). Hereafter: Hofstadter, "Manifest Destiny and the Philippines."

¹²Walter LaFeber, The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898 (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), esp. pp. 18-21, 360, 373-75, 410; William Appleman Williams, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy (Rev. ed.; New York: Delta, 1962), esp. pp. 33-36, 66. "That the future welfare of American industry was dependent upon the command of foreign markets was an opinion so common as to appear almost universal," writes Julius W. Pratt in Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936), pp. 252-53. Cf. Healy, Expansionism, p. 159, and Thomas J. McCormick, China Market: America's Quest for Informal Empire, 1893-1901 (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967), pp. 26-29. Hereafter: LaFeber, The New Empire; McCormick, China Market: Informal Empire; Pratt, Expansionists of 1898; and Williams, Tragedy.

consumer demand, according to Socialists and Free-Silver Populists, but this would have implied serious shifts in the distribution of economic power. Thus such demands were perceived as dangerous to the fabric of society, i.e. to the existing distribution of power. There was an alternative. As the older frontier had been viewed as a "safety valve," so a new, overseas frontier was needed to drain off the discontent and radicalism produced by the 1893 crisis. This idea was expressed crudely by "Marse" Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier Journal: "We escape the menace and peril of socialism and agrarianism, as England has escaped them, by a policy of colonialism and conquest. We risk Caesarism, certainly; but even Caesarism is preferable to anarchism."¹³

The domestic crisis coincided with a crisis in Asia as China seemed on the verge of collapse and Japan and Russia made menacing moves to close off parts of China to world trade. What came to be called the "open door" policy, based on open markets in East Asia, had been "the tap-root of American policy" in Asia for a century.¹⁴ As the expenses of the Sino-Japanese War forced China into the world investment market,

¹³

See footnote 12. The quote is from Leon Wolff, Little Brown Brother: How the United States Purchased and Pacified the Philippine Islands at the Century's Turn (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961), p. 270. Hereafter: Wolff, Brown Brother.

¹⁴Tyler Dennett, Americans in Eastern Asia: A Critical Study of United States' Policy in the Far East in the Nineteenth Century (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963 -- reprint of Macmillan, 1922), pp. vii, 508. Dennett's work reveals the underlying continuity of America's Asian policy throughout the nineteenth century. Hereafter: Dennett, Eastern Asia.

and increased her awareness of the need to modernize, it appeared as if a great market for American goods and capital would soon appear.¹⁵

The Spanish-American War presented the opportunity to acquire the Philippines as a stepping-stone to Asian power. In June of 1896 a contingency plan of the Naval War College, not binding on the Navy, envisioned seizing the Philippines in the event of a war with Spain.¹⁶ In September 1897 Theodore Roosevelt wrote to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge that the United States should seize "Manilla" [sic] at the first opportunity. While Secretary of the Navy John D. Long was absent from his office on February 25, 1898, Roosevelt, as Assistant Secretary, issued orders building up American strength in the Pacific, including instructions to Admiral George Dewey to begin "offensive operations in Philippine islands" in the event of war with Spain.¹⁷

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 599-601. Frederick Emory of the State Department's Bureau of Statistics wrote: ". . . the recent war between China and Japan will probably have the effect of opening vast markets to us." Quoted in McCormick, China Market: Informal Empire, p. 62. In reality the situation was vastly more complicated than most Americans appreciated. France, Russia and Germany generally found themselves on one side, opposing the "trading nations"; namely, the United States, Great Britain and Japan. Dennett, Eastern Asia, p. 636; McCormick, China Market: Informal Empire, p. 60.

¹⁶ Ronald Spector, "Who Planned the Attack on Manila Bay?" Mid-America: An Historical Review, 53:2 (April 1971), 94-102, pp. 95-96.

¹⁷ Howard K. Beale, Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power (New York: Collier Books, 1962), pp. 69-70. Hereafter: Beale, T. R. and World Power.

Four days before Admiral Dewey fulfilled his directives by sinking the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay, Republican Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana told a Boston audience: "We are a conquering race . . . we must obey our blood and occupy new markets." He added: "The Philippines are logically our first target."¹⁸ At about the same time, the Secretary of War recorded the decision to send troops to occupy the Philippines. However, Dewey's spectacularly one-sided victory on May 1 created the impression that an Act of God had presented America with the Philippines as a stroke of fortune -- rather than as the result of well-laid plans and weak Spanish defenses.¹⁹

Annexation of the Philippines was defended on grounds other than economic. Abstract power, nationalism, and an aggressive definition of national security dominated the thinking of the Roosevelt-Lodge-Mahan²⁰ group. Equating civilization with the Anglo-Saxon "race" and with Christianity was another common characteristic of imperialist thought. God had "made us the master organizers of the world[, / His chosen nation."²¹

¹⁸Quoted in Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 63. Mark Hanna agreed that "a strong foothold in the Philippine Islands" would enable us to "take a large slice of the commerce of Asia. That is what we want." LaFeber, The New Empire, p. 410.

¹⁹LaFeber, The New Empire, p. 61. Also: May, Imperial Democracy, p. 244; Morgan, Road to Empire, pp. 72, 76-77.

²⁰Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, president of the Naval War College, author of The Influence of Sea Power Upon History (1890). See Beale, T. R. and World Power, pp. 160-63, 226-29, for Mahan's views on Asia and his influence on Roosevelt.

²¹On race, see Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, pp. 283-323; on religion, see Pratt, Expansionists of 1898, pp. 279-316. For a synthesis which includes the role of abstract power, see Healy, Expansionism, pp. 9-33. The quote is from a speech by Senator Beveridge (Weinberg, Manifest Destiny, p. 308).

The power of America's newly-emerged industrial base, channeled through a State Department that was just beginning to become a professional bureaucracy, would enable Americans to be "world organizers." Bolstered by the new definitions of order and efficiency resulting from the rise of the corporation, business and government elites imparted to imperialism a new force and coherence.²² This policy was soon subjected to the test of warfare.

On April 23, 1898, Admiral Dewey had cabled the American Consul at Singapore, E. Spencer Pratt, to have Emilio Aguinaldo return from his exile. Dewey felt that the assistance of the Filipino insurgents would be useful in defeating the Spanish. Aguinaldo and Pratt interpreted Dewey's cable as an indication that the Filipinos and the Americans shared the same goal: liberation of the Islands from foreign rule.²³

Aguinaldo returned to the Islands and his insurgents defeated the Spanish forces, occupied the vital Luzon plain, and laid siege to Manila. By the time American forces arrived in July under General E. S. Otis, the insurgents were in the process of establishing a government at Malolos, just north of Manila. Admiral Dewey estimated that Aguinaldo could have

²² Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), pp. 224-56.

²³ Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 30-41, covers the early maneuvering and contacts between Americans and Filipinos from the Filipino viewpoint. For a denial that independence was promised or implied, see Dean C. Worcester, The Philippines, Past and Present (New York: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 97-109. Hereafter: Worcester, The Philippines. For less biased views on the subject, see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 83-86, and Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 48-54.

recruited "the whole population" into his army, such was the popularity of the rebel movement at that point.²⁴

In August, when General Otis announced that the United States was the only legal authority in the Philippines and ordered the Filipinos to pull their troops back from the environs of Manila, relations with the insurgents deteriorated drastically. The American government knew very little of what was happening. Aguinaldo's proclamations of independence were passed on to the State Department without comment, the government at Malolos was ignored in Otis' cables, and his assessments of the situation were confused and contradictory.²⁵

Two events brought the Americans and the Filipinos to the brink of war. On December 10, 1898, the Treaty of Paris which included annexation of the Islands, was signed (but not yet ratified), and on December 21 President McKinley, unaware of

²⁴ Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 71-80; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 87-90. See Dewey's testimony in U.S. Congress, Hearings on Affairs in the Philippine Islands (57th Cong., 1st Sess., 3 vols.; Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1901), esp. pp. 2928-40. Hereafter: Hearings. (Quote from p. 2940.)

²⁵ Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 71-80; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 87-90; Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 72-75, 143-47. On the situation in Manila during 1898, see U.S. Congress, Annual Reports of the War Department, 1899 . . . Department of the Pacific (56th Cong., 1st Sess., Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1899-1900), pp. 1-78, 334-62. Hereafter: War Department Reports, with year. Otis had been shot in the head in the Civil war; this may have impaired his mental faculties (Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 141). "Everything remains quiet . . . business . . . as usual," he cabled, followed, two days later, by "very shortly [they will] give us battle." Otis excused this ambiguity on the grounds that rumors were so abundant "sane conclusions were impossible." War Department Reports, 1899, p. 88.

the dangerous tensions in the Philippines, sent the Filipinos a proclamation extolling "benevolent assimilation" of the Islands by the United States. Otis released a censored version of the proclamation but the original was also released by mistake. Aguinaldo issued a counter-proclamation and the rebel paper Junta Patriotica warned: "any moment a shot may be fired by an irresponsible American or Filipino soldier."²⁶

The signing of the Treaty of Paris also acted as a catalyst in the United States. The Anti-Imperialist League was formed at this time, to defeat the ratification of the treaty in the Senate.²⁷

The League's chief characteristic (and its most serious disadvantage) was its heterogeneity. It brought together

²⁶ Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 87-88; Morgan, Road to Empire, pp. 97-99; Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 199-201. Quote from Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 201.

²⁷ On the Anti-Imperialist League, see Robert L. Beisner, Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900 (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968); Bryan, Stevenson, Weaver, Hoar, Gompers, Carnegie, Adams, et al., Republic or Empire? The Philippine Question (Chicago: The Independence Co., 1899); Fred H. Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 22:2 (September, 1935), 211-230; and John W. Rollins, "The Anti-Imperialists and Twentieth Century Foreign Policy," (with critiques by Harold Baron and Thomas J. McCormick) Studies on the Left, 3:1 (n.d., 1962), 9-24. Hereafter: Beisner, Twelve Against Empire; Harrington, "Anti-Imperialist Movement"; and Rollins, "Anti-Imperialists and Foreign Policy." Also useful are the concluding chapters (pp. 213-55) of Healy, Expansionism, and William E. Leuchtenberg, "Progressivism and Imperialism: The Progressive Movement and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1916," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 39:3 (December 1952), 483-504. Hereafter: Leuchtenberg, "Progressivism and Imperialism."

Mugwumps like Carl Schurz²⁸ and Regulars like George F. Hoar;²⁹ the capitalist Andrew Carnegie and the labor leader Samuel Gompers; the aristocrat Charles Francis Adams and Populist-backed William Jennings Bryan; single-taxers, pacifists, prohibitionists, and free-traders; second-generation reformers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson's son and William Lloyd Garrison's son; and the leading intellectuals of the time: William James, Mark Twain, William Graham Sumner, Charles Eliot Norton, Finley Peter Dunne, and William Dean Howells.³⁰

Although Democrats eventually dominated the League when anti-imperialism was made the "paramount issue" of the election of 1900,³¹ its initial strength came from Republicans of the old Lincoln-Fremont school.³² Their objections to imperialism were as diverse as their backgrounds. Annexation of the Philippines was opposed on constitutional, economic, diplomatic,

²⁸Schurz was typical of those Republicans whose devotion to their party's principles had caused them to abandon their party in the 1884 presidential campaign. On Schurz, see Beisner, Twelve Against Empire, pp. 18-34.

²⁹Hoar represents the staunch partizan who insisted on pursuing anti-imperialism while remaining within the Republican Party. See Beisner, Twelve Against Empire, pp. 139-65.

³⁰Harrington, "Anti-Imperialist Movement," pp. 216-19.

³¹See Thomas A. Bailey, "Was the Presidential Election of 1900 a Mandate on Imperialism?" Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 24:1 (June 1937), 43-52. Hereafter: Bailey, "Election of 1900."

³²Beisner, Twelve Against Empire, deals entirely with Republicans.

moral, humanitarian, racial, historical and political grounds.³³

While dissident Republicans attacked the McKinley administration in Congress for imperialism, and the intellectuals voiced their opposition in the journals, the grass-roots level of anti-imperialism was being voiced by newspapers such as the World-Herald of Omaha, Nebraska. William Jennings Bryan, leading anti-imperialist³⁴ and presidential candidate in 1896,³⁵ had been an editor of the World-Herald for two years (1894-1896) and enjoyed the paper's firm support for several years thereafter.³⁶ In fact, one critic singled out the World-Herald as the "most constant, earnest and zealous advocate" of "Bryanarchy"

³³ Ibid., pp. 215-20. The categories of anti-imperialist arguments will be examined in the concluding chapter of this thesis (below).

³⁴ See Paolo E. Coletta, "Bryan, Anti-Imperialism and Missionary Diplomacy," Nebraska History, 44:3 (September, 1963), 167-87. Hereafter: Coletta, "Bryan and Anti-Imperialism." On Bryan's evolution from anti-imperialist to pacifist, see Merle E. Curti, "Bryan and World Peace," Smith College Studies in History, XVI:3-4 (April-July 1931), 107-262. Hereafter: Curti, "Bryan and World Peace."

³⁵ On Bryan from 1896 to 1898, see Paolo E. Coletta, William Jennings Bryan, I: Political Evangelist, 1860-1908 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), pp. 213-38. Hereafter: Coletta, Bryan.

³⁶ Paul V. Peterson, "The Omaha Daily World and World-Herald, 1885-1964," Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1966, pp. 256-61. Bryan became an editor in hopes of publicizing his views; the publisher, Gilbert M. Hitchcock, invited him to join the paper in hopes of using Bryan's influence to raise funds for investment in typesetting equipment. Both men achieved partial satisfaction of their hopes. See Paul V. Peterson, "William Jennings Bryan: World-Herald Editor," Nebraska History, 49:4 (Winter 1968), 348-71. Hereafter: Peterson, "World-Herald," for the thesis, and Peterson, "Bryan: Editor," for the article.

in the country.³⁷ The so-called "Bryanarchists" were the radical agrarians, silverites, and anti-imperialists within the Populist and Democratic parties,³⁸ who opposed the McKinley administration's twin goals of "Gold and Empire," as they put it.³⁹

The World-Herald's viewpoint reflected that of its top executives; Gilbert M. Hitchcock, the publisher and later United States Congressman and Senator; Richard L. Metcalfe, Editor; William Maupin and Cortez Kitchen, editorial writers;

³⁷The paper accepted that as a compliment. The critic quoted was J. Sterling Morton, prominent Nebraska Democrat who had been Cleveland's Secretary of Agriculture. The Omaha Evening World-Herald, April 14, 1899, p. 4. Hereafter cited as World-Herald. All references are to editorials--always located on p. 4--unless otherwise specified.

³⁸After two decades of falling prices and drought, the farmers of the Midwest had revolted. Rejecting both major parties, they swept the Populists to victory in the Nebraska legislature in 1890. Through Bryan's labors, Populist agrarianism was injected into the Democratic party. Coletta, Bryan, pp. 101-103, 157; James C. Olson, History of Nebraska (2nd ed., Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), pp. 207-33. Hereafter: Olson, History of Nebraska.

³⁹World-Herald, December 6, 1899. Although Populists elsewhere may have been weak in their opposition to economic imperialism, the Midwestern Populists were staunchly anti-imperialist. See J. R. Johnson, "Imperialism in Nebraska, 1893-1904," Nebraska History, 44:3 (September 1963), 141-66, esp. p. 147. Hereafter: Johnson, "Imperialism in Nebraska." Also see Samuel Walker, "Populism and Industrialism: The Ideology of the Official Organ of the Nebraska Populist Movement," M.A. Thesis, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1970. Hereafter: Walker, "Nebraska Populist Movement."

and Guy H. Spencer, editorial cartoonist.⁴⁰ The careers of Hitchcock and Metcalfe, in particular, were closely entwined with that of Bryan.⁴¹

It is the aim of this thesis to examine anti-imperialism as seen in the editorials of the World-Herald. This will be done by examining the paper's coverage of the war in the Philippines, 1899-1902, and by a more general and topical discussion of the World-Herald's anti-imperialism.

40

Besides Peterson, "World-Herald," see the history of the paper published in the August 27, 1900 edition (p. 27), and Robert F. Patterson, "Gilbert M. Hitchcock, A Story of Two Careers," Ph.D. thesis, University of Colorado, 1940. Hereafter: Patterson, "Hitchcock."

41

Metcalfe first came to know Bryan as the World-Herald's Washington correspondent. In March of 1905 he resigned editorship of the Omaha paper to join Bryan in publishing Bryan's own paper, The Commoner. (Patterson, "Hitchcock," p. 220.) Hitchcock had his differences with Bryan but supported him until after the 1908 Presidential campaign. For details of their relationship, see Patterson, "Hitchcock," passim.

II. 1899

With the Americans and the Filipinos at the brink of war at Manila as the year opened,¹ Aguinaldo sent a representative, Felipe Agoncillo, to the United States to explain the Filipinos' position and their goal of independence. Agoncillo was discouraged by his cool reception, but told the press: "It is my hope that all differences may be adjusted in a friendly manner."² The New York Journal attacked Agoncillo and shortly afterward also attacked Aguinaldo, proposing he be exiled to a "nice secluded bit of rock." The Omaha World-Herald came to the defense of the Filipino leaders: "That is peculiar doctrine in free America! Banish a man who fights for freedom! Chain to a barren rock the man who dares to advocate freedom for his race, instead of serfdom. The imperialists have gone stark, staring mad."³

¹ Aguinaldo was having difficulty restraining his men (Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 79-80). On the 20th of January the "Republic of the Philippines" (the Malolos government) had ratified its constitution in assembly (Worcester, The Philippines, p. 207; World-Herald, January 31, p. 1. All references in this chapter are 1899 unless otherwise specified.). The Filipino troops were becoming impatient to "defend" their "sovereignty," which they seemed to regard as a process akin to proving one's masculinity. See Colonel Julio Cailles' belligerent report to Aguinaldo on how to deal with the Americans, in Worcester, The Philippines, p. 157.

² Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 83-86; Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 161-62, 211. Quote from World-Herald, January 12.

³ Ibid., January 14. In December of 1900 General Arthur MacArthur would exile fifty Filipinos, civilian and military leaders of the insurrection, to Guam. Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 107.

On the night of February 4, troops of the First Nebraska Volunteers from an advanced outpost encountered four Filipinos and ordered them to halt. When the Filipino Lieutenant answered back "Halto," Corporal W. W. Grayson decided "the best thing to do was to shoot him. He dropped."⁴

In minutes the whole line was crackling with rifle fire. Word of the outbreak of war arrived at the same time as ratification of the peace treaty containing annexation. The World-Herald ran two large headlines: "Treaty Ratified by Three Majority" and "Filipinos Attack the Americans."⁵ The editorial expressed pity for the Filipinos, who would be slaughtered by the superior American troops; for the American soldiers, who were required to "slay liberty-craving Filipinos"; and for the parents of the soldiers who must die for such a "damnable policy."⁶

The next day the World-Herald defended William Jennings Bryan, who had urged Democratic Senators to vote for the treaty containing annexation.⁷ The editors accepted Bryan's explanation that "ratification converts a foreign question into a

⁴ Quoted in Aguinaldo, Second Look, p. 93.

⁵ World-Herald, February 6, p. 1

⁶ Ibid., p. 4

⁷ For a sympathetic but plausible view of Bryan's reasons for supporting ratification, see Paul W. Glad, The Trumpet Soundeth: William Jennings Bryan and His Democracy (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960), pp. 70-73. Hereafter: Glad, The Trumpet Soundeth.

domestic one" and added their own judgment that America would become aroused by the oppression of the Filipinos and the waste of lives and money.⁸

The World-Herald carried news stories expressing Washington's concern that, although the insurgents were poorly armed, untrained, and led by young, inexperienced officers, "their strong point is their knowledge of the country, and a certain fanatical bravery." The fear was expressed that, "by taking to the interior of the country, practically impassable . . . a prolonged Indian fighting style of campaign may follow."⁹

On February 7 it was announced that a brigade of Nebraskans "advanced and took the water works at Singalon." But the Filipinos, although "retiring in bad order," took some of the glory out of the Nebraskans' victory by "carrying with them the valves and heads of the pumping machinery."¹⁰

In a more serious vein, it was also reported on February 7 that "a converted river gunboat did terrible execution among the rebels, sweeping both banks of the river with her gatling guns and her heavier battery. Hundreds of Filipinos undoubtedly crawled into the canebrakes and died there."¹¹

⁸World-Herald, February 7.

⁹Ibid., February 8, pp. 5, 6 (unidentified correspondent).

¹⁰Ibid., February 7, p. 1. On February 9 and again on March 8, 9 and 11, the World-Herald pointed to the capture of the waterworks as evidence of the wonderful progress the temperance movement enjoyed among "Nebraska's soldier boys." A Kansas unit, by contrast, had captured a brewery.

¹¹Ibid., February 7, p. 1. This was probably the Laguna de Bay, with two three-inch guns, two 1.65 Hotchkiss guns, "a few Gatlings," and sixty riflemen. It drew only four feet of water, and the Pasig River cut directly through Filipino lines. (Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 219.)

A Kansan wrote home:

If it had not been for the gunboats we would have had a hard time of it. Their searchlights just showed us where they were, and those not killed in the trenches were killed when they tried to come out. No wonder they can't shoot, with that light thrown on them, shells bursting and infantry pouring in lead all the time. Honest to God, I felt sorry for them.¹²

The World-Herald commented:

We take it that Private Conley did not mean that remark in a sacrilegious sense. And now, "honest to God," who does not feel sorry for the Filipinos? . . . They are being killed by hundreds because they lifted their arms against American soldiers, and death is the due of every man who fires upon the American colors. . . .

But . . . day [had] followed day without a sign that the Filipinos were to be allowed to have a voice in their own government. . . . and in despair they attacked their former allies. By doing this they sealed their death warrants. Half-naked, poorly armed, without military training, the Filipinos are being mowed down like ripened grain before the sickle--and for what?

. . . it is a war of organized greed engineered by men who think nothing of blood if there is a dollar in sight, and the war is being fought, not by the greedy ones, but by brave men, who declare "honest to God" we are sorry for the Filipinos.¹³

On Washington's birthday, William Jennings Bryan made a noteworthy speech in which he identified what he saw as the core of the problem: was America to be a progressive world influence or a conservative force?

¹² Because of the slowness of surface mail, this letter did not appear until April. World-Herald, April 3, p. 4.

¹³ Ibid., April 3.

The forcible annexation of the Philippine islands is not necessary to make the United States a world power. . . . Mexico and the republics of Central and South America testify to the benign influence of our institutions, while Europe and Asia give evidence of the working of the leaven of self government. In the growth of democracy we observe the triumphant march of an idea . . .

Anglo Saxon civilization has, by force of arms, applied the art of government to other races for the benefit of Anglo Saxons; American civilization will by the influence of example, excite in other races a desire for self-government and a determination to secure it.¹⁴

Two weeks later the World-Herald picked up the theme of America's alternate futures:

The United States . . . have the opportunity to become, if indeed they are not already so, the greatest among the nations of the earth. But there is a radical difference between greatness as contemplated from the standpoint of a monarchy and . . . from the standpoint of an ideal republic.

The power of a monarchy is shown in its treasury surplus, in its militarism, its force; the strength of a republic is shown in the contentment and happiness of its citizens, in a government . . . administered so successfully that militarism is repugnant to the public mind. . . .

. . . If we would be strong . . . let us administer the government in the interests of the whole people rather than in the interests of a small class . . .¹⁵

On March 4, the Schurmann Commission¹⁶ arrived in the Philippines but its attempts to establish an orderly administration

¹⁴ Ibid., February 23, p. 5.

¹⁵ Ibid., March 8. This editorial is typical of the way in which different categories of arguments were woven together; in this case, topics of national interest, militarism, and class rule.

¹⁶ The Schurmann Commission was appointed to investigate--and govern--the islands. General Otis and Admiral Dewey were

for the islands were undermined by the intensification of combat that accompanied the assault on Malolos, the rebel capital. It was generally believed that the fall of Malolos would end the war.¹⁷

Perhaps in anticipation of an imminent end to the war, the World-Herald put full effort into a lengthy editorial on the morality of the war; the patriotism of the war critics, and the justice of the Filipino cause, and then asked what we shall do "if in the near future the time shall come when we have in fact suppressed this people." Will we then look back over "a bloody field . . . strewn with the corpses of lovers of liberty," some of whom are our own brave sons, others the sons of Filipino parents, but all "lovers of liberty"?

When we have established ourselves as monarch of all we survey in their beloved land, what is there before us?¹⁸

On March 31 headlines announced that the capital had been taken, at the cost of thirty-four Nebraskan casualties. News

¹⁶(continued) members of the Commission, and its civilian members included Dean C. Worcester, an ardent imperialist. Thus weighted, the Schurmann Commission's policies were military and imperialist in tone, especially when contrasted with the Taft Commission that replaced it in June, 1900. William Howard Taft's aim was to assert civilian control over policy and build up a professional bureaucracy; these aims conflicted with a kind of "warlordism" that had evolved during the protracted conflict. On the Schurmann Commission, see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, p. 118; Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 255-56; and Worcester, The Philippines, p. 57. On the Taft Commission, see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 124-25; and Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 312-13. On "warlordism," see Governor-General F. B. Harrison's remarks in Worcester, The Philippines, p. 733n.

¹⁷World-Herald, March 13 and 25. Headline during assault on Malolos: "Insurgent Prisoners Say Aguinaldo Will Make No More Resistance if Defeated There." Ibid., March 28, p. 1.

¹⁸Ibid., March 28.

was less decisive the next day, however. The insurgents had escaped from Malolos unscathed.¹⁹ While Otis continued to assure Washington of impending doom for the rebels, morale among his own troops continued to sink. "Majority of Volunteers Complain That They 'Did Not Enlist to Fight Niggers' but Only Spaniards," the World-Herald reported.²⁰

Some complaints were aimed at Colonel John Stotsenburg, commander of the First Nebraska regiment, and on April 15 the newspaper published a lengthy defense of the Colonel by Sergeant L. Ryan, Quartermaster of the First Nebraska. Among the items in Colonel Stotsenburg's favor, wrote Sergeant Ryan, was the fact that "we are now engaged in a kind of Indian warfare," with which the Colonel was very familiar.²¹

Ironically, the old Indian fighter was dead nine days later, ambushed while reconnoitering near Malolos. The World-Herald eulogized the "strict disciplinarian"; whatever his faults, he was a "brave and capable officer."²²

The limelight now shifted to Generals Henry W. Lawton and Arthur MacArthur and their drives northward to capture the rebels' new capital, Tarlac.²³

¹⁹ Ibid., March 31, p. 1; April 1, p. 3.

²⁰ Ibid., April 3, p. 1; April 10, p. 1.

²¹ Ibid., April 15, p. 4.

²² Ibid., April 24. Also see J. R. Johnson, "Colonel John Miller Stotsenburg: Man of Valor," Nebraska History 50:4 (Winter 1969), pp. 339-357, esp. pp. 350-53.

²³ Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 95; World-Herald, April 22, p. 1. A certain glamor clung to General Lawton by virtue of his capture of Geronimo in 1886 (Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 239).

The Filipinos sent staff officers to Otis with requests for three weeks' time in which to convene their Congress, which supposedly had sole power to authorize negotiations.²⁴ Otis insisted on unconditional surrender. Defeat did indeed seem near for the rebels as town after town went up in flames.²⁵

While attacking the war relentlessly, the World-Herald was always careful to support the soldiers fighting in that war. This was done partly, no doubt, as a political tactic, to avoid alienating the public,²⁶ partly out of a patriotic pride in American strength, and partly out of a sincere concern for the welfare of "our boys."²⁷ Such support, however, fell short of accepting the argument that such bloodshed as the First Nebraska had experienced gave the United States, in

²⁴This was a face-saving device; the leaders needed some way to appeal to the "will of the people" rather than take the full blame for a humiliating surrender. (Aguinaldo, Second Look, p. 101-04; Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 257; World-Herald, April 28 and 29, p. 1.)

²⁵See World-Herald, May 2 to 11, all p. 1.
It was not only the Filipinos for whom the end seemed near. The First Nebraska had petitioned Otis for release from service, having been reduced to less than half their normal strength (World-Herald, May 12, p. 1.). The Nebraska regiment had, in fact, suffered the heaviest casualties of any regiment on any front in the entire Spanish-American war and its aftermath. J. R. Johnson, "The Saga of the First Nebraska in the Philippines," Nebraska History, 30:2 (June 1949), 159-60. An early headline (based on a letter) maintained that Nebraskans hurried back from hospitals for fear of missing a battle, but later in the summer a different picture was revealed: the troops had been on the "verge of mutiny" and were sent home "just in time." (World-Herald, May 25 and July 25, p. 1.)

²⁶See, for example, the World-Herald, May 5.

²⁷Ibid., February 6 and 7, March 28.

the words of the Sioux City Journal, "an added sense of proprietorship in the islands fertilized by American blood." This was, the editors replied, simply another way of defending title by conquest.²⁸

Support for the First Nebraska regiment usually took the form of fund-raising campaigns. The war was scarcely a week old when the World-Herald suggested that the legislature appropriate \$6,000 to the First Nebraska. A bill introduced for that purpose brought letters of condemnation ("World-Herald free thunder") and of praise. Bryan endorsed the idea, and a former Cavalry surgeon wrote that, as long as "our boys" had to live "in a climate where even the horse cannot live," to "shoot down innocent people, panting for liberty," we should not make it any worse for them by withholding needed aid.²⁹

A week later the Republican legislature killed the bill and was promptly condemned by the World-Herald.³⁰ When the legislature introduced a resolution of praise for the First Nebraska the World-Herald declared it an "impertinence" after the legislature's defeat of the appropriations bill, and hoped for its defeat.

The Fusionist Governor, William A. Poynter, vetoed the resolution on March 31 on the grounds that it contained the

²⁸ Ibid., May 1

²⁹ Ibid., February 13 and 16, p. 5.

³⁰ Ibid., February 22. With the return of some prosperity the Republicans had taken control of the legislature in the 1893 elections, but the Democrats and Populists, under the Fusion party label, remained in control of the governorship. Olson, History of Nebraska, pp. 235-36, 355.

phrase that our soldiers were "defending in the far-off Philip-
pines the principles of our government." The Governor pledged
"the honor of the state" to our troops but added that the con-
flict in which they were sacrificed was "at utter variance with
the . . . principles of our government."³¹

The World-Herald ran lengthy editorials defending the
Governor's veto. A petition began to circulate in Nebraska,
calling for the Governor to remove the troops on the grounds
that the First Nebraska had become a "shuttlecock of political
sophistry." The paper agreed on the removal of troops but de-
nied that it was the Governor who had made the regiment a
political issue.³²

Meanwhile the Schurmann Commission had issued a proclama-
tion of American supremacy, and promised to work toward a goal
of liberty for the Filipinos.³³ The message also included the
promise of an "honest and effective civil service," which, the
World-Herald felt, "would mean more if backed up by civil serv-
ice of a similar kind right here at home."³⁴

The effects of the Schurmann proclamation were admitted to
be less than had been expected, as was revealed in an article

³¹World-Herald, March 3, April 3.

³²Ibid., April 4, 7, 8, 12, 17, 21. On the 25th the paper
opened a fund drive for the purchase of hospital supplies. By
May 5 they could report the arrival of the fund in Manila. Ibid.,
April 25 to 29; May 5, 6.

³³Ibid., April 4, p. 1

³⁴Ibid., April 5.

under the headline "Guerrilla Warfare Now Fully Expected." Guerrilla warfare was conceived of as something analogous to Indian warfare; very familiar and easily handled. Americans had always known "how to oppose that sort of thing when occasion demanded,"³⁵ said the World-Herald.

On May 22nd, the World-Herald published "The Creed of the Anti-Imperialist," consisting of quotations from the Founding Fathers, early Presidents, party platforms (Liberty party, 1843, Whig, 1857, Republican, 1856, 1868, 1876, 1884) and other items doubtless useful to public speakers.³⁶

Four days later "Hymn" followed "Creed": The "Battle Hymn of the Empire" was printed. The first two lines were:

Mine eyes have seen the "glory" of the empire that
has come;
I've heard its mad hosannas in the trusts' marauding
hum;³⁷

Meanwhile, the World-Herald's Republican competitor, the Bee, abandoned its opposition to imperialism and advocated annexation plus a "measure of autonomy" for the Philippines.³⁸ The World-Herald commented on autonomy: "Let's see; isn't that what Spain offered Cuba and what all Americans advised Cuba not to accept?" The World-Herald attributed the Bee's

³⁵Ibid., April 13, pp. 1, 4.

³⁶Ibid., May 22. This approach was frequently used, to establish in the reader's mind the idea that anti-imperialism was traditional Americanism.

³⁷Ibid., May 26.

³⁸Ibid.

shift of position to "the threat that the administration would establish in Omaha a Republican newspaper that would uphold administration policies."³⁹

A week later the paper made the same charge against the Lincoln Journal.⁴⁰ In response to denials by the Bee and the Lincoln Journal, the World-Herald, although failing to reveal concrete evidence of "administration pressure," published a number of excerpts from the Bee and Lincoln Journal to illustrate their "flop" on the issue of annexation.⁴¹

Memorial Day came, with no end to the war in sight. In Southeast Asia, spring meant the coming of monsoon weather:

Filipinos Take a New Grip in the Struggle:
Approach of Wet Season Gives them Great
Encouragement⁴²

It Is Real War Now: . . . General Otis Believed
to Have Informed the War Department He Must Have
More Men . . . Rainy Season Complicates the Sit-
uation and Reveals How Little of the Archipelago
Americans Control.⁴³

The World-Herald joked: "If Aguinaldo is depending upon the rainy season he will be disappointed. The American troops

³⁹ Ibid., May 27. The World-Herald had a long history of feuding with the Bee. See Patterson, "Hitchcock," pp. 26, 87.

⁴⁰ Ibid., June 27.

⁴¹ Ibid., June 10, 12.

⁴² Ibid., May 29, p. 5.

⁴³ Ibid., May 30, p. 5. On May 31 the Administration denied that Otis had requested more men, but the next day Otis' request was again headlined. (Ibid., May 31, June 1.) In fact, Otis' optimism was catching up with him; he was in trouble with Washington. Not until August 15 would Otis admit that he needed 60,000 more men. (Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 238-40.)

charge so rapidly that they run out from under the falling raindrops."⁴⁴

By early summer the first reports of war crimes and news censorship began to appear. About the former there was no editorial comment, but the "un-American censorship" caused great indignation.⁴⁵ This was quickly overshadowed in the headlines as the fiercest fixed fighting of the war (as contrasted to later guerrilla warfare) broke out south and east of Manila. There, 3,000 of General Lawton's Kansans fought for days, swimming the Zapote River under fire, for a gain of only 500 yards.⁴⁶

Lawton was impressed by the determination of the Filipinos:

. . . they waited until [we] brought [our] cannon to within thirty-five yards of their trenches. Such men have a right to be heard. All they want is a little justice.⁴⁷

In the aftermath of the heavy casualties of June, impatience over the war grew and became increasingly focussed on General Otis, and his handling of the military campaigns in the Islands. When Otis expressed doubts that the Filipinos could be trusted in American-led army units, the World-Herald

⁴⁴ World-Herald, June 2.

⁴⁵ Ibid., May 30, p. 5; June 8, p. 1; June 9.

⁴⁶ Ibid., June 10, p. 1; June 12, p. 5; June 13, 14, 15, p. 1; Aguinaldo, Second Look, p. 101; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 95-97.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 290.

recalled his earlier statements that the Filipinos welcomed the Americans, and attacked him for inconsistency.⁴⁸ His denials that he needed reinforcements, when he had only 600 men for each mile of front, led the paper to state that "Otis has not only proved a miserable failure, but he has needlessly prolonged the war and sacrificed precious American lives."⁴⁹

Much ammunition was furnished Otis' critics by the issue of censorship, which returned to the headlines in full force when the news correspondents in Manila signed a protest against the suppression of news. Otis retaliated with threats to expel or court-martial the correspondents and the censorship continued.⁵⁰

After June, however, there was one less irritant: Otis had released the First Nebraska from service, and they arrived at San Francisco on July 26, amid charges that the sick had not received proper care.⁵¹ Republicans and Democrats rushed to

⁴⁸ On June 15, the World-Herald printed a cable from Otis: "Inhabitants . . . rejoice at deliverance and welcome . . . our troops" but on May 13 a news item had reported: "Among the thousands of pretended friendly natives, who are returning to their homes behind the American armies there are some who have taken advantage of the generosity of the conquerors [sic] to make the zone unsafe . . . Soldiers going about alone are frequently fired upon . . ." (Ibid., May 13, p. 1.)

⁴⁹ World-Herald, June 26, July 11, 12.

⁵⁰ Ibid., July 17, p. 1; July 18, p. 5; July 20; November 15, p. 1. On Otis' threats, see Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 262-63.

⁵¹ World-Herald, July 26, p. 3. Also see "Horrors of a Troop Ship," Ibid., December 1, p. 1.

San Francisco and, while awaiting the release of the regiment from quarantine, accused each other of attempting to seduce the returned troops into attacking or defending the war.⁵²

The World-Herald "scooped" all rivals by boarding the troopships during quarantine.⁵³ Interviews with soldiers critical of the war brought cries of "shirkers" and "riff-raff" from Republican papers, and the World-Herald pointed out that one of the "shirkers" was none other than William Grayson, who had fired the first shot of the war.⁵⁴

Pennsylvania and Wyoming hired special trains to bring their troops across the continent. The World-Herald took the lead in raising \$20,000 so that the Nebraska forces, "our boys," would not be "Left in the Cold," as a headline put it. The fund was raised, the train was hired, and the regiment arrived August 30th.⁵⁵

During the summer, the rainy season kept the war at a

⁵² Ibid., June 19, p. 1; July 1, p. 1; July 26, p. 3; July 27 and 28.

⁵³ Peterson, "World-Herald," p. 299; World-Herald, July 31, p. 1; August 1.

⁵⁴ World-Herald, August 1, 4, 8.

⁵⁵ Ibid., August 10, p. 1; August 11; August 12, pp. 1, 4, 5, August 13 to 22; August 30, p. 1. There was a dispute with the Republican Bee over the method of financing the train, resolved in the World-Herald's favor. See World-Herald, August 12, 22, 30.

minimal level, and the World-Herald was free to devote much of its attention to the Bates Treaty and to the Boer War.⁵⁶

The Bates Treaty with the Sultan of Sulu, announced on the 24th of August, required the United States to treat the leader of the Moros, a Moslem minority in the southwest Philippines, exactly as the Spanish had. That is, there would be no interference with their Moslem religion, their slave trade, or their polygamy ("each a sin against God and civilization," fumed the World-Herald).⁵⁷

To pay the Sultan and his staff a total of \$6,000, for "the encouragement . . . of a lecherous old heathen in his cussedness,"⁵⁸ was almost more than the Omaha editors could bear, and for the next two years they kept up a barrage of editorial comment in condemnation of the Treaty (especially its provisions covering slavery), and of anyone daring to defend the Treaty.⁵⁹

⁵⁶The paper devoted thirty editorials to the Boer War from September to December. The editors sensed that America's position on the Boer War was crucial to the completion of the emerging Anglo-American axis, which was bound to strengthen the imperialists and "Tories" in both countries. A de facto alliance, it was feared, would encourage interventionism abroad and militarism at home. See Beale, T. R. and World Power, pp. 85-158, and World-Herald, September 16, October 14, 16 and 18 and November 25.

⁵⁷Ibid., August 25. On the Treaty, see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 79n, 99; Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 317, and President McKinley's annual Congressional message which included a defense of the Bates Treaty. For the text of his message, see World-Herald, December 5, p. 9 (editorial reply, December 6).

⁵⁸World-Herald, August 25.

⁵⁹See, for example, September 1 and 26, October 5, 10, 28 (text of Treaty), and January 3 and March 30, 1901. The World-Herald's position usually centered on the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits slavery not only in the United States, but in "any place subject to their jurisdiction," which raised this question: Was the Sultan of Sulu acknowledging American sovereignty but not our jurisdiction? See editorial, October 27.

By October the rainy season had ended and Generals Lawton and MacArthur resumed their northward advances with fresh troops toward the new rebel capital, Tarlac. Anticipating the worst, Aguinaldo authorized General Pio del Pilar, the young and popular "boy general," to begin mobilizing the hinterland for guerilla warfare.⁶⁰ European-educated General Jose Alejandrino, interviewed in the United States, predicted a long and costly struggle--⁶¹ one which could be avoided if the Filipinos were offered an "honorable peace." They were even willing to accept an American protectorate. But the "rebels" had no legal standing in Washington's eyes; there could be no negotiations.⁶²

The American advance was so rapid that Tarlac was taken by surprise and fell without serious resistance; many high officials were captured. Aguinaldo's mother and son were seized. Aguinaldo and his pursuers entered into a deadly game of hide and seek. The conflict had arrived at a new stage: full-fledged guerrilla warfare.⁶³

⁶⁰ Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 99; Worcester, The Philippines, p. 218.

⁶¹ Alejandrino pointed out that the Americans were only in control of Manila and the railroad north, while the Filipinos held the productive countryside and could hold out indefinitely. Thus, the Americans would incur a great expense, and Alejandrino wondered whether the American people would stand for the heavy expenditures, although he considered the opposition to peace would be formidable from "army contractors and business men making profits" from the military budget. World-Herald, October 2, p. 1.

⁶² World-Herald, October 2 and 3, p. 1; October 9.

⁶³ Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 101, 107; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 99-100; World-Herald, November 15, 20, 22, 25, 29, p. 1; November 13, p. 3; November 17, 23.

Few events in this new stage of the war would merit the kind of headlines that had accompanied the first nine months, but there was still a surprise or two awaiting the newspaper's readers.

On December 7 news came that Aguinaldo had apparently been pursued into a narrow canyon. The "boy general" Del Pilar and a handful of his men volunteered to make a stand to buy time for their leader to escape. (Del Pilar's stand has since assumed mythic proportions in the eyes of the Filipinos.) Headlines told of a five-hour fight: "Filipinos . . . Made Brave Stand Until Cold Steel Was Used."⁶⁴ The "boy general" was slain and his body stripped of every possible souvenir, to the point where correspondent Richard Little reported that "it suddenly occurred to me that his glory was about all that we had left him."⁶⁵

Ironically, within two weeks of Del Pilar's heroic stand, America was mourning the death of the most famous general in the Philippines.

General Henry W. Lawton, who had called his enemy the bravest men he had ever seen, was killed in battle on December 18.⁶⁶

⁶⁴World-Herald, December 7, p. 1; Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 108-12; World-Herald, December 8, p. 1.

⁶⁵Quoted in Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 288.

⁶⁶World-Herald, December 19, p. 1. As a further irony the captor of Geronimo was killed by another Geronimo. At San Mateo Lawton had engaged an elite "death squad" (Tiradores de la Muerte) under the command of General Licerio Geronimo (Wolff, Brown Brother, p. 291).

The World-Herald asked "what," after all, "could we expect other than mourning" from this evil war? General Lawton had been "sacrificed upon the altar of this modern Moloch."⁶⁷

Thus, as 1899 closed, the first phase of the war had ended; the transition to guerrilla warfare being punctuated, as it were, by the deaths of Del Pilar and Lawton. With the return of the First Nebraska, one of the direct links between the war and the World-Herald was severed, and with the fall of Tarlac it was easy, if erroneous, to assume as many may have done at the end of 1899, that the war might begin to decline in importance. After 1899 the newspaper's coverage of the hidden jungle warfare became, of necessity, more topical and general, and less chronological and specific, and attention turned more toward the politics of domestic anti-imperialism and less toward military activities in the Islands.

⁶⁷World-Herald, December 22.

III. 1900

The year 1900 saw the World-Herald dealing with coverage of Congressional debates and other matters related to imperialism; with the progress of the war in the Philippines and, finally, with the presidential election that climaxed the year, and in which imperialism was a prime issue.

The resolution introduced by Republican Senator Richard F. Pettigrew, of South Dakota, to inquire into the information made available to Congress concerning the war stimulated Senate debate. Senator Pettigrew charged "concealment and duplicity," and stated, "We have reached a turning point. We must decide whether [to] proceed in a course of rapacity and aggression on the British principle, or pursue a course of justice and right."¹

Particularly odious to the Plains Senator was the practice of censorship: according to the Associated Press, the Manila censor was instructed to delete from news reporting anything harmful to William McKinley or beneficial to William Jennings Bryan. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge countered by proposing to extend the Senate inquiry into such topics as "that the anti-imperialist league had been urging our soldiers to oppose the war."²

¹ World-Herald, January 12, 1900, p. 1. Hereafter all references are to the morning edition. All references in this chapter are to 1900 unless otherwise specified.

² Ibid.

Shouts of "treason" soon greeted Senator Pettigrew's speeches³ but he continued to press the issue, and insisted that relevant documents be printed in the Congressional Record, especially since the major newspapers were, he said, hiding the facts, to help the Administration.⁴

On January 17th, the Senate resolved to demand from the Executive all documents pertaining to the war.⁵ This move was perhaps made necessary, the World-Herald felt, because there existed "too wide a distance between the legislative and the executive branches of the government," a situation which could be remedied by mandatory appearances of Cabinet members before Congress. Otherwise "the President (and he is responsible for all that is done by the members of his Cabinet) does not need to account to the people at all . . ."⁶

Senators Donelson Caffery⁷ and Samuel D. McEnery,⁸ both Louisiana Democrats, spoke against the war, with the latter arguing that the Philippines would compete in cotton and rice with the South, and that war expenditures would be better spent in

³ Ibid., February 1, p. 1

⁴ Ibid., February 3, p. 1. Senator Pettigrew also pressed the issue of Dewey's promise of independence for the Philippines. The Senator forwarded to the World-Herald a letter to him from Filipino General Jose Alejandrino concerning the early conferences with Dewey (July 23, p. 1. Also see the interview with Pettigrew on August 7, p. 5).

⁵ Ibid., January 18, p. 1. The first documents were sent to the Senate in March (World-Herald, March 6, p. 1).

⁶ Ibid., January 23.

⁷ Ibid., February 6, p. 5

⁸ Ibid., February 17, p. 8.

reclaiming and developing the West, a theme often endorsed⁹ by the Omaha editors. The World-Herald also agreed with Senator Joseph L. Rawlins, Utah Democrat, who argued that, since the Filipinos had never acknowledged American sovereignty, "insurrection" was doubletalk; that in reality, "a war of aggression is being waged against them."¹⁰

The maiden speech of Senator Albert J. Beveridge initiated an intense debate between Indiana's representative of "young republicanism"¹¹ and Senator George F. Hoar, the elderly Republican statesman from Massachusetts. The editors described the event somewhat one-sidedly in headlines; "Brilliant Rhodomontade for Imperialism Cracked by Blazon of Barren Facts. Senator Hoar . . . In His Wisdom of Age, Teaches Youth Fallacies of Conquest."¹² When pro-war newspapers blamed Hoar for "prolongation" of the war, the World-Herald countered that it was the need to kill all the resisting "Tagals" that prolonged the war, and that this human element of resistance was once admired by Americans, at Bunker Hill.¹³

Senator Beveridge said "I have seen our mangled boys in the hospital and field" and condemned "those whose voices . . . have cheered those misguided natives on to shoot our soldiers down." The editors replied that the guilty were "the men who make sacrifice of American blood in order to gain new fields of speculation."¹⁴

⁹Ibid., January 29, March 16, April 1.

¹⁰Ibid., March 13, p. 5. cf. World-Herald, May 14.

¹¹Ibid., January 10.

¹²Ibid., January 10, p. 5.

¹³Ibid., January 18.

¹⁴Ibid., January 17.

Nebraska's newly-appointed Populist Senator, William V. Allen, linked McKinley's imperialism to his domination by commercial interests, and to his pursuit of a secret alliance with Great Britain.¹⁵ Allen also introduced a resolution demanding to know the number of deaths in various categories in the Philippines.¹⁶

Congressional debates on imperialism also made reference to the topic of Puerto Rico, particularly the establishment of a tariff for the islands. Vermont Republican Redfield Proctor in the Senate, and Maine Republican Charles Littlefield in the House, opposed tariffs for Puerto Rico and for the Philippines, and called on the G.O.P. not to ignore the popular sentiment for free trade.¹⁷ The House passed a Puerto Rican tariff by 172 to 161;¹⁸ during the Senate debate the World-Herald ran many editorials¹⁹ condemning the tariff as an example of imperialism, as a distortion of the Constitution, and as evidence of McKinley's domination by corporate interests (in this case, sugar and tobacco

¹⁵ Ibid., February 24, p. 6. Secret alliance with Britain became an issue when the Omaha Bee charged there was no evidence to support the charge. In response, the World-Herald published three full columns of quotations from periodicals and politicians dealing with Anglo-American relations and supposedly demonstrating the existence of an alliance. World-Herald August 17, p. 4.

¹⁶ Ibid., March 28. Accuracy of War Department casualty lists also became an issue. World-Herald, March 9, p. 1, April 25. Of particular interest was death from diseases; World-Herald, June 18, p. 5, July 29, p. 2.

¹⁷ Ibid., April 3, March 25 ¹⁸ Ibid., March 1, p. 1

¹⁹ Ibid., March 3, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 20.

trusts). Despite the opposition of Republican Cushman K. Davis of Minnesota, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and former member of the 1898 Paris Peace Commission, the measure passed the Senate (40 to 31) and was signed into law by President McKinley on April 12.²⁰

Critics associated the topic of the Philippines not only with the Puerto Rican tariff and with Britain's suppression of the Boers,²¹ but more obviously, with the entire field of Asian politics. Chinese Minister Wu Ting Fang, speaking at the University of Pennsylvania on Washington's Birthday, stated that the acquisition of the Philippines had extended the Monroe Doctrine across the Pacific and obligated the United States to become the protector of China.²² With the proclamation of the Open Door and the testing of that doctrine by the Boxer rebellion,²³ China thrust into prominence in the pages of the World-Herald to rival the war in the Philippines.²⁴ "It is only by preserving the integrity of China that the United States can hope to profit," said the editors, presumably using "profit" in

²⁰ Ibid., April 4, p. 1, April 13, p. 1

²¹ For example, see World-Herald, January 27.

²² Ibid., February 23, p. 1 Also see World-Herald, January 2, p. 2, July 4, p. 2.

²³ Ibid., May 31, p. 1

²⁴ For example, see World-Herald, July 11, p. 1, July 26, p. 1, August 18.

a figurative sense. A permanent American occupation force in parts of China was a possibility the editors feared.²⁵

The immediate result of the Boxer uprising was the transfer of troops to China from the Philippines, to which General MacArthur objected.²⁶ Events in China brought to a head, through the Open Door, the matter of foreign trade. The World-Herald did not explicitly attack Secretary of State Hay's Open Door policy, since, like many Americans, they thought of it as a protective gesture toward China. But they did continue to maintain that development of domestic markets should take priority, and that foreign trade was an extension of the exploitative nature of corporate wealth.²⁷

The editors noted caustically that the January 1 issue of American Trade, the National Association of Manufacturers' periodical, reported that most capital in the Philippines was British. And, the editors added, "of course Pabst and Schlitz and others sell beer . . . more or less a camp follower's trade. . . ." The editors asked if we had sacrificed 2,700 lives merely to sell beer and protect British capital.²⁸

Increasing exports and rising world food prices could not

²⁵ Ibid., June 13, November 15, p. 1

²⁶ Ibid., June 18, p. 1, July 10, p. 1, August 5, p. 1

²⁷ Ibid., January 29, March 16, April 1

²⁸ Ibid., January 5. Cf. January 15, concerning British capital in the Philippines.

be credited to the imperialistic policies of McKinley, the paper said, but to increased demand abroad, resulting, in the case of food prices, from famine. With an eye to the forthcoming Presidential campaign, the paper argued that the "prosperity argument" thus rested on the misfortune of others.²⁹

Entanglement in the world market was only one of the aspects of becoming a world empire. Even if the United States could avoid the Asian war which seemed imminent,³⁰ the very nature of being a world power was corrupting and self-destructive, the editors warned. An example was the "Pomp of Royalty"³¹ with which the American governor of Puerto Rico was installed as head of a bureaucracy of "carpetbaggers"³² partially paid for by Puerto Rican revenues.

This conclusion was reinforced by the exposure of embezzlement scandals in the Cuban Administration.³³ The moral of these scandals was: "A conquering people will become haughty, domineering, arbitrary, corrupt; a conquered people will become servile, treacherous, malicious and despondent."³⁴

²⁹ Ibid., September 15 (and May 4). The Populist paper, the Independent, had maintained for two years that rising prosperity was due to overseas crop failures (Walker, "Nebraska Populist Movement," p. 92).

³⁰ World-Herald, March 28, p. 1 ³¹ Ibid., April 27, p. 1.

³² Ibid., April 26. See also April 22 and May 2.

³³ Ibid., May 12, p. 1, May 13, p. 1, May 15, p. 1, and July 26, p. 1.

³⁴ Ibid., May 17.

Just as the Civil War was "the judgement of God" for the "war of criminal aggression" against Mexico, so the United States was again courting judgment, the editors warned. Past nations which followed the urge to empire ended disastrously, and the old warning of Tom Corwin, a pre-Civil War statesman, still held: "doom . . . shall fall on the strong nation which tramples in scorn upon the weak."³⁵

Yet the most visible symbol of empire continued to be the war in the Philippines. The year opened with coverage of a new advance southward from Manila by two battalions of the Twenty-Ninth Infantry, which soon captured Aguinaldo's wife and sisters. Manila remained isolated from much of the countryside, with the rebels holding the mountain passes near the city. In the province of North Cebuanes rice had quadrupled in price, and famine threatened. The gunboat Laguna de Bay bombarded the town of Cabuyao, and "the Americans burned the country between and around Cabuyao."³⁶

Manila was the only area free of war, but even Manila's security was of a precarious nature. Throughout the year, fighting occurred not far from the city.³⁷ The Filipinos in Manila

³⁵Ibid., May 27. A month later the World-Herald noted with satisfaction that the New York Herald, which had been pro-McKinley in 1896, was now joining the World-Herald in its fears that the United States would end up buried under the ashes of empire, as had other republics. (World-Herald, June 27.)

³⁶Ibid., January 1, January 2, p. 1.

³⁷Ibid., January 1, p. 1, April 9, p. 1, April 15, p. 8, May 31, p. 1, September 27, p. 1.

were reported to be uncooperative and hostile; Americans travelled only in groups or were escorted.³⁸ Captured papers indicated plans for an uprising.³⁹ The city festered with disease; bubonic plague was reported periodically.⁴⁰ Other reports stated that Army personnel were engaged in black-marketeering.⁴¹ Most disconcerting to the God-fearing World-Herald editors was rampant sin described in lurid headlines:

Vice Flourishes at Manila Under Government
Control -- Most Horrible State of Affairs --
Two Hundred Licensed Bawdy Houses -- Six
Hundred Prostitutes . . . Hell on Earth . . .⁴²

Under the circumstances, severity characterized American administration of the Philippines. When earlier rumors that guerrillas would be shot proved to be true, the World-Herald called this policy "Weylerism in its worst shape."⁴³ Powers given to the Executive under martial law were dictatorial, said Republican Senator John Spooner of Wisconsin.⁴⁴ Brigadier General Frederick Funston was reported to have summarily executed

³⁸ Ibid., March 19, p. 1

³⁹ Ibid., January 2, p. 1

⁴⁰ Ibid., January 4, p. 1, January 9, p. 1, August 8, p. 2.

⁴¹ Ibid., October 26, p. 2

⁴² Ibid., September 9, p. 18.

⁴³ Ibid., February 22, p. 1, and quote from February 27 editorial.

⁴⁴ Ibid., April 3, p. 5.

two Filipino prisoners, but no charges were filed;⁴⁵ the burning of towns was occasionally noted;⁴⁶ but, except for these glimpses, little factual material on the administration of the Philippines was presented to World-Herald readers.

War Department reports and Congressional hearings later revealed more extensive information on conditions in the Philippines.⁴⁷ General MacArthur's view, that "all insurgents [were] without the pale of the laws of war"⁴⁸ led to intensification of the war. General Order No. 100 from the Civil War was enforced, stating that rebels "are violators of the laws of war, and are not entitled to their protection" and that they may be killed on capture because "they are not prisoners of war."⁴⁹ General Otis reported the result: 333 "fanatics" killed in Aglipay with only two losses to the Americans,⁵⁰ and noted that "in some instances it was necessary" to destroy villages.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Ibid., April 10, p. 1, May 28, p. 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid., April 8, p. 24, April 27, p. 1.

⁴⁷ A recent work which makes extensive use of official documents in a detailed critical analysis of American administration of the Islands is William J. Pomeroy, American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia (New York: International Publishers, 1970). Hereafter: Pomeroy, Neo-Colonialism.

⁴⁸ War Department Reports, 1900, p. 286.

⁴⁹ Rules 52 and 85 of General Order 100, printed as Exhibit D in U.S. Congress, Charges of Cruelty in the Philippines (57th Congress, 1st Sess., 2 vols.; Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902). Hereafter: Charges of Cruelty in the Philippines. The conduct of the war under General Order No. 100 did not receive the editors' attention until 1902 (below).

⁵⁰ War Department Reports, 1900, p. 334.

⁵¹ War Department Reports, 1899, p. 100.

The only item in the World-Herald in this period to touch directly on such tactics was a reprint of a Colliers Weekly article by Frederick Palmer, which contained a description of guerrilla warfare and the tense military occupation. Palmer noted that the natives and the troops alike talked of, and feared, "extermination" as the inevitable tactic.⁵²

The World-Herald noted, without elaboration, that the municipal elections held by Otis were not very successful.⁵³ In fact, as War Department reports revealed, such elections were not very significant: the American administration could withhold elections and appoint municipal officials instead, where appropriate. No other level of civilian government was functioning.⁵⁴ And to qualify, prospective electors had to be able to read and write English or Spanish, have held office under the Spanish, or have paid fifteen dollars in gold per year in taxes.⁵⁵

In June the Administration announced a three-month amnesty program for defecting rebels, but it met with little success.⁵⁶ One report indicated that Aguinaldo was reluctant to surrender because he feared amnesty would not apply to him.⁵⁷ When the

⁵² World-Herald, July 22, p. 6.

⁵³ Ibid., January 22, p. 1, March 4, p. 1, September 3, p. 1

⁵⁴ War Department Reports, 1900: Vol. III, pp. 28-30.

⁵⁵ Hearings, p. 56.

⁵⁶ World-Herald, June 21, p. 5, June 22, p. 8, July 30, p. 1

⁵⁷ Ibid., August 13, p. 2.

amnesty expired in September, Aguinaldo offered an amnesty program of his own: forty dollars would be paid to each American surrendering to the Filipinos.⁵⁸

Aguinaldo's supporters continued to use guerrilla tactics, ambushing Americans wherever possible.⁵⁹ Letters from the American troops reflected a grim reality that rarely found its way on to the editorial page. Leo Fischer of the Second Nebraska, for example, wrote that "It did me good to see" the burning of an abandoned village,⁶⁰ and "an Omaha boy," Al Miller, found that the Filipinos reminded him of various animals. When the water treatment was applied, "they swell up like toads." Otherwise, "I class them with a hog or a dog."⁶¹ Generally the news of officers was more uplifting,⁶² although a Lieutenant Waugh of Plattsburgh admitted casually that his men captured a Filipino and "mauled him up in a horrible manner."⁶³ But any suggestion, such as that from Rev. J. M. Carter of Chatanooga, Tennessee,⁶⁴ that American soldiers

⁵⁸Ibid., September 24, p. 1.

⁵⁹Ibid., March 11, p. 2, May 9, p. 1.

⁶⁰Ibid., April 8, p. 24.

⁶¹Ibid., May 13, p. 21. Commenting on a soldier's description of Filipinos as "queer creatures," the World-Herald cited this observation as sufficient condemnation of imperialism, "a policy that would bring into our citizenship such foreign substance" World-Herald, May 28.

⁶²See the "brave deeds" of Captain Wallace Taylor of Omaha; World-Herald, April 8, p. 29, April 15, p. 27, May 13, p. 21.

⁶³Ibid., March 9, p. 1.

⁶⁴Ibid., May 5.

killed in the Philippines were most likely destined for Hell, was vigorously rebutted. In fact, "Our Fallen Heroes" were praised and commemorated.⁶⁵

The alien and hostile environment in which the Americans found themselves was perhaps a factor in two developments: the alleged use of narcotics (cocaine) by some troops, and the demoralization of the officer corps.

In an editorial pondering the "important question" of the reputed need for stimulants of white men in the tropics, the World-Herald cited an article in the Medical Journal by Captain Charles Woodruff, an assistant surgeon in the Army. The World-Herald noted the "instinctive desire for a stimulant, tea, coffee, cocaine or alcohol."⁶⁵ This topic did not, however, become a standard part of the World-Herald's repertoire of arguments.

More significant was a story that appeared May 24, shortly after General Otis, the "incubus"⁶⁷ of the war, returned to the United States.⁶⁸ An undisclosed source ("an officer of high standing") said that Otis had received the resignations of over 200 officers. He allegedly held back most, and the Secretary

⁶⁵ Ibid., May 27, p. 18.

⁶⁶ Ibid., May 20.

⁶⁷ Ibid., May 3.

⁶⁸ On recall of Otis, see World-Herald, February 8, p. 1 May 6, p. 14.

of War rejected those which were sent through channels on the grounds that to accept resignation of some would demoralize the remainder. Otis' successor, MacArthur, had allegedly been ordered to spread the promise of relief for the Volunteers by November, which was perceived as a political campaign tactic.⁶⁹

Even when relieved, the return trip was often an ordeal for the troops. Conditions aboard the transport ships were the subject of "bitter"⁷⁰ debate. The transport Sherman, for example, arrived with 180 sick soldiers aboard, including twenty-two insane,⁷¹ and 135 military prisoners, and experienced five deaths en route.⁷² Contagion such as typhoid posed a constant danger.⁷³

MacArthur and the Taft Commission, having replaced Otis and the Schurmann Commission, faced formidable tasks. Hearings were held, at which the United States military urged greater military effort and the Filipinos urged honest, democratic government.⁷⁴ The scheme that was followed was to establish limited municipal elections (as described above) in areas that had first been pacified militarily.⁷⁵ The World-Herald editors

⁶⁹ Ibid., May 24, p. 1

⁷⁰ Ibid., May 3, p. 4.

⁷¹ It was charged that the war drove men insane. World-Herald, February 19, p. 4.

⁷² Ibid., April 27, p. 1

⁷³ Ibid., April 2, p. 1

⁷⁴ Ibid., June 11, p. 1. On eight proposals put forward by the Filipinos, see World-Herald, July 8, p. 5.

⁷⁵ Ibid., August 6, p. 1.

analyzed the authoritarian powers of the Commission and concluded that this was imperialism at its worst.⁷⁶

Aguinaldo issued a proclamation urging the Filipinos to welcome the Taft Commission and to tell the Commissioners they wanted independence and freedom of speech, and not to believe what the Commission promised, since it had no power to bind Congress.⁷⁷

The Commission, which supposedly represented a transition from "military" to "civilian" government, in reality presided over a continuing state of war.⁷⁸ General William R. Shafter, in an earlier interview, felt garrisons would be necessary "during your lifetime and mine."⁷⁹ Former Commission chairman Jacob Gould Schurmann who had returned to the United States to become president of Cornell University, said in a speech in New York that our descendants could grant independence to the Filipinos if they still wanted it after a generation of American-sponsored schools and courts.⁸⁰ But earlier in the year Schurmann had stated that the Commission's proposed system of government was identical to that of Aguinaldo's. The World-Herald

⁷⁶ Ibid., August 15.

⁷⁷ Ibid., May 19, p. 2. Aguinaldo himself remained in hiding, wandering, and at times barely eluding capture (World-Herald, April 29, p. 7, June 4, p. 1). The first formal surrenders of Filipino units and officials began to occur in the spring of 1900. See World-Herald, April 18, p. 5, April 29, p. 14, May 25, p. 4.

⁷⁸ On the Commission at this point, see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, pp. 124-5; Pomeroy, Neo-Colonialism, pp. 132-49; and Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 312-3.

⁷⁹ World-Herald, February 19, p. 1

⁸⁰ Ibid., November 17.

wondered why our best minds could not improve on this savage's schemes, and felt that this proved Aguinaldo's concern was for good government. If we had left them alone, the Filipinos would be enjoying their own government by now, the editors pointed out.⁸¹

The specific details of the actual administration of the Philippines drew less attention from the editors than the dangers of imperialism and militarism, perhaps the real issues in their eyes. Of particular concern was the "enormous" cost of the war.⁸² American military appropriations had risen above those of France or Italy, to about the same as that of Germany. "And what do we get for the awful expenditure and the desertion of time-honored principles? Recognition as a 'world power' and a welcome to the turmoils and intrigues of Europe."⁸³ In one month the war cost 1,300 Filipino casualties, 175 American casualties, and \$12 million.⁸⁴ Sixty-four thousand troops were in the Philippines⁸⁵ (and the number was rising), McKinley's imperialism had resulted in doubling the federal budget,⁸⁶ burdensome war taxes were necessitated by the war,⁸⁷ inflation was becoming a topic,⁸⁸ and war appropriations bills occasioned

⁸¹Ibid., March 14.

⁸²Ibid., February 5, p. 2

⁸³Ibid., April 4.

⁸⁴Ibid., May 2.

⁸⁵Ibid., April 13, p. 1

⁸⁶Ibid., February 17, p. 4

⁸⁷Ibid., June 23 and 28.

⁸⁸Ibid., April 27.

bitter debate.⁸⁹ The cost of the war by August was \$186 million and 2,400 American dead from all causes.⁹⁰ In September it was said that 100 casualties had been suffered in ten days.⁹¹

In the fall the intensity of the war slackened with the rainy season. Both sides awaited the results of the November American Presidential elections and the coming of the dry season.⁹² With the guerrillas fortifying the mountains for a long siege,⁹³ it appeared that the only immediate solution to the war might be the political one: to elect William Jennings Bryan.

The Presidential election was the one overriding theme of the year, the subject of a great variety of comment. The year opened with Democratic speakers at the Jackson Club sounding the themes on the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans: "Old Hickory Democracy Sounds the War Cry."⁹⁴ Congressman (later Senator) Edward W. Carmack of Tennessee, warned of the danger of straying from our ideals. The "greatest danger," he said, was government by "surprise," including unilateral Executive actions such as those of Admiral Dewey or the censors

⁸⁹ Ibid., May 3.

⁹⁰ Ibid., August 14, p. 1

⁹¹ Ibid., September 24, p. 1

⁹² Ibid., October 8, p. 1, November 16, November 19, p. 1

⁹³ Ibid., August 8, p. 2

⁹⁴ Ibid., January 9, p

at Manila.⁹⁵ Governor David Overmyer of Kansas spoke on McKinley's "kindness" to the trusts, his abuse of war powers, the menace of a standing army, the Administration's toleration of slavery and polygamy; usurpation of the treaty power, and lack of respect for the Founding Fathers.⁹⁶

When invoking Andrew Jackson was questioned by Republicans the World-Herald cited Jackson's farewell address, which warned against the money power that would "dictate the choice of the peoples' highest officers."⁹⁷ The editors viewed the campaign of 1900 as the continuation of an older struggle between the people and their oppressors. "The doctrines of Hamilton are arrayed against the principles of Jefferson."⁹⁸ The survival of agrarianism was at stake. As the New York Press gloated: "The last vestige of the Jeffersonian Tradition . . . is likely to be effaced in the coming election." That would be the downfall of America, and future historians would trace our decline to financial exploitation even more than to imperialism. We enslaved ourselves first, the editors explained, before we enslaved others.⁹⁹

Optimism, however, was the order of the day. Senator

⁹⁵Ibid., January 9, p. 10.

⁹⁶Ibid., January 9, p. 9

⁹⁷Ibid., January 14. Noticeably lacking, however, was any reference to expansionism.

⁹⁸Ibid., September 14.

⁹⁹Ibid., June 3, p. 28.

James K. Jones of Arkansas, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, predicted that the silver issue and anti-imperialism would puncture holes in the East, the G.O.P.'s stronghold.¹⁰⁰ Tammany political leader Richard Croker, interviewed in England, also predicted a Bryan victory,¹⁰¹ and Toledo's "Golden Rule" Jones and John Peter Altgeld expressed their support for Bryan.¹⁰²

Particularly encouraging to Bryan's backers was the defection of prominent Republicans. H. L. Habercorn, who had headed the G.O.P.'s "German bureau" left the party reportedly because of militarism and imperialism in the Republican Party.¹⁰³ The Republican governor of Michigan, Hazen S. Pingree, warned the Party to cut itself loose from the President.¹⁰⁴ Colonel A. K. McClure of the Philadelphia Times deserted.¹⁰⁵ And a Sunday edition of the World-Herald carried a lengthy collection of names of former McKinley supporters who had switched to Bryan, including Theodore Roosevelt's uncle, a New York banker.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰Ibid., February 12, p. 2.

¹⁰¹Ibid., May 29.

¹⁰²Ibid., August 5, p. 18; September 15, p. 1.

¹⁰³Ibid., August 3, p. 4. On the German-American vote, see July 26; September 3, 12, and 27.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., September 1.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., October 1, p. 1.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., September 16, p. 18. A similar potpourri of converts appeared a week later. See World-Herald, September 23, p. 20.

The Vice Presidential candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, attracted much attention from the World-Herald editors. They examined Roosevelt's Winning of the West and noted that as an historian he had condemned "old world colonization," but in the campaign he praised it. They added: "The expansion of Thomas Jefferson was peaceful, the imperialism of William McKinley is a riot of bloodshed."¹⁰⁷ The theme of "Roosevelt the Author versus Roosevelt the Politician" was kept alive through several more editorials¹⁰⁸ until he arrived in Nebraska on a campaign trip.

In Lincoln Roosevelt accused Governor Poynter of calling our soldiers "fifteen dollars a month hirelings."¹⁰⁹ Instead of denying this, the World-Herald retaliated by printing a deprecatory passage on farmers from an earlier work by Roosevelt, and by pointing out Governor Poynter's past efforts on behalf of the troops in the Philippines.¹¹⁰ When the candidate denied the statement about farmers, the paper noted that the work was readily available for reference at the Omaha Public Library.¹¹¹ When Roosevelt appeared in Omaha, the World-Herald did not print his speech verbatim, but carried their own account of it.¹¹²

¹⁰⁷Ibid., July 22.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., July 23 and 24, August 11, September 27, p. 12.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., October 3, p. 1. ¹¹⁰Ibid., October 6.

¹¹¹Ibid., October 4, p. 1.

¹¹²Ibid., October 5, p. 1. Mark Hanna was another favorite target, as the power behind the throne. See World-Herald, April 28 and 29, p. 1, October 1, p. 4.

President McKinley received his share of attention. "The fact that Mr. McKinley may be a mild and good natured man does not eliminate the serious precedent that is being established by allowing one man, without restraint, . . . to govern a people against their will."¹¹³ McKinley's "full dinner pail" became, in the editorial cartoon, "The Full Sinner Pail," filled with War Taxes, Gatling Gun Gospel, and the Sulu Slave Treaty.¹¹⁴

The editors agreed with an article that implied that gold was no longer the issue: "In the last presidential contest financial issues were most prominent. As a result of foreign war now new questions are occupying the attention of the people. Republicanism directs us toward military imperialism and financial and industrial concentration."¹¹⁵

What the Republicans were directing the nation toward was nothing less than monarchism. When the Des Moines Weekly Globe's editor advocated a constitutional monarchy, and supported McKinley's imperialism, the World-Herald publicized his remarks as true Republicanism.¹¹⁶ The paper also publicized a Washington Post interview in which an unnamed Army officer said that McKinley's intent was "to conceal under the form of a republic the power and spirit of a monarchy."¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Ibid., October 5.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., September 8, p. 4.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., April 29.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., August 30, p. 1.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., September 18. Equating imperialism and monarchism was another point of agreement with the Populist Independent. See Walker, "Nebraska Populist Movement," p. 89.

The real issue, then, underlying imperialism, was the "revolutionary" shift of power to the Executive branch of government, a shift caused by Congress' failure to act on the question of the Philippines.¹¹⁸ The coming election would decide whether we would be an empire, with a monarchical Executive, or a republic, governed by the people's legislators.¹¹⁹

The United States, Bryan maintained in a speech at St. Joseph, Missouri, was a world power, but the question was whether we would rule by force or by the example of the gospel of love.¹²⁰ Such idealism earned Bryan the admiration of his staunch supporters at the World-Herald, who shared his view, but brought scorn from his opponents. When Bryan was insulted at a New York Democratic club, the editors found it difficult to understand why "one of the cleanest and purest of men" should have "indignities" heaped upon him.¹²¹ Bryan's virtues included, said the editors, intelligence and consistency on the issue of imperialism, and, as a soldier and leader of men, courage, decisiveness and patriotism.¹²²

¹¹⁸World-Herald, June 18.

¹¹⁹Ibid., April 29, May 13.

¹²⁰Ibid., September 20, p. 1. Bryan's speeches on imperialism are available in William Jennings Bryan, Bryan on Imperialism, in the series, American Imperialism: Viewpoints of United States Foreign Policy, 1898-1941 (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1970). Also see the World-Herald's excerpts and chronology of his speeches, May 4, p. 4.

¹²¹World-Herald, January 25.

¹²²Ibid., April 29, p. 18, May 14, July 6, September 10, and 20, p. 5.

The World-Herald's coverage of the 1900 Presidential campaign showed the emerging role of the issue of imperialism. In February the Anti-Imperialist League Convention at Philadelphia received favorable publicity.¹²³ In May the Populist National Convention at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, voted for William Jennings Bryan and Fusion.¹²⁴ In July the Democratic nomination was made in Kansas City, and Bryan was acclaimed as having the true strength that grew out of his intelligence, honesty and patriotism on the issue of imperialism.¹²⁵ Bryan's acceptance speech was a warning of the dangerous futures open to both the American and Filipino peoples.¹²⁶ The acceptance speech of Vice Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson shared Bryan's anti-imperialism.¹²⁷

President McKinley's acceptance speech indicated his sensitivity to the charge of imperialist. Most of his speech was devoted to a detailed justification of his actions in the Philippines.¹²⁸

¹²³ Ibid., February 23, p. 2.

¹²⁴ Ibid., May 11, p. 1

¹²⁵ Ibid., July 6, p. 1, and editorial.

¹²⁶ Ibid., August 9, p. 1, and editorial. (Nomination speech: August 9, p. 5. Nomination speech in German: August 20, pp. 5-6.)

¹²⁷ Ibid., August 12, p. 21.

¹²⁸ Ibid., September 10, pp. 1, 5. For the World-Herald's reaction to the speech, see September 11 editorial; for Carl Schurz's rebuttal to McKinley, see September 30, p. 26.

As the campaign neared its climax, Bryan toured Ohio and spoke in Chicago, then returned to Nebraska.¹²⁹ Feelings ran high. Headlines warned that the Democratic party "Does Not Approve of Force, but All Should Insist on an Honest Election."¹³⁰

The World-Herald editors viewed the clash between "the masses" and "the classes" as apocalyptic; everything was at stake.¹³¹ Earlier in the year Bryan had voiced his attitude toward defeat:

. . . if it is fate that this nation is to cease to be a republic and become an empire, . . . if in the providence of God the time has come when the pendulum should swing back toward the dark ages of the triumph of brute force, I pray to God that the democratic party may go down to eternal death with the republic rather than to live when its principles are gone.¹³²

In an earlier moment of somewhat pessimistic reminiscing about the 1896 election,¹³³ the Omaha paper had felt that "nothing less than a heroic effort can now bring deliverance," and had noted the apathy with which the American public greeted events in the Philippines.¹³⁴ Now, on the eve of the election

¹²⁹Ibid., November 1, p. 1, November 2, November 3, p. 1, November 5, p. 1.

¹³⁰Ibid., November 1, p. 2.

¹³¹Ibid., January 12, July 11, p. 1, September 24.

¹³²Ibid., January 21, p. 2. Bryan felt that refusal to compromise these principles would keep the party intact as an agent of reform, even if he lost the election. Coletta, Bryan, p. 263.

¹³³World-Herald, July 23.

¹³⁴Ibid., May 1.

that would, they felt, decide America's future, they prayed: "God grant that the American people may realize the dangers confronting this nation. . . ."135

On election day, McKinley received fifty-two percent of the votes cast; Bryan received forty-six percent. The newspaper headlined: "People Say Again 'Not this Man but Barabbas'."136

Perhaps the editors were not overly surprised. In a thoughtful comment the next day, they accepted the election but had doubts about its effect. They engaged in lengthy praise for the way Americans readily accepted the will of the majority, but they could not help ending on a note of concern that this acceptance could too easily become indifference: ". . . what will be the effect on the rising generation of the spirit of casting aside great issues for another four years, if the present trend to an empire on the part of the administration is not checked . . . ?"137

Speaking in Boston, Senor Sixto Lopez, an associate of Aguinaldo, said the Filipinos would continue to fight until they received a promise of independence,¹³⁸ and the editors

¹³⁵Ibid., November 6.

¹³⁶Ibid., November 7, p. 1. On the election, see John W. Bailey, "The Presidential Election of 1900 in Nebraska: McKinley Over Bryan," Nebraska History, 54:4 (Winter 1973), pp. 560-84. Mr. Bailey accepts the Republican contention that the Democrats lacked any good issues in 1900 (pp. 578-79).

¹³⁷World-Herald, November 8.

¹³⁸Ibid., November 10, p. 1.

noted the hollowness of the claim that Bryan's defeat would end the insurrection.¹³⁹ In England, McKinley's reelection was reportedly applauded as support for British imperialism.¹⁴⁰

Bryan's comment on the election paralleled the World-Herald's: "I am sure that the republican policies will be repudiated by the people when the tendency of these policies is fully understood."¹⁴¹

Bryan noted that "The prosperity argument was probably the most potent one. . . ." ¹⁴² In retrospect, the election of 1900 was not a clear-cut mandate on imperialism. Since Bryan was unable to clearly link the war to economic issues, many voters who were anti-imperialist but were also anti-silver had to settle in their own minds a question of priorities. The war was a temporary issue; the economy a permanent one.¹⁴³ Bryan's speeches on imperialism were answered by McKinley's on gold. In a sense, the issue of the campaign was: what is the issue?¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Ibid., November 12 and 16.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., November 11, p. 16.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., November 9, p. 1.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ See Curti, "Bryan and World Peace," pp. 120-28, 254; and Glad, The Trumpet Soundeth, pp. 77-79, 143-48.

¹⁴⁴ Bailey, "Election of 1900," p. 45.

Bryan's tendencies toward pacifism were intensified by his encounter with imperialism,¹⁴⁵ but despite his efforts, imperialism was dead as a political issue in Nebraska after the election of 1900.¹⁴⁶ Only the war could continue to furnish the World-Herald editors with a subject for polemics, even though they knew¹⁴⁷ that the conflict could end only in American victory.

¹⁴⁵ Curti, "Bryan and World Peace," loc. cit.; Coletta, "Bryan and Anti-Imperialism."

¹⁴⁶ Johnson, "Imperialism in Nebraska," p. 159.

¹⁴⁷ World-Herald, November 12.

IV. The End of the Insurrection

Having been defeated at the polls, the World-Herald's anti-imperialist crusade rapidly began to falter. The "day of reckoning" was no longer a specific date in November but an indefinite rhetorical date. On the occasion of a "masterly appeal to the conscience of the American people" by Democratic Senator Charles A. Towne,¹ of Minnesota, the World-Herald warned:

We have just finished a hotly contested presidential campaign, and many people have grown weary of political discussions, consequently the masterly speech of Senator Towne did not create a profound impression upon the country. But . . . let no imperialist drunk with power /think that/ adherence to truth and compliance with conscience are considerations wholly dead in the American breast. . . . there will yet be an awakening

That portion of the American people that is depending for information upon the republican press has not yet learned the truth of the situation in the Philippines. . . . In time these people will learn . . . and the day of reckoning will be at hand.

. . . no bayonet was ever made so sharp that it could pierce the heart of liberty. . . . no people were ever so prosperous that they could afford to trample upon the rights of the weak and helpless.²

¹The full text of Senator Towne's speech was printed in the World-Herald, February 10, 1901, p. 20.

²Ibid., January 30, 1901.

The editors had touched on a basic advantage that the Administration enjoyed: the ability to control the flow of information from the Philippines. As will be developed below, sensational publicity concerning conditions in the Philippines did not come until the spring of 1902, with the trial of General Jacob Smith and testimony at Senate hearings, by which time anti-imperialism was suffering rigor mortis.

As soon as the election was past, the Administration began pressing hard for a military solution to the insurrection. Widespread escalation was reported, and the Administration, weary of a prolonged war, was said to be planning to "show no mercy."³

On the diplomatic front, the American government pressed England hard to suppress Filipino insurgent activities in Hong Kong.⁴ At home, General MacArthur and the War Department, anxious to secure passage of an Army Reorganization bill, began issuing statements on the need for a large permanent standing army of 100,000 men.⁵ The editors noted that in the past our army had always been large enough, but now it was being called "absurdly small." Thus, they observed, militarism was creeping into our life.⁶

³ Ibid., November 19 and 22, 1900, p

⁴ Ibid., November 22 and 26, 1900, p. 7

⁵ Ibid., November 12 and 27, 1900, p. 1

⁶ Ibid., November 14, 1900.

The War Department reports for the Philippines for 1900 were released by General MacArthur with little publicity. Support for the insurgents was widespread, MacArthur noted, but only because the natives "have been maddened . . . by rhetorical sophistry, and stimulants applied to national pride . . ."⁷

Detailed analysis of War Department reports could have yielded material for sharp criticism of Administration policies but the World-Herald editors were unable to perform such analysis because of the relative inaccessibility of the reports.⁸

The picture that emerges from the reports for 1900 and 1901 is that of widespread popular resistance to military occupation. What would now be called "shadow governments" were established "simultaneously and in the same sphere as the American governments, and in many instances through the same personnel." They "acted openly in behalf of the Americans and secretly in behalf of the insurgents. . . ." General MacArthur noted the obvious: "One traitor in each town would effectually destroy such a complex organization."⁹

The guerrilla portion of the population moved as easily as fish in the sea: "At one time they are in the ranks as

⁷Ibid., November 11, 1900, p. 13.

⁸ Not until 1912, with the publication of The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons) by James H. Blount, who served four years in the Philippines as District Judge, was effective critical use made of government documents on the war. (Hereafter: Blount, American Occupation.)

⁹War Department Reports, 1900, 5, p. 61.

soldiers, and immediately thereafter are within the American lines in the attitude of peaceful natives, absorbed in a dense mass of sympathetic people."¹⁰ MacArthur further noted: "The cohesion of Filipino society in behalf of insurgent interests is most emphatically illustrated by the fact that assassination, which was extensively employed, was generally accepted as a legitimate expression of insurgent governmental authority."¹¹

Aguinaldo's dissolution of the insurgent army had earlier been taken as a sign of American success, but MacArthur now realized this had been merely a prelude to guerrilla warfare. Once this was realized, "an entirely new campaign" was launched. Generous treatment of the population, which had been taken as a sign of weakness, was replaced by "more vigorous field operations."¹² In addition, news was controlled, "popular agitators" were exiled, and "a pro-American native party" (the Federal Party) was encouraged.¹³

Until the Taft Commission officially inaugurated "Civil" government in July of 1901, (and in some cases afterward) military policy predominated over alternate policies. The military policy reflected the belief, first, that the war should be made

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 60.

¹¹ War Department Reports, 1901, 2, p. 90.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 92, 93, 96.

unbearable to the population, and second, that treasonous criticisms at home encouraged the rebels.¹⁴ Both beliefs were shared to some extent by the civilians, and both encouraged the practice of censorship.

Hampered by lack of knowledge of conditions in the Islands, much of the World-Herald's coverage of the war was undistinguished, focussing on routine reporting: The 39th U.S. Volunteers advanced on Brinan, captured Puerta De Viga under Captain Wallace Taylor, and so forth.¹⁵ Better coverage was afforded personalities, such as Bryan, Aguinaldo, MacArthur, and McKinley, in their relation to the war.

Bryan told his followers that, although he did not intend to run for President again, they would continue to hear from him, since he believed supporting principles more important than winning elections.¹⁶ A short time later the first issue of Bryan's paper, The Commoner, appeared.¹⁷ When the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Administration in the insular cases (see below) Bryan blasted the decision which "has declared President McKinley emperor . . ."¹⁸ and repeated the charge to the Jackson Club in Kansas City.¹⁹

¹⁴Blount, American Occupation, pp. 276-84; Hearings, pp. 71, 340, 554-59, 666; Pomeroy, American Neo-Colonialism, pp. 84-98, 118-49; War Department Reports, 1901, pp. 39-96; Worcester, The Philippines, pp. 248-52.

¹⁵World-Herald, January 20, 1901, p. 13; February 17, 1901, p. 22; March 13, 1901, p. 2; March 17, 1901, p. 18.

¹⁶Ibid., January 12, 1901.

¹⁷Ibid., January 23, 1901, p.5.

¹⁸Ibid., June 2, 1901, p. 1.

¹⁹Ibid., June 6, 1901, p. 1.

Meanwhile, time had run out for Aguinaldo. Three months after promising "a long and terrible struggle,"²⁰ Aguinaldo was captured by the "Daring Project of American D'artagnan," Frederick Funston, who was immediately promoted to Brigadier General.²¹ The editors commented: "Christian Filipinos are hunted down for daring to fight for independence. Sulu heathens are coddled and salaried. . . ."²²

The Administration announced that Aguinaldo's capture meant the end of the war, but was unsure of what to do with him.²³ Aguinaldo took an oath of allegiance to the United States but continued to be held captive until he issued a proclamation which stated, in part, "the complete termination of hostilities and a lasting peace are not only desirable but absolutely essential to the welfare of the Philippines."²⁴ Aguinaldo apparently was sincere in his wish to see the war end,²⁵ and in fact, the insurrection, as an organized campaign, did collapse.²⁶

²⁰Ibid., January 27, 1901, p. 1.

²¹Ibid., March 23 and March 31, 1901, p. 1. On the capture, see Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 120-28; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, pp. 103-04; Worcester, The Philippines, p. 219.

²²World-Herald, March 28, 1901. The editors were still fuming that the Sulu flag had been flown in Washington (World-Herald, January 15, 1901, p. 1), the flag of "greasy, polygamous, slave-holding datos" (World-Herald, March 30, 1901).

²³Ibid., March 28 and 30, 1901, p. 1.

²⁴Ibid., April 3, 1901, p. 5; April 20, 1901, p. 1 Worcester, The Philippines, p. 220.

²⁵World-Herald, April 23, 1901, p. 1; Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 115-16.

²⁶War Department Reports, 1901, (Philippine Commission) 1, p. 7.

The Omaha editors drew an extended analogy between Aguinaldo and Toussaint L'Ouverture, who had led Santo Domingo in rebellion against Napoleon, and hoped that the Administration would treat Aguinaldo justly and not exile him, for "History is replete with the record of nations that lived unjustly and perished from the earth."²⁷ Aguinaldo was not exiled; he settled down to the role of elder statesman, and by 1903 he was urging Filipinos to study hard in order to advance upward in the American administration.²⁸

Shortly before Aguinaldo was captured, General MacArthur reported that "the conditions throughout the entire archipelago are very encouraging."²⁹ There was little noticeable dissent on this point. However, MacArthur's rigorous measures were subjecting him to unfavorable publicity on the matter of filling Manila jails with local editors.³⁰

Manilans gave the Americans other problems as well: two thousand of the leading citizens of the capital had signed a memorial in January praising Aguinaldo and pointing out that a thousand of his supporters arise for every hundred killed by

²⁷ World-Herald, April 1, 1901.

²⁸ Ibid., September 3, 1903, p. 1

²⁹ Ibid., March 12, 1901, p. 1

³⁰ Ibid., January 28, February 6, 1901, p. 4, and February 12, 1901, p. 5.

the Americans.³¹ Shortly afterwards, Manila was startled by the news that the Italian and Uruguayan consulates were assisting the insurgents.³² American authorities broke up this activity, and it was rumored that several other consulates were also involved.³³

General MacArthur was subsequently asked to report on a black market scandal,³⁴ and an investigation revealed that merchant trading with the insurgents was so widespread that charges had to be dropped.³⁵ MacArthur was soon to be relieved by Major General Adna R. Chaffee, as authority was transferred to the Civil Governor, William Howard Taft.³⁶

The powers of Taft and his Commission had rested on the exercise of Executive (military) authority, but the Spooner Amendment to an appropriations bill provided Congressional (civil) authority³⁷ and ended any question as to whether Taft

³¹Ibid., January 10, 1901, p. 1

³²Ibid., February 22, 1901, p. 2

³³Ibid., March 13, 1901, p. 2.

³⁴Ibid., April 1, 1901, p. 1; April 2, 1901, p. 2

³⁵Ibid., May 26, 1901, p. 1.

³⁶MacArthur still faced the unpleasantness of testifying before Senate critics (see below).

³⁷Forbes, The Philippine Islands, p. 128; World-Herald, February 26, 1901, p. 5; February 28, 1901, p. 1; March 3, 1901, p. 2.

or the military commander was the chief executive. It did not, however, end the question of the Bill of Rights in the Philippines. The "insular cases" brought this matter before the Supreme Court. This series of cases revolved around the right of Congress to legislate for the Islands irrespective of Constitutional provisions. That right was upheld, "but in . . . decisions so contradictory that no one has ever been able to unravel their logic."³⁸

There had been rumors that the Court would uphold the Administration's position,³⁹ and when the first decisions were handed down, the World-Herald was ready. "United States a Part of an American Empire," they headlined; "Congress Decides How Much of the Constitution Applies."⁴⁰ The next day, in an editorial entitled "Dred Scotts by the Millions," the editors reprinted portions of the dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Fuller and Justices Brewer, Harlan, and Peckham. The dissenting opinion attacked the theory which

assumes that the constitution created a government empowered to acquire countries throughout the world to be governed by different rules than those obtaining in the original states and territories and substitutes for the present system of republican government a system of domination over distant provinces in the exercise of unrestricted power.⁴¹

³⁸Morison, Commager and Leuchtenberg, The Growth of the American Republic, (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1969), Vol. II, p. 260. The Court arrived at its position by distinguishing between "fundamental" and "formal" rights. (Ibid., pp. 264-65.)

³⁹World-Herald, February 9, 1901, p. 1; March 2, 1901, p. 1

⁴⁰Ibid., May 28, 1901, p. 1.

⁴¹Ibid., May 29, 1901. The editors considered this a clear definition of imperialism.

Having been defeated at the polls, the anti-imperialists had now been defeated at the bench, and although the Omaha editors gave out a last brief flurry of editorials, a note of despair was beginning to creep into their arguments. The "average man," they complained, does not realize that the Court's decisions mean unqualified support for imperialism:

The American people in these days of prosperity do not realize the great change that has been worked among their institutions. . . .

Power and wealth is being concentrated in a limited circle. Truth is being crushed to earth on every hand. . . . and the people, lulled into a sense of security and satisfaction by the contents of a full dinner pail, sleep on.⁴²

They also explored the parallel with Rome: a republic in Italy, an empire in the provinces.⁴³ The Administration, vindicated, pressed ahead with plans for the establishment of civil government for the Islands.⁴⁴

On the fourth of July the World-Herald did not comment directly on the significance of the date to the Filipinos (it was the date of Taft's inauguration as the first Civil Governor), but did comment that "if we are to have colonies, if we are to have a constitution that is for a select few, . . . then the time will very soon come when the intelligence [sic] of this

⁴² Ibid., May 30, 1901.

⁴³ Ibid., June 3, 1901.

⁴⁴ Ibid., June 5, 1901, p. 1

country will insist that the Declaration of Independence be abolished as a feature at our Fourth of July celebrations."⁴⁵

The Chicago Tribune felt the Fourth was now a glorious day for the Filipinos, too. On the contrary, said the Omaha daily, "Never was more foul desecration done the memory and spirit of the days of 1776."⁴⁶

The insular cases in the spring of 1901 were followed by almost a year of silence on the subject of the Philippines. It took the events of the spring of 1902 to arouse a reaction from the Omaha paper.

The Fifty-seventh Congress held hearings "on affairs in the Philippines," during which many dramatic heated exchanges took place between Senators critical of the war, and Generals critical of the Senators.⁴⁷

While Taft was in Washington testifying, "pacification" intensified in the Islands. At the town of Balangiga in Samar, American troops were massacred; no prisoners were taken. The

⁴⁵ Ibid., July 4, 1901.

⁴⁶ Ibid., July 7, 1901.

⁴⁷ See the three volumes of testimony in Hearings, cited previously (Senate Documents 4242, 4243, and 4244, paginated consecutively). Highlights are the exchanges between Taft and Democratic Senator Charles Culberson, of Texas (pp. 71-80), parts of the testimony of General Robert Hughes (pp. 554-60; 635-66), and all of MacArthur's testimony (esp. pp. 1571-1956). Admiral Dewey's testimony and General Otis' testimony are of little value. A good selection of excerpts is available in paperback in the "Testimony of the Times" series. See Henry F. Graff, ed., American Imperialism and the Philippine Insurrection (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969). The World-Herald's coverage of the hearings was sparse. See World-Herald (1902), April 9, p. 5; April 13, p. 6; May 7, p. 1; May 8, p. 1; May 10, p. 3; and three editorials: May 13, June 29, and July 5.

gory details inflamed the troops, and General Jacob Smith ordered Major General Littleton Waller to kill all males over the age of ten and turn the island of Samar into a "howling wilderness." An extremely violent campaign resulted; when reports of the slaughter reached Chaffee he was disturbed, and ordered an investigation that resulted in the trial of Waller for murder, and of General Smith for "conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline."⁴⁸

The first major coverage⁴⁹ to appear in the World-Herald was the appearance of background information. A report from Major Cornelius Gardener, civil governor of the province of Tabayas, was released to the Senate. It revealed that the policies of laying waste to the land, use of water torture and other tactics were engendering a deep hatred of the Americans. Major Gardener felt that "the small number of irreconcilable insurgents still in arms . . . does not justify the means employed. . . ."⁵⁰ There was no editorial comment.

Shortly after, it was revealed that Secretary Elihu Root had ordered Chaffee to investigate "Charges of Barbarity."⁵¹

⁴⁸ See Joseph L. Schott, The Ordeal of Samar (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964), for details of the "pacification" campaign and the trials. Waller was acquitted; Smith was found guilty and was summarily retired; Roosevelt and Root were embarrassed. Also see Blount, American Occupation, pp. 376ff; Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 356ff.

⁴⁹ There was a minor item buried on page 14 of the March 23rd issue on the opening of Waller's trial.

⁵⁰ World-Herald, April 11, 1902, p. 1.

⁵¹ Ibid., April 16, 1902, p. 1.

There was no immediate editorial comment, but two days later the editors did note that "the American people have been deliberately and persistently deceived," seeing censorship as the main issue.⁵² As the case against Smith emerged,⁵³ the World-Herald reprinted an item from the Philadelphia North American which recounted a number of reports, like that of Major Gardener, that had reached the Administration. The Omaha editors concluded that it would be difficult for the government to plead ignorance.⁵⁴

The "water cure" became a topic. An eyewitness account reported that internal pressure resulting from being bloated full of water caused blood to issue from the victim's eyes and nose.⁵⁵ The World-Herald did not comment on this harsh image of the reality of the war. If the World-Herald had carried the "Mr. Dooley" column, they might have printed his biting version:

We are giving hundreds of these poor benighted heathen the well-known, old-fashioned American water cure. . . . Under the influence of the hose that cheers but does not inebriate [the captive] soon . . . swells up to a realization of the grandeur of his adoptive country. One gallon makes him give three groans for the Constitution. At four gallons, he will ask to be wrapped in the flag.⁵⁶ At the dew point he sings "Yankee Doodle." . . .

⁵² Ibid., April 18, 1902.

⁵³ Ibid., April 21, 1902, p. 1

⁵⁴ Ibid., April 25, 1902.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 5.

⁵⁶ Mr. Dooley Remembers: The Informal Memoirs of Finley Peter Dunne, edited by Philip Dunne (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963), p. 294. This passage occurs in an excellent satire on Mr. Taft's reports on conditions in the Islands, pp. 292-95. (Mr. Dooley's brogue is deleted in the book.)

In New York a Major General Brookes defended the water cure, on the grounds that war is brutal.⁵⁷ This, and General Smith's orders to kill and burn, aroused the Omaha editors to action: ". . . this sounds more as if it came from some cannibal chieftain than from an American officer. . . . Advancing civilization? We are sending it backward."⁵⁸

As the Smith trial went on,⁵⁹ the paper warned that if the General were acquitted on the grounds that he was following orders, the American people would want to know who, higher up, was responsible. If he were acquitted on the grounds that his conduct of the war was within a General's powers, "the conscience of the American people will revolt."⁶⁰

General MacArthur, meanwhile, was facing difficult questioning in the Senate,⁶¹ especially in regard to the high Filipino death rates in some provinces.⁶² He accepted

⁵⁷World-Herald, April 24, 1902, p. 1. Dean Worcester also defended the water cure; The Philippines, p. 215. A score of enlisted men testified to the Senate on the water cure: see Hearings, pp. 2061-2860, passim.

⁵⁸World-Herald, April 28, 1902.

⁵⁹Ibid., April 29, 1902, p. 5; May 4, 1902, p. 3; May 17, 1902, p. 1; May 20, 1902, p. 1.

⁶⁰Ibid., May 5, 1902. (Smith was not acquitted.)

⁶¹See MacArthur's testimony on Samar in Hearings, pp. 1571-93.

⁶²World-Herald, May 1, 1902, p. 3

responsibility for the deceptions used in the capture of Aguinaldo, he said, but not for General Smith's tactics.⁶³

The World-Herald had evidently not realized the importance of Civil War General Order Number 100. To judge from the headlines, they were thunderstruck when it was introduced in General Smith's trial,⁶⁴ and they scoured the Order for explicit prohibitions of cruelties and excesses. They denied that General Order 100 justified General Smith's orders, and were particularly incensed over the G.O.P.'s attempt to bring Abe Lincoln into the trial. He was far too great a man to condone such barbarities.⁶⁵

In addition to the Senate hearings and the Smith trial, the Lodge Philippine government bill, which in essence further fleshed out the Spooner Amendment, prompted general debate on

⁶³ Ibid., April 30, 1902, p. 8. Actually, MacArthur's own pacification proclamation of December 20, 1900 (pp. 91-92 of War Department Reports, 1901), and General Smith's Circular Order Number 6 of December 24, 1901 (p. 208 of War Department Reports, 1902), shared certain similarities, both being based on the Civil War General Order Number 100, particularly the notion in Rule 29: "The more vigorously wars are pursued the better it is for humanity. Sharp wars are brief." (p. 25 of Charges of Cruelty in the Philippines.) This essentially abstract notion was part of MacArthur's imperialism. As he put it in War Department Reports, 1901 (p. 113), he felt the war was necessary to acquire the Philippines as "the stepping-stone to commanding influence, if not political, commercial, and military supremacy, in the East."

above,
p. 44

⁶⁴ World-Herald, May 1, 1902, p. 1

⁶⁵ Ibid., May 11, 1902. This theme was repeated for several days; World-Herald, May 12, 13, 14, and was the subject of an editorial cartoon, May 15, 1902, p. 1.

Philippine policy.⁶⁶ Senators Rawlins and Carmack attacked Administration policy. After two weeks of such attacks, the Republicans abandoned their lofty silence and counterattacked,⁶⁷ and the debate raged for several more weeks, until the final headlines: "Lodge Philippine Bill Passed by the Senate: Last Day of Debate Arouses Little Interest."⁶⁸

In the six weeks of debate, the only editorial to appear was one dealing with Republican efforts to change the term "reconcentration camps" (which smacked of Weylerism) to the less offensive "concentration camps."⁶⁹

It would be unfair to say that the editors were tired of these issues, but outside of special events such as the insular cases and General Smith's trial, very few anti-imperialist editorials appeared during 1901 and 1902.⁷⁰ It might be more accurate to say that the editors felt they had simply exhausted all possible arguments and that all avenues of change had been closed, having been defeated at the polls and in

⁶⁶Ibid., April 25, p. 1; April 26, p. 7; April 27, p. 1; May 2, p. 1; May 4, p. 1.

⁶⁷Ibid., May 5, 1902, p. 5 ⁶⁸Ibid., June 4, 1902, p. 1

⁶⁹Ibid., May 28, 1902.

⁷⁰Those that did appear dealt with such topics as the second anniversary of the outbreak of war (World-Herald, February 5, 1901), Mark Twain's notable North American Review article (World-Herald, February 7, 1901; see Wolff, Brown Brother, pp. 356-37); a glaring conflict of interest by the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, who was also president of the Philippine Lumber and Development Company (World-Herald, March 4, 1901); religious perspectives on the issues (World-Herald, March 9, 1901, June 8, 1902); and, of course, the endless feud with Rosewater and the Bee (World-Herald, March 24, 1902).

court. Two events constituted the coup de grace to the topic: the official end of the insurrection, and Teddy Roosevelt's presidency.

On July 4, 1902, Secretary of War Root proclaimed that "The insurrection against the sovereign authority of the United States in the Philippine Archipelago having ended,

. . . the office of military governor in said archipelago is terminated."⁷¹ At the same time, President Roosevelt issued his proclamation of peace and a general amnesty.⁷²

The World-Herald reported the official end of the insurrection,⁷³ but confined its Fourth of July oratory to an analogy with the abolitionist struggle. Someday democracy and the war critics would triumph just as William Lloyd Garrison had. "History will repeat itself. The men who protest against present day policies are not . . . fanatics, they are not public enemies."⁷⁴

But first place in the editors' concerns was no longer taken by issues of war and peace. Attention was now diffused

⁷¹The full text is available in Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 128-29.

⁷²Ibid., Vol. II, Appendix X. War Department reports continued to insist that the Filipino majority welcomed the Americans and that the insurrection, with minor exceptions, was dying out. See War Department Reports, 1902, p. 3; 1903, p. 25; 1904, p. 1; 1905, p. 59; and 1906, p. 40. The latter notes that the Philippines are now in "orderly condition aside from" some ten pages of disorders.

⁷³World-Herald, July 4, 1902, p. 1

⁷⁴Ibid.

among many other interests: government-promoted irrigation, local trash-and-garbage hauling monopoly, the Panama Canal, Carrie Nation in Omaha, and proper school attire.⁷⁵

Finally, in Teddy Roosevelt the World-Herald found an imperialist far more subtle and complex than William McKinley. The transition of power and the final stages of the World-Herald's editorial attitudes deserve a close look.

On September 6, 1901, Leon Czolgosz shot President McKinley. The Omaha paper stated that "in the presence of the great calamity . . . we are all democrats, we are all republicans, we are all populists, we are all imperialists and we are all anti-imperialists."⁷⁶

Doctors were initially optimistic: "Now Sure President Will Live," "All Fears Vanish,"⁷⁷ and the editors noted that in "the excitement of the hour, . . . too many were betrayed into extremes of execration for the assailant and eulogy for his victim."⁷⁸ They opposed greater security measures for Presidents, denied that critics of McKinley could be partly to blame, and were cautious on the matter of an anarchist conspiracy.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Ibid., July 2, 1901; April 13, 1901; March 24, 1902; April 26, 1902, p. 24; May 24, 1902.

⁷⁶ Ibid., September 7, 1901.

⁷⁷ Ibid., September 11 and 12, 1901, p. 1

⁷⁸ Ibid., September 11, 1901.

⁷⁹ Ibid., September 10, 12 and 16, 1901.

McKinley took a "Sudden Unfavorable Change"⁸⁰ and died. Of his successor, the editors said Roosevelt "has seemed to be impulsive" but hoped he would be "wise and patriotic."⁸¹ A not very flattering biography filled readers in on his background.⁸²

On the occasion of Roosevelt's first message to Congress, the Omaha paper noted that it was refreshing to see something so pleasantly readable from a high official, and that it contained encouraging support for the development of the West, but little on trusts.⁸³ The editorial did not even mention whether or not the President's message dealt with imperialism, but the text indicated that it did. Roosevelt urged the acquisition of markets abroad and stated that we must be cautious about granting too great a degree of independence to the Filipinos.⁸⁴

That spring, during the Smith trial and Senate hearings, a significant editorial appeared. If President Roosevelt were to wage war on the trusts, said the editors, the American people would be overwhelmingly grateful; such important action would endear the President to men of all political parties.⁸⁵ Two

⁸⁰ Ibid., September 13, 1901, p

⁸¹ Ibid., September 15, 1901.

⁸² Ibid., September 15, 1901, p. 7, and September 22, p. 22.

⁸³ Ibid., December 4, 1901.

⁸⁴ Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁸⁵ Ibid., May 6, 1902.

days after he apparently ended the war, Roosevelt was reported to be working on a bill to regulate the trusts.⁸⁶

Roosevelt took action in 1902 on two important fronts: he directed his Attorney-General to initiate an anti-trust suit against Northern Securities Company, the Hill-Morgan-Harriman railway trust, and he secured passage of the Newlands Reclamation Act, which financed irrigation by sale of public lands. While Roosevelt's motivations for these acts were his own,⁸⁷ it must have seemed to the World-Herald that here was a President who shared their opposition to corporate power and their support for development of the West.

The editors had maintained that imperialism was the policy of trust-coddling pro-business Republicans who thirsted for overseas markets as an alternative to domestic development. How, then, could they explain an anti-trust, pro-West imperialist Republican? Their theoretical basis lacked the analytical power to cope with a Roosevelt. Trapped by the limits of their ideology, they fell back on a vague exhortation to fight on, on the side of truth.⁸⁸ Independence for the Filipinos would come "someday in the future, near or far."⁸⁹

⁸⁶Ibid., July 6, 1902, p. 1.

⁸⁷See the interesting interpretive essay by John Morton Blum, The Republican Roosevelt (New York: Atheneum, 1968).

⁸⁸World-Herald, December 8 and 25, 1901.

⁸⁹Ibid., March 26, 1902; also July 4, 1902.

In the 1904 Presidential campaign, the Democratic candidate, Alton B. Parker, made extensive and serious charges against the Administration's Philippines policy.⁹⁰ No editorial appeared in support of his charges.⁹¹

In 1907, the first elections to the Philippine National Assembly were held. The pro-American Federal Party was wiped out.⁹² Again, there was no editorial comment.⁹³

Finally, in 1916, the Jones Act was passed, with its definite promise of independence (at an indefinite date, however). Gilbert M. Hitchcock, publisher of the World-Herald, which had so consistently rejected the notion that any men can sit in judgment on the fitness of other men for self-government, was now in the United States Senate and was, in fact, chairman of the Committee on the Philippines. In this role he was instrumental in the passage of the Jones Act. This law, the World-Herald boasted, saw to it that the Filipinos "are to be trained . . . in the difficult art of self-government as an indispensable preliminary of freedom."⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Philippine Governor-General Luke Wright issued a detailed rebuttal; see Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 149-51.

⁹¹ A minor news item reported Parker's speech. World-Herald, October 16, 1904, p. 7.

⁹² Aguinaldo, Second Look, pp. 132-33; Forbes, The Philippine Islands, I, 146.

⁹³ A minor news item reported that an election was held. World-Herald, November 17, 1907, p. 1.

⁹⁴ Ibid., August 29, 1916. See also Patterson, "Hitchcock," pp. 364-65.

The world had changed. America stood on the verge of the Great War. The Philippine insurrection had been dead for years. With the adoption of the imperialist notion that Americans would decide when the Filipinos could be free, anti-imperialism, too, was dead.

V. Conclusion:
The Anti-Imperialism of the World-Herald

The anti-imperialism of the World-Herald was compounded of motives as diverse as those of the anti-imperialist movement across the nation.

Imperialism was seen, first and foremost, as the policy of a greedy capitalist ruling class, generally identifiable with the conservative wing of the Republican party. Economic, class, and partisan motives for opposing imperialism were, therefore, closely related. The moneyed aristocracy wanted new fields for the investment of capital, and as a result they were out to extend their system of economic exploitation to other races. Adding insult to injury, the taxpayers would be burdened with the costs of extending organized greed to the Philippines.¹

To what extent this viewpoint was part of a crusade on moral principle, and to what extent it was a pragmatic partisan weapon with which to attack the Republican party, is problematic, but from the important role played by religious arguments, it appears certain that the editors of the World-Herald were, on the whole, men imbued with deep religious convictions

¹For examples of this viewpoint, see World-Herald editorials for January 3 and 5, February 7, March 8, April 3, June 9, August 12, October 18, November 25, 1899; February 5, April 4, June 23, September 24, 1900; January 14, March 4, July 29, 1901; July 3, 1902.

antithetical to the moral system of imperialism.² These were God-fearing men to whom this war was a sin. To base a war of conquest on the gospel of the Prince of Peace was to reduce Christianity to the level of Islam's "Mahomet or the sword."³

Generally, Christianity was absorbed, along with the Constitution, in a conservative quasi-religious Americanism. The editors felt that traditional principles and precedents were being abandoned or threatened by overseas expansion. Americans who respected the ideas on which this nation was founded must be shocked to see the Constitution trampled underfoot by an imperialist Executive branch of the government.⁴

In the World-Herald's opinion, proper Americanism would be concerned with building a strong unified nation, without class divisions and exploitation, a nation whose strength rested in the international scene, on moral example rather than on military force, and at home, on benevolent government rather than on selfish interests. Instead of expanding overseas, a policy that was bringing other nations to regard us

² Ibid., January 5, September 1, 1899; February 4, 1900; March 9, 1901; June 8, 1902. Their religious sentiment is evidenced not only by the content of the editorials but by the collections of inspirational essays and poems published by editor Richard Metcalfe and editorial writer Will Maupin. See entries for these authors in the Bibliography, below.

³ Ibid., June 7, 1899.

⁴ Ibid., January 12, and 16, February 14, October 12, 1899; January 10, August 20, September 15, 1900.

with fear, true Americanism would invest our excess capital in our own internal underdeveloped regions.⁵

Much of the opposition to the conquest of the Philippines was on humanitarian grounds. Aguinaldo's forces represented the aspirations of the Filipino people, said the World-Herald, and were being cut down like grain before the reaper. It was an inhumane policy to kill such numbers of people for so little cause.⁶

The brutal war was stifling American consciences and allowing militarism to flourish. Militarism was the final evil fruit of imperialism. The paper did not define "militarism"; its meaning was presumably self-evident and its growth was adequate condemnation of Administration policy. Militarism accounted for most of the government's budget, and was claiming human sacrifice--not only abroad but close to home, in Nebraska, where a deserter was shot.⁷

A large standing army would bring with it the danger of abuse of power. The editors feared such an army would be

⁵ Ibid., February 23, p. 5; March 8, June 24, October 23, 1899; January 29, April 1, 1900.

⁶ Ibid., March 28, April 3 and 12, June 23, 1899; March 23, November 14, 1900.

⁷ Ibid., March 8, May 12 and 15, September 12, 15, 21, October 12, November 22, 1899; February 17, April 22, November 22, 1899; February 17, April 22, November 1, 1900. On the deserter: December 4, 1899; January 8, 1900. Also note the editorial entitled, in approximately two-inch type, "Whither Are We Drifting?" which contained quotations from Republican papers on militarism, imperialism, and monarchism, September 24, 1900.

used "to shoot down laboring men who resort to strikes in order to obtain justice. . . ."8

Militarism would distract us from our true interests. "In our dreams of imperialism we have imagined that a monster navy, a giant army, a few islands . . . are all that is necessary to make a 'world power'." The drought Nebraskans were experiencing was a reminder that "after all our prosperity and our material greatness are not dependent so much upon the Kraeg-Jorgensen [rifle] and the cutlass as upon the plowshare and the reaper."9

To the extent that the Omaha paper's anti-imperialism consisted of normative statements, i.e., value judgments, it could be rebuffed by opposing statements of value. For example, the Army and Navy Journal asked what was wrong with militarism. Far from eating away at Germany's vitality, said the Journal, the discipline of that country's military had pervaded the entire society and was responsible for Germany's world leadership. The World-Herald could only respond by asking whether Americans truly wanted to be "a nation of warriors."10

⁸Ibid., November 4, 1900.

⁹Ibid., July 28, 1901. The editorial, entitled "The Impotence of a World Power," went on to note items needing attention, including perfecting the civil service, controlling the trusts, establishing a satisfactory financial system, and reducing the level of crime and violence.

¹⁰Ibid., November 1, 1900.

Framing the debate in terms of systems of moral values embittered the struggle between imperialist and anti-imperialist and made it difficult for either side to communicate with the other.¹¹ This moral absolutism made the election of 1900 appear to be Armageddon,¹² and asked imperialists to think of themselves not as mistaken but as evil.

Yet imperialist and anti-imperialist shared many of the common assumptions of late nineteenth-century America. Democracy was defined as a specific doctrine uniquely rooted in Anglo-Saxon history.¹³ An imperialist might ask how Anglo-Saxon traditions could be grafted onto Filipino culture. Without an understanding of the psychological relationship of individual self-realization to democratic culture,¹⁴ the question was one that most anti-imperialists could not answer.

We have seen¹⁵ that the Omaha editors sometimes accepted certain racial attitudes toward the Filipinos. There was some

¹¹This was partly due to the "personal, partisan type of journalism" that was popular at the time. Patterson, "Hitchcock," p. 187.

¹²World-Herald, January 12 and November 6, 1900.

¹³Ibid., July 1, 1900.

¹⁴For a traditional analysis of this relationship, see Zevedei Barbu, Democracy and Dictatorship: Their Psychology and Patterns of Life (New York: Grove Press, 1956). For an innovative approach, see Alan W. Watts, Psychotherapy East and West (New York: Pantheon Books, 1961).

¹⁵Above, page 46

fear that Filipino immigration would result from annexation, and the World-Herald asked if we were "ready to have the halls of Congress filled with their representatives." Was it worth shedding superior American blood to acquire an inhospitable territory inhabited by Asians?¹⁶

Race entered the picture in other ways. Imperialist Bishop Henry C. Potter drew an analogy between acquiring the Philippines and marrying a creole. The World-Herald agreed with the New York World which maintained that the analogy was not valid. Excluding the Philippines from the Constitution would make her a concubine, kept only for pleasure and profit.¹⁷

Central Europeans, Irish, and Latins in the United States feared that America was following Britain's example. The Anglo-Saxons on both sides of the Atlantic would sacrifice democracy at home while establishing empires abroad.¹⁸

The World-Herald's anti-imperialism was multifaceted. To a certain extent, no amount of effort can bring their anti-imperialist perspective into sharp focus, for two reasons. First, it was not a single viewpoint with a single argument

¹⁶ World-Herald, February 7, 1899.

¹⁷ Ibid., May 8, 1900.

¹⁸ On the ethnic theme, see Johnson, "Imperialism in Nebraska," pp. 153-55, and World-Herald, January 17, October 12, 16, 24, 26, December 3 and 18, 1899.

but as we have seen, a diverse collection of viewpoints and arguments. Second, one characteristic of most of their editorializing was a certain element of unreality, which deserves examination.

The anti-imperialists could make no realistic response to the challenge because they had no realistic perspective on themselves. The World-Herald's account of "The Foundation of Populism," for example, reveals only a superficial analysis of political and economic power.

During the long winter evenings the farmers . . . read and studied political history. . . . They noted the steady drifting of power . . . into the hands of money gamblers. . . . Like patriots they protested. . . .¹⁹

Their view of their opponents was equally simplistic:

The men who uphold trusts, the defamers of the Declaration of Independence, the advocates of imperialism and militarism, the apologists for Great Britain, the champions of corporate domination, the organized money power and all the enemies of popular government. . . .²⁰

Although they reported on the use of water torture and the widespread famine in the Philippines, there remained always an element of unreality, a light note, about the editors' attitude toward the war. What a joke it would be, they said,

¹⁹World-Herald, November 16, 1899.

²⁰Ibid., October 20, 1899. On occasion (October 8, 1900, p. 1), the editors publicized views on the alienation of the worker from his work under capitalism, but they failed to formulate a clear theory of the relationship between foreign policy and domestic ideology, beyond that inherent in the slogans quoted above.

to rotate the "carpet knights" and "barnacles" in Washington to posts in the Philippines.²¹ On learning that the army's rations were to include sauerkraut, they said this move was

calculated to spread death and disaster within the zone of its influence. A few whiffs of its odor after it had been left out . . . for a few days would paralyze even the stoutest Filipino. . . . It may be a cruel and inhuman kind of warfare, but war is hell.²²

Although they were opposed to the imperialist adventure, the editors were proud of the performance of Nebraskans in the war. The Omaha editors' cause was therefore weakened by a certain pride in the arrival on the world scene of the highest product of Nebraska, the World Cowboy. The rest of the country and the world had discovered "an intelligence, a humanity, a chivalry" in the cowboy, said the editors. His service in Cuba and the Philippines had earned him a crown.

The world has now become his plain. He has become a world power and everybody will congratulate him on the extension of his sphere of influence. . . . and it is to be presumed that the next European nation that gets into war will cry aloud for him.²³

Finally, the weakness of the World-Herald must include all those disadvantages under which the national anti-imperialist movement labored, particularly its heterogeneity. For example, although Grover Cleveland was an anti-imperialist, the World-Herald attacked him.²⁴ Hoar, Carnegie, Schurz, C. F. Adams

²¹ Ibid., November 26, 1900.

²² Ibid., January 22, 1901.

²³ Ibid., January 29, 1900.

²⁴ Ibid., October 20, 1899.

and others found it impossible to support Bryan.²⁵ The only element uniting these diverse interests was a negative one; they knew what they disliked, but could not agree on a positive alternative.

There were other national trends that entered the picture. A nationalistic pride in America's growing strength was combined with a sense of righteousness over the agony of Cuba. The charisma of Theodore Roosevelt who seemed to embody turn-of-the-century American values so perfectly, and a certain amount of wide-spread and often unconscious racism, which assumed that the lesser races were destined for white stewardship further weakened the anti-imperialists. Imperialist domination of the press, not unimportant in an age of mass communication, and partisanship, which made expansion a pawn in the game of political rivalry and obscured the long-range issues at stake, are additional considerations.²⁶

In the face of all this, perhaps it is less surprising that the World-Herald and the anti-imperialists lost their struggle against "the strange gods of imperialism and militarism"²⁷ than that they showed any significant ability to perceive the issue and put up a struggle at all.

²⁵Hofstadter, "Manifest Destiny and the Philippines," p. 190; Leuchtenberg, "Progressivism and Imperialism," pp. 486-88.

²⁶Hofstadter, "Manifest Destiny and the Philippines," esp. pp. 176, 182, 189-90; Leuchtenberg, "Progressivism and Imperialism," esp. pp. 497-99.

²⁷World-Herald, November 22, 1899.

VI. Bibliography

DOCUMENTS

- U.S. Congress. Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1898-1899. 55th Cong., 3d Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.
- _____. First Philippine Commission Report, 1899. 56th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899-1900.
- _____. Reports of the War Department, 1899. 56th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899-1900.
- _____. Report of the Taft Philippine Commission, 1900. 56th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.
- _____. Reports of the War Department, 1900. 56th Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900-1901.
- _____. Charges of Cruelty in the Philippines. 57th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901-1902.
- _____. Hearings on Affairs in the Philippines. 57th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901-1902.
- _____. Reports of the War Department: Philippine Commission, 1901. 57th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901-1902.

PRIMARY WORKS

- Aguinaldo, General Emilio, with V. A. Pacis. A Second Look at America. New York: Speller, 1957.
Simple and direct. No trace of residual anti-Americanism.
- Blount, James H. The American Occupation of the Philippines, 1898-1912. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.
Critical of imperialist policies. A very useful account.

Bryan, William Jennings. Bryan on Imperialism: American Imperialism: Viewpoints of United States Foreign Policy, 1898-1941. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1970.

Reproduction of Bryan on Imperialism: Speeches, Newspaper Articles and Interviews originally published in Chicago by Bentley & Company, 1900.

Bryan, Stevenson, Weaver, Hoar, Gompers, Carnegie, Adams, et alia. Republic or Empire? The Philippine Question. Chicago: The Independence Co., 1899.

A collection of essays and articles by anti-imperialists. Includes an appendix of documentary material. A review of sorts appeared in the World-Herald, April 5, 1899, p. 1.

Forbes, W. Cameron. The Philippine Islands. 2 vols.; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1923.

Forbes was Governor-General, 1909-1913, and had held other posts in the Philippines government.

Maupin, William. Sunny Side Up. Omaha, Nebraska: Acorn Press, 1926.

The essays of World-Herald editorial writer Maupin reveal a traditional "middle border" religious spirit. See, for example, the essay "Close to God," p. 47.

Metcalf, Richard L. "Bishop Sunbeams" and Other Stories of Service. Lincoln, Nebraska: Woodruff-Collins Press, 1909.

_____. "Of Such Is the Kingdom" and Other Stories From Life. Lincoln, Nebraska: Woodruff-Collins Press, 1906.

The essays of World-Herald editor Metcalf, like those of Maupin, are imbued with Christianity of an optimistic, sentimental sort.

Worcester, Dean C. The Philippines, Past and Present. One-volume revision; New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Revised by Ralston Hayden, who has added a biographical sketch of Worcester. Despite his obtrusive imperialist bias, Worcester's book is useful for its abundance of documentary materials, many unavailable elsewhere (e.g., captured insurgent documents).

SECONDARY WORKS

Barbu, Zevedei. Democracy and Dictatorship: Their Psychology and Patterns of Life. New York: Grove Press, 1956.

The psychological and sociological characteristics of democratic, fascist and communist political cultures.

Beale, Howard K. Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Beale sees imperialism as a result of conscious decisions by key persons.

- Beisner, Robert L. Twelve Against Empire: the Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
Covers Carl Schurz, E. L. Godkin, William James, Charles Eliot Norton, Edward Atkinson, Charles Francis Adams, George F. Hoar, Andrew Carnegie, Benjamin Harrison, John Sherman, Thomas Reed, and George S. Boutwell.
- Blum, John Morton. The Republican Roosevelt. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
An interesting interpretive essay.
- Dennett, Tyler. Americans in Eastern Asia: A Critical Study of United States' Policy in the Far East in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963. Reprint of Macmillan, 1922 edition.
A pioneering effort, still useful.
- Dunne, Philip, ed. Mr. Dooley Remembers: The Informal Memoirs of Finley Peter Dunne. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.
Turn-of-the-century political satire.
- Glad, Paul W. The Trumpet Soundeth: William Jennings Bryan and His Democracy, 1896-1912. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960.
Broad in scope; early chapters offer a close look at Plains culture.
- Graff, Henry F., ed. Testimony of the Times: American Imperialism and the Philippine Insurrection. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
Exerpts from Congressional hearings.
- Healy, Robert. U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.
A useful survey.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Social Darwinism in American Thought. Rev. ed.; New York: Beacon Press, 1955.
An important work, but of secondary importance for this thesis.
- La Feber, Walter. The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967.
Although they differ in period covered, La Feber and Williams (below) both see dynamic expansion as being inherent in the American economic system, as contrasted to Beale's position. La Feber provides the data, where Williams emphasizes analysis.
- Leech, Margaret. In the Days of McKinley. New York: Harper, 1959.
A well-written account, but of secondary importance.

May, Ernest R. Imperial Democracy: The Emergence of America as a Great Power. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.

Examines the effects of American expansion in the American and European press and government circles.

McCormick, Thomas J. China Market: America's Quest for Informal Empire, 1893-1901. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1967.
Economic determinism.

Morgan, H. Wayne. America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Attempts to prove that McKinley had no choice but to hold the Philippines, but suffers the disadvantage of brevity.

Morison, Samuel Eliot; Commager, Henry Steele; and Leuchtenberg, William E. The Growth of the American Republic. 2 vols.; New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
An introductory survey.

Olson, James C. History of Nebraska. 2nd ed.; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.
For background only.

Pomeroy, William J. American Neo-Colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
A detailed Marxist critique.

Pratt, Julius W. Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936.
Still useful.

Schott, Joseph L. The Ordeal of Samar. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964.
Detailed account of the campaign on Samar and the subsequent courts-martial.

Watts, Alan W. Psychotherapy East and West. New York: Pantheon Books, 1961.
Oriental paths to "liberation" and Occidental theories of "self-actualization."

Weinberg, Albert K. Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.
An indispensable classic.

Wiebe, Robert H. The Search for Order, 1877-1920. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
Good as background.

Williams, William Appleman. The Tragedy of American Diplomacy. Rev. ed.; New York: Delta, 1962.
Williams sees the creation of an "Open-Door Empire" as the result of expansive capitalism. According to Williams, "imperialism" lost, but "expansionism" won (pp. 34-38).

Wolff, Leon. Little Brown Brother: How the United States Purchased and Pacified the Philippine Islands at the Century's Turn. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961.
An enjoyable account, with a wealth of detail, written in a highly readable style.

ARTICLES

Bailey, John W. "The Presidential Election of 1900 in Nebraska: McKinley Over Bryan." Nebraska History. 54:4 (Winter, 1973), 560-84.

Bailey, Thomas A. "Was the Presidential Election of 1900 a Mandate on Imperialism?" Mississippi Valley Historical Review. 24:1 (June, 1937), 43-52.

Coletta, Paolo E. "Bryan, Anti-Imperialism and Missionary Diplomacy." Nebraska History. 44:3 (September, 1963), 167-87.

Curti, Merle E. "Bryan and World Peace." Smith College Studies in History. XVI:3-4 (April-July, 1931), 107-262.

Harrington, Fred H. "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900." Mississippi Valley Historical Review. 22:2 (September, 1935), 211-30.

Hofstadter, Richard. "Manifest Destiny and the Philippines" in Daniel Aaron, ed., America in Crisis. New York: Knopf, 1952.

Johnson, J. R. "The Saga of the First Nebraska in the Philippines." Nebraska History. 30:2 (June, 1949), 139-62.

_____. "Imperialism in Nebraska, 1898-1904." Nebraska History. 44:3 (September, 1963), 141-66.

_____. "Colonel John Miller Stotsenburg: Man of Valor." Nebraska History. 50:4 (Winter, 1969), 339-57.

Leuchtenberg, William E. "Progressivism and Imperialism: The Progressive Movement and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1916." Mississippi Valley Historical Review. 39:3 (December, 1952), 483-504.

Peterson, Paul V. "William Jennings Bryan: World-Herald Editor." Nebraska History. 49:4 (Winter, 1968), 348-71.

Rollins, John W. "The Anti-Imperialists and Twentieth Century Foreign Policy." Studies on the Left. 3:1 (n.d., 1962), 9-24.

Spector, Ronald. "Who Planned the Attack on Manila Bay?" Mid-America: An Historical Review. 53:2 (April, 1971), 94-102.

DISSERTATIONS

Patterson, Robert F. "Gilbert M. Hitchcock, A Story of Two Careers." Ph.D. thesis, University of Colorado, 1940.

Peterson, Paul V. "The Omaha Daily World and World-Herald, 1885-1964." Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1966. Two pages deal with anti-imperialism and the Philippines. (297-99).

Walker, Samuel E. "Populism and Industrialism: The Ideology of the Official Organ of the Nebraska Populist Movement." M.A. thesis, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1970.

NEWSPAPER

Evening World-Herald, Omaha, Nebraska, 1899.

Morning World-Herald, Omaha, Nebraska, 1900-1902.