

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1898.

Number 20.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

When hostilities between this country and Spain broke out, there was a reasonable fear they would not end until all the great nations of the world were at war. It may have been in some sense an explanation of this that led Spain on to the last ditch. Certain it is that she relied more upon the possibilities of European diplomacy, and of interference in her behalf by continental powers, though that would have involved counter-interference by Great Britain and consequently a world's war, than she did upon the strength of her own arms, or the weakness of ours. Fortunately, so terrible a calamity as universal war has for the present been avoided, but the prospects of universal peace are not encouraging. The ink is hardly dry upon the protocol which stops our conflict with Spain, when England begins to show signs of preparation for war with Russia.

Should England go to war with Russia, we of this country could in all sincerity reciprocate the sympathy we have just received from her, for she would be fighting for freedom. While it is true that the surface cause of her war would be Russian interference with British investments in a Chinese grant of railway monopoly, yet honorable causes lie deeper down. Russia is making encroachments upon the English policy of the "open door" in China—free trade there for all nations; and her action with reference to the railroad grant in immediate question is a culmination to those encroachments. The Russian policy is inimical to freedom; for commerce is so interwoven with free-

dom that freedom is menaced when commerce is obstructed. What gives to questions of commercial right a sordid tinge, is the fact that commercial benefits are so largely monopolized by means of grants to favored individuals. But for that, we should more clearly see that in resisting Russian aggression England stands for the American principle of liberty and equality. For that principle we should fight, and our sympathies cannot but go out to England when she fights for it, even though on the surface the war should be in the interest of monopoly investments.

It will be observed that the protocol under which hostilities between Spain and the United States are suspended pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace, makes no mention of the Spanish debt for which Cuba is mortgaged. Spain naturally wishes the United States to assume it. So do the bondholders. And in the course of the negotiations for peace this was proposed. The United States refused, however, to consider the matter in connection with the protocol, insisting upon unconditional relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty in Cuba. But there is no doubt that the peace commissioners might take Spain's wishes and those of her bondholders into consideration in framing the treaty. While Spain must relinquish Cuba whether we agree to provide for the debt or not, the treaty may nevertheless provide for it, if our peace commissioners, our president and our senate should so decide. That Spain is relying upon some such possibility is evident; and if her bondholders do not lobby for it till they are blue in the face, they are an entirely unique species of the bondholding genus. The fact that the Spanish Cuban bonds hold their own in the Paris market, is very significant of

the purposes and expectations of the fraternity of government note-shavers. It is within the possibilities, therefore, that in some shape the people of this country will have to think over the justice of protecting the owners of the Spanish bonds for which Cuba has been pawned. It is even more than a possibility. A prominent liberal statesman of Spain, an ex-minister, makes this statement:

I have reason for thinking that our government has received positive information of an unofficial assurance that the American government will do something for the Cuban debt. You know the Americans are practical people. Still, Spanish and foreign bankers, especially French, German and Belgian, have induced some powerful American speculators and financiers to buy Cuban stock with a view to creating a syndicate in New York that will oblige McKinley to listen to their arguments.

The question of making the Cuban debt good by the treaty of peace admits of but one answer. It must not be done. The people of the United States are, of course, under no possible obligations in justice to help either Spain or the bondholders. There was no privity between us and them in the issuing of the bonds. On the contrary the bonds were issued chiefly to pay the expenses of keeping up a bloody fracas near our front door. And no privity could be charged to us in consequence of our having beaten Spain in war and as a condition of peace forced her to get out of the neighborhood. If Spain had mortgaged the Caribbean sea, or the proceeds of a system of piracy which she carried on there, it would hardly be pretended that we incurred any liability for the mortgage by sending our battleships and driving her and her piratical system away. Why does not the same principle apply to a mortgaged system of piracy carried on upon an island in the Caribbean?

The liability of the Cubans is no greater than our own. To impose the burden of these bonds upon Cuba would be like charging a murdered man's estate for the weapon with which he was put out of the way. And when we get to the bottom of the matter, the people of Spain ought not to pay the bonds either. The bonds were never issued for their good, nor did they ever receive any benefit from the proceeds, as the bondholders well know. So far from being evidence of a nation's faith, these bonds are evidence of corrupt agreements between government note-shavers and a rascally government, and from any point of view their repudiation would be entirely just. It is not likely that any Spanish government will have the boldness and honesty to repudiate them, but if that were done it would clear the money-lending atmosphere immensely. No one thing could give a more healthy tone to political conditions generally, than an honest repudiation of one of the great fraudulent public debts of the world. It would be a new and wholesome interpretation to that eminently just maxim, "let the buyer beware."

Tammany Hall has spoken on the subject of territorial expansion, in characteristic fashion. Her mouth-piece is the redoubtable Richard Croker himself. "I do not believe"—says Mr. Croker in an interview given out for publication from Saratoga on the 12th of August—"I do not believe in giving up anything we have gained by this war; on the contrary, I believe in holding on to all we have gained, and reaching out for more."

Mr. Croker's utterance is full of native candor. Being the boss of Tammany Hall and speaking for that organization, he can afford to be candid, boldly and cheerfully so; for Tammany Hall indulges not in sentiment, nor tolerates it as a social or political element. There is no necessity. In politics for "what there is in it," Tammany men are undisturbed by moral considerations or political

principles of the higher grade. The moral considerations that weigh in the precincts of Tammany would never win prizes at Sunday school; the political principles which pass current there never rise above the rules of the game. And whether from indifference or policy, Tammany scorns to indulge in the homage which well-mannered vice is supposed to pay to virtue. She is no hypocrite. From long experience in holding on to all the plunder they gain and then reaching out for more, Tammany men have come to regard that as a principle of human conduct as just and honorable as it is wise and profitable. It is no reflection, therefore, upon Tammany patriotism, if they recommend the same principle to the United States. If expansion of territory is to be desired, nothing could be more natural to either Tammany or its boss than gravely to propose as he has done that we hold on to all we have gained by the war, and reach out for more.

The only difference, unfortunately, between Tammany and the rest of the expansionists is in Tammany's candor. While Tammany, wishing to grab, plainly says so, the others give their predatory propositions nice names and bury the larcenous intent in pretty phrases. The purpose of all, however, is the same and unmistakable. Gen. Gomez understood it from the beginning. When at the outbreak of the war—the story is upon the authority of E. Hernandez, one of his close friends, who recently made it public through a Chicago interview—when at the outbreak of the war, his attention was called to the disclaimer on the part of the United States of all intention to acquire territory, Gomez "would only shake his head and say that whatever America's present intention might be, there could only be one end to the matter, with American troops and generals conducting the campaign, and that was the complete ascendancy of American rule." Gomez was right in his fears. Unless the American people denounce the policy, we shall, in Croker's plain

language, hold fast to all we get, and reach out for more. This policy contemplates the appropriation of Cuba.

Since a positive pledge stands in the way of reaching out boldly for Cuba—Tammany fashion, Croker fashion, highwayman fashion—as we are reaching out for Puerto Rico, we are under the necessity of reaching out for it sneak-thief fashion. John Morley explains the method in his account of the "forward" rake's progress. He is describing the British method, but that is the method we are preparing to imitate. Mr. Morley says:

First, you push on into territories where you have no business to be, and, in our case, where you had promised you would not go; secondly, your intrusion provokes resentment, and in these wild countries resentment means resistance; thirdly, you instantly cry out that the people are rebellious and that their act is rebellion, this in spite of your own assurance that you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them; fourthly, you send a force to stamp out the rebellion; and fifthly, having spread bloodshed, confusion and anarchy, you declare, with hands uplifted to the heavens, that moral reasons force you to stay, for if you were to leave, this territory would be left in a condition which no civilized Power could contemplate with equanimity or with composure. These are the five stages of the Forward Rake's Progress.

That is a fairly good outline of the plan which American Tories, less blunt than Croker, are inculcating with reference to Cuba. If not exact it is at least suggestive. First, we are to establish a military government in Cuba, where we have no business except to turn over the relinquished island to the Cuban republic, which our congress has distinctly recognized. Then, when our unwarranted military dominion excites resentment of some sort, we are to find it necessary to remain in control for the sake of "stability." Finally, we are to see our way, as a necessity, of staying permanently; and thus for moral reasons—reasons that would make Croker impatient, but which are nevertheless intended adroitly to justify his all too bluntly expressed purpose—we are to

do in Cuba what England has been doing in Egypt.

When England went into Egypt, it was upon a pledge to evacuate the country when she should have established a stable government there. But after two decades of occupation she is adjusted to the idea of remaining. English Tories do not intend that she shall ever evacuate. When the ministry were recently interpolated as to whether the government intended to stop in Egypt, Mr. Balfour replied that the present situation did not "seem to call for any declaration of policy beyond those which have already been made." That was all the satisfaction the minority in parliament were able to obtain. But the London Spectator, the great Tory weekly, mildly rebukes Balfour for not having gladly taken advantage of the question to make a frank statement. "We should have liked him to have faced the problem fairly and squarely," says the Spectator—

and to have told the house and the nation how these conditions have not been fulfilled; and how every year it has appeared more and more clear that they will not be fulfilled; and how, in fact, it has become evident that evacuation is a moral and physical impossibility. Then he should have gone on,—When once a man finds he has blundered into a declaration as to future acts, which it is clear he cannot carry out, the honorable thing for him to do is to state publicly that he finds he will be unable to act upon his declarations. Men have constantly to admit to such mistakes, and no reasonable person can accuse them of faithfulness, if they do not conceal their mistake after they have themselves become aware of it. We cannot, we find, act upon our declarations as to evacuation without ruining Egypt; therefore, we take an early opportunity of withdrawing those declarations once and for all. That is, we contend what the government ought now to say and do, but what, unfortunately, they do not say and do. Though they know that we shall not evacuate Egypt, though the country knows it, though all the foreign powers know it, the British government still refuses to officially admit the fact. The pretense that the idea of evacuation has not been abandoned has become a mere farce which takes in nobody.

We venture the prediction, that unless the people of the United States

promptly condemn the policy now forming in regard to Cuba, the foregoing extract from the Spectator, with only a few verbal alterations, will soon be as applicable to America in Cuba as it is now to England in Egypt.

Since the 30th of July the customs receipts at Santiago have exceeded \$60,000, which evokes much joyful palaver. But why should anyone but the Santiago landlords be joyful? All this money comes, first and last, out of the inhabitants and sojourners in Santiago and vicinity, in proportion to their consumption. To that extent the land owners are exempt, though they alone reap the financial benefits of the expenditure. Assuming the money to be wisely expended, their property will be augmented in value, and other kinds of property will not be.

This idea that public improvements add to the value of land is very difficult to grasp, when used as an argument for requiring the beneficiaries to pay the expense of the improvements; but when advanced as an inducement to investment in land it is as easily understood. For example, a real estate expert was recently quoted in a Chicago paper as urging the city to make a certain street improvement because it would increase land values in the vicinity from \$200 to \$1,000 a foot. He understood the point, and so did the owners. It is plain enough for anyone to see that public improvements enhance land values and no other values; and it ought to be as plain to an unseared conscience that the beneficiaries of this enhancement, and not the public generally, ought to foot the bill. Whoever rents his house, if he pays taxes for public improvements, is taxed double for them. He is taxed first in the tax he pays to the authorities, and second by his landlord in higher rent made possible by the very improvement for which he has already been taxed by the authorities.

Lyman J. Gage, in his interview on the return of peace, published on the

14th of August, said he could "see no reason why we should not now have a great share of prosperity." What did Mr. Gage mean? Are we to understand that all the talk of the prosperity touters for 18 months past has in his opinion, also, been mere buncombe? That is a reasonable inference from Mr. Gage's remark; and that all this talk has been mere buncombe, is, moreover, a positive fact.

A prosperity calendar would be entertaining. Somewhat more than two years ago, we were promised prosperity as soon as "the advance agent of prosperity" should be nominated for president. Then the date was postponed until he should be elected, one William J. Bryan having meantime recklessly thrust himself in the way. Accordingly, on the day after Mr. McKinley's election, the railroads and hotels swarmed with drummers, and a grand prosperity chorus burst forth from the throats of the touters; but in two weeks the drummers, utterly disappointed, swarmed back again. After that the "advance agent's" date was postponed month by month for a weary year; at first until his inauguration, then until he could settle down in his chair, then until a new tariff bill could be introduced, then until it could be signed, then until it could get fairly into operation; and at last, the tariff bill having failed to bring on the prosperity show, until we could get down to hotwork in the approaching war with Spain. But even the war didn't bring prosperity; perhaps because too few men were killed—for who could expect this fickle god to be tempted with so small a death offering? At any rate war as a prosperity producer proved to be as grand a failure as either McKinley's election or the Dingley tariff bill. Now, however, the people are assured that with peace, prosperity must come—it simply must! But it simply won't. The "want ads." will be as numerous as ever in the papers next winter, in the columns of "situations wanted," and as weak as ever in the columns of "help wanted."

J. Sterling Morton, Mr. Cleveland's secretary of agriculture, used to be a thorough going democrat of the Jeffersonian kind; but if he is to be judged by the prospectus of his new newspaper, *The Conservative*, published at Nebraska City, Neb., he has sadly fallen from grace. In that prospectus it is announced, for instance, that *The Conservative* will at all times and under all circumstances "stand up for equal rights to all the intelligent citizenship of the republic." What does Mr. Morton propose as to unintelligent citizens? Have they no rights which the intelligent are bound to respect? In what school of democracy, we should like to know, did Mr. Morton learn that equality of rights depends upon intelligence, more than upon property or birth or any other consideration except manhood?

This solicitude for the equal rights of the intelligent might pass for a mere awkward expression, were it not that Mr. Morton's prospectus is a confession that *The Conservative* starts out with a disposition to defend monopolies, those special privileges which the intelligent so often use their intelligence to lay hold of. He asserts that there is no menacing leisure class in the United States; yet he must know that even if our leisure classes are not menacing, some of those he includes in the working classes are decidedly so. Work devoted to getting or manipulating monopolies is menacing, and its purpose and effect is to establish a menacing leisure class in the next generation. Mr. Morton also speaks bravely for the rights of both labor and capital; but he evidently refers to their conflict of rights and not to the aggressions against both by monopoly. He is solicitous also about the rights of corporations, without, however, distinguishing from the special privileges of corporations, their legitimate property rights. True, he only speaks of defending their rights; but it is evident that he includes their special privileges, their plundering franchises, their monopolies, among their rights. If Mr. Morton really intends

to assail monopoly, his prospectus admirably keeps the secret.

Doubtless Mr. Morton's paper, *The Conservative*, has a horror of socialism. His attitude toward corporations implies it. That is wholesome, for some kinds of socialism are worse than a distemper. But in view of the indiscriminating tendency of his prospectus, we beg to submit a suggestion by means of an extract from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican. This extract, which expresses our own view exactly, better than we could express it ourselves, may be stimulating to Mr. Morton in his management of *The Conservative*. It refers primarily to old age pensions, and is as follows:

There is a "socialism" which would pauperize, demoralize and corrupt, and this pension scheme and all others that strive to bring government into the attitude of a guardian and patron of the individual is of that stamp. There is a "socialism," on the contrary, which strives simply to introduce conditions of substantial equality in economic opportunity—which aims to help men to help themselves, and this is a very different matter. Public ownership or control of what are called natural monopolies is styled socialistic, but the advocates of such a policy seek simply to remove inequalities of opportunity, which discriminate against labor and capital which has obtained the monopoly. Such a socialism, if that be the proper term, stands for no more than industrial equality, along with political equality, and insists as strenuously as the so-called individualist upon self-help, self-reliance, self-denial, and each being the architect of his own fortune. Old-age pensions and all like schemes are to be avoided for the very reason that they place the individual on a very different footing and make him a dependent ward of the state.

Congressman Maguire now a candidate for governor of California, is represented in the Congressional Record of August 3, by four speeches which furnish good reading, not only in California, but throughout the Union. All were delivered on the floor of congress. One of them deals with the subject of railroads. Maguire believes in public ownership of the roads as public highways, and private competitive operation of trains. Another

deals with the subject of the war revenue bill, and shows that nearly the whole burden of the war tax falls upon the poorer classes of the country. The third is an argument for the foreclosure of the government liens on the Central Pacific railroad; and the fourth denounces the labor arbitration bill as involving involuntary servitude. Judge Maguire's speeches are always interesting and inspiring. He is an eloquent and forceful speaker. But these speeches are in addition valuable contributions to the literature and history of the subjects with which they deal. It will be a bright day for California and a dark one for the millionaire looters of the Pacific slope, when Maguire takes the oath of office as governor of California.

SELF GOVERNMENT.

I.

When the American colonies had determined to throw off the despotic government of Great Britain, and, as they expressed it, "to assume among the nations of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God" entitled them, they formally stated the causes that impelled them to the separation. In doing so, and in justification of their revolutionary intentions, they also proclaimed certain principles which they held to be self-evident truths. The document in which those causes of separation were stated and those self-evident truths proclaimed, is known to every American schoolboy as "the declaration of independence."

In so far as that declaration states the causes that impelled the colonies to throw off a foreign yoke, it is to us only an historical monument. However oppressive, however arrogant, however tyrannical the policy of George III. may have been toward his colonies in America, that policy is to this generation of Americans of no vital concern. It belongs with the dead and buried past. But in so far as the declaration of independence enunciates what its signers describe as self-evident truths, it is not a mere landmark of history. In that respect it is the pole star of our national progress, the chart by which our ship

of state must steer or be pounded on the rocks; it is the breath of national life which God breathed into the nostrils of our nation. Those truths are indeed self-evident, and they are as vital now as they ever were or ever will be. Incontestable inferences from the all-embracing principle of the universal fatherhood of God, and the consequent universal brotherhood of man, and therefore denied only by atheism, they make the declaration of independence immortal, and place this nation, to the degree that it faithfully holds to them, in the van of human progress.

II.

First among these self-evident truths which the founders of our nation proclaimed is this, that "all men are created equal." That does not imply that all men are created equal in size or strength, or intellect, or will; but that they are equally endowed by their Creator, as the declaration of independence goes on to explain, "with certain unalienable rights," among which "are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It is equality of rights, therefore, and not uniformity of personal characteristics, with which all men are held to be endowed.

Proceeding from this primary truth, the declaration of independence next proclaims the rightful origin and scope of government. By what right do we place any man's conduct under governmental control? and whence comes authority to govern? The answer is made plain. Government relates to the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, already asserted, and it originates with the people themselves. "To secure these rights," says the declaration, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Just powers of government, then, are derived from the consent of the governed; other governmental powers are unjust. This fundamental proposition of our immortal declaration of independence is also an unavoidable corollary of the primary principle that "all men are created equal;" for if all are created equal, none can be specially commissioned to govern.

Nor let it be doubted that the principle of self government is sound,

though we have not yet learned how to apply it with exactitude. We are obliged to assume, in the absence of better methods, that the consent of the majority is the consent of all. Upon the surface, that may appear to be absurd; but there can be no denial that it is an honest effort to put the principle of self-government in practice. It is the method to which free men always and everywhere naturally resort to harmonize differences among them. At any rate, it is in the present state of human development the only known way of ascertaining the public will; and, when fairly used, this method does approximately and in the long run secure the intended result—government by the consent of the governed. When right, the will of the majority soon comes to be the will of all; when wrong, it comes only somewhat more slowly to be the will of a vanishing minority.

III.

This doctrine that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, as expressed by the voice of the majority, is the life giving principle of the American policy. Not only is it proclaimed by the declaration of independence, but it is woven into our national history. True, we have not been strictly faithful to it. Manhood suffrage did not begin with the government, and womanhood suffrage has still to establish its claims. These faults, however, like the continued recognition of the slave trade and the persistent protection of chattel slavery, are to be accounted for rather as short-comings, than as evidence of national hostility to national ideals. They were not deliberately adopted in the face of our declaration of independence; they merely survived the regime which it abolished, and lapped over into the one which it instituted. Inconsistencies of that sort are but the wriggling of the snake's tail after the snake is killed. But all the great deliberate changes of public policy since the declaration of independence, from the ordinance of 1787 to the fifteenth amendment, have been in harmony with the principle of equality and the doctrine of self-government.

Now, however, we are confronted with a situation which puts our sincerity in these respects to a crucial

test. We are advised not merely to retain old wrongs in conflict with the declaration of independence, but to establish new ones. The so-called "forward" movement, which we are being dragooned into adopting with reference to Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Cuba, is in fact a backward movement. Conceived in the vicious principle that some people are created either without rights, or with rights inferior to others who are therefore their natural rulers, this movement challenges the integrity of the declaration of independence, threatens the consistency of our national polity, and trifles with our good faith as a people.

IV.

Already we have annexed the Hawaiian islands without submitting the question to the inhabitants. The sole pretext of regularity in that annexation rests upon the consent, not of the people whom we have thus decided to govern, nor a majority of them, but of a very small minority, mostly Americans, who usurped their power by force of arms and hold it by disfranchising the vast majority. We have thus undertaken to impose our own government upon the Hawaiians without their consent, thereby assuming to institute over them a government which, so far as they are concerned, derives none of its powers from the consent of the governed.

Puerto Rico is not yet annexed, but shameless preparations are in progress to seize it and hold it as American territory without the consent of its inhabitants. When the war with Spain began, only Cuba was thought of as likely to give rise to a question of annexation; and to allay all suspicion, we solemnly disclaimed any intention of annexing it, as solemnly declaring it to be our purpose to leave it to the government of its people. That disclaimer and declaration applies in spirit to all the territory conquered in the war—to Puerto Rico as well as to Cuba. If we appropriate Puerto Rico, we prove to the world that the war on our part was one of conquest, prove it as convincingly as we could by appropriating Cuba. We also prove that our declaration of independence and our much-vaunted principle of equality and self-government are the veriest shams. Wholly irrespective of

the spirit of our pledge, the annexation of Puerto Rico without the consent of at least a majority of the male inhabitants would involve the institution over the people of that island of a government which, so far as they are concerned, would derive none of its powers from the consent of the governed.

What is thus true of Puerto Rico is also true of the Philippines. The spirit of our Cuban pledge stands against any appropriation of Philippine territory; and back of our pledge, and broader than our pledge, stands our declaration of independence—the charter not only of our own liberties, but of our recognition of the liberties of mankind—proclaiming the fundamental principle of the American ideal of government, that governments “derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.” We cannot appropriate the Philippine islands nor any of them without denying to the inhabitants what we claim for ourselves as one of the natural rights of man—without instituting a government over them which would derive none of its powers from the consent of the governed.

Worse than all would be the appropriation of Cuba. As to that island we are bound not merely by the spirit of our pledge; we are bound by the pledge itself. To the inhabitants of Cuba, and to all the world besides, we made this pledge when we ordered Spain to withdraw:

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

In the face of that pledge, we could not honorably add Cuba to our territory without first receiving complete and convincing evidence of the general desire of the inhabitants. We certainly could not do so, pledge or no pledge, without such evidence as would demonstrate that the people of Cuba whom we propose to govern had by at least a majority vote given their consent. Yet there is little effort on the part of the tory organs of the United States to conceal what is fast developing into the definite purpose of our government, to establish American sovereignty and jurisdic-

tion over the Cubans. So far as they are concerned, that would be instituting a government deriving no powers from the consent of the governed.

V.

Nor is it proposed merely to establish the American government over these different parts of the world without the consent of the people to be governed. If that were all, the wrong might wear away with lapse of time; and while the act would be infamous and the precedent fraught with danger to American ideals, the ultimate effect might not be disastrous. But in addition to this it is proposed to maintain indefinitely over the territory in question a government deriving none of its powers in that connection from the consent of the inhabitants. The inhabitants are to be for the most part permanently disfranchised. At a seat of government far removed, a president, congressmen and supreme court judges, in the selection and control of whom they are to have no voice, are to hold absolute sway over them and their fortunes and liberties, even to the extent of selling them to other powers. This policy cannot be put into operation on so grand a scale without reacting upon the liberties of the people at home. It would repeat the experience of Rome and her provinces.

Thus to deliberately disregard the declaration of independence in entering upon a new policy, is to cast it wholly aside; and its principles once permanently cast aside as to the inhabitants of territory that we annex, the way would be paved for abandoning them as to the people of the States themselves. Let a disfranchised class be once established, and disfranchisement will know no limit short of the will of the ruling classes. Yet this is the policy which the American tory now invites us to inaugurate in connection with the new territory he asks us to annex.

VI.

Every wickedness has its excuse, and the “forward” movement is not without one. The reason urged for proposing to disregard our own foundation principle of government and to institute and permanently maintain governments over distant peoples

without their consent, is that those peoples are unfitted for self-government, and must not be granted that privilege until they are fit.

That has been the plea for autocracy since freedom was first snatched from the human race. Every extension of the right of self-government has been acquired against the protests of the tories of the time, who urged, with quite as much reason as is now advanced against Cuban self-government, that the persons seeking enfranchisement were unfit. Had the plea prevailed in the past, few of those who now object to self-government in Cuba would yet be fit, in the estimation of their “betters,” for self-government themselves.

Whether the Cubans are as weak and vile as they are described, we need not consider. It is enough in passing to say that the more responsible correspondents in Cuba defend them, and that Gen. Lawton denies the charges of uselessness and cowardice preferred against them, while Gen. O. O. Howard testifies to their competency for self-government. Whatever the truth in this regard may be, it is immaterial. We shall look in vain in the declaration of independence for an assertion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of those who are fitted for self-government. The powers are there declared to come from the consent of the governed. There are but two natural limitations to the right of self-government, and they are only apparently limitations—insanity and infancy. Without other exception fitness is not an element. The very fact that people are governed raises in them, fitted or unfitted, the right to participate in the governing. Either that, or the declaration of independence and our whole advance as a nation, in so far as we have advanced, rest upon false doctrine.

It can make no difference, therefore, from the American point of view, whether the Cubans are wise or foolish, weak or strong, learned or ignorant, brave or cowardly, white or black, industrious or lazy, generous or selfish, just or unjust, clean or dirty, full or hungry, rich or poor; whatever their personal characteristics may be, so long as they are sane and of an age which removes them,

according to generally recognized standards, from the natural tutelage of infancy, they are of right entitled to exercise all the functions of citizenship.

VII.

Self-government is the only natural government. It is the kind of government that all were intended for. This is well enough proved by the fact that no one has ever produced a natural commission to govern others without their consent, which did not in the end turn out to be a commission to misgovern them.

Macaulay riddled all the arguments against self-government, which make fitness a prerequisite, when he said—

There is only one cure for the evils which newly acquired freedom produces; and that cure is freedom. When a prisoner first leaves his cell he cannot bear the light of day; he is unable to discriminate colors or to recognize faces. But the remedy is not to remand him into his dungeon, but to accustom him to the rays of the sun. The blaze of truth and liberty may at first dazzle and bewilder nations which have become half blind in the house of bondage. But let them gaze on and they will soon be able to bear it.

Yet we are urged by the organs of American torism to prevent self-government, and ourselves to undertake and indefinitely maintain the responsibilities of government, in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippines, regardless of the consent of the inhabitants. We are urged, that is to say, to take these islands as colonies, and to hold them in that condition, the condition of our own original 13 states before the revolution.

If unhappily we agree to do this, let us at least be candid about the matter. Let us first frankly denounce the self-evident truths of the declaration of independence as self-evident lies, acknowledge that our whole policy of giving life and force to that instrument has been mistaken, and explain that Lincoln dealt in empty platitudes when in his memorable Gettysburg oration he said: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Dorothy (who is accustomed to have her eggs prepared before they come to the table)—"Mamma, can't I have my eggs cooked with the covers on some time, same as you do?"—Judge.

NEWS

The peace negotiations between Spain and the United States, which we were able to report last week as nearing a favorable end, were completed at 4:23 o'clock in the afternoon of Friday, August 12th.

The protocol was signed at the White House in the presence of the president by Jules Cambon, ambassador from France, in behalf of Spain, and by William R. Day, United States secretary of state, in behalf of the United States. It is as follows:

His Excellency, M. Cambon, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the French republic at Washington, and Mr. William Day, Secretary of State of the United States, having received respectively to that effect plenary powers from the Spanish government and the government of the United States, have established and signed the following articles which define the terms on which the two governments have agreed with regard to the questions enumerated below and of which the object is the establishment of peace between the two countries—namely:

Article 1. Spain will renounce all claim to all sovereignty over and all her rights over the island of Cuba.

Article 2. Spain will cede to the United States the Island of Puerto Rico and the other islands which are at present under the sovereignty of Spain in the Antilles, as well as an island in Ladrona Archipelago, to be chosen by the United States.

Article 3. The United States will occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines.

Article 4. Spain will immediately evacuate Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the Antilles. To this effect each of the two governments will appoint commissioners within ten days after the signing of this protocol, and these commissioners shall meet at Havana within thirty days after the signing of this protocol with the object of coming to an agreement regarding the carrying out of the details of the aforesaid evacuation of Cuba and other adjacent Spanish islands; and each of the two governments shall likewise appoint within ten days after the signature of this protocol other commissioners, who shall meet at Puerto Rico within thirty days after the signature of this protocol, to agree upon the details of the evacuation of Puerto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the Antilles.

Article 5. Spain and the United States shall appoint to treat for peace

five commissioners at the most for either country. The commissioners shall meet in Paris on October 1 at the latest to proceed to negotiations and to the conclusion of a treaty of peace. This treaty shall be ratified in conformity with the constitutional laws of each of the two countries.

Article 6. Once this protocol is concluded and signed hostilities shall be suspended, and to that effect in the two countries orders shall be given by either government to the commanders of its land and sea forces as speedily as possible.

Immediately upon the signing of the protocol in behalf of the two governments, President McKinley issued a proclamation suspending hostilities. His proclamation bears date August 12, 1898. It recites the fact of the signing of the protocol, and, in accordance with the terms thereof, concludes in these words:

Now, therefore, I, William McKinley, president of the United States, do, in accordance with the stipulations of the protocol, declare and proclaim on the part of the United States a suspension of hostilities, and do hereby command that orders be immediately given through the proper channels to the commanders of the military and naval forces of the United States to abstain from all acts inconsistent with this proclamation.

Forthwith the president's proclamation was officially telegraphed to the naval and military commanders at the seat of war, and orders were given accordingly. Admiral Sampson was notified that the blockade of Cuba and Puerto Rico was raised, and directed to withdraw his vessels to different points, while the military commanders were instructed to inform the Spanish commanders. The orders to Admiral Dewey were not made public. On the 14th the governors general of Cuba and Puerto Rico acknowledged the receipt of peace orders from Madrid.

The proclamation of peace caught Gen. Miles in the midst of his campaign in Puerto Rico. As we explained last week, Gen. Miles was advancing in four columns from the southern coast of the island to San Juan, on the northern coast. Gen. Brooke, at the head of the right column was moving from Guayama to Cayey; Gen. Wilson, commanding the column of the right center was to move along the military road and, after passing through Coamo, to diverge to the east and join Gen. Brooke at Cayey, whence the United

columns were to move directly upon San Juan; Gen. Henry, with the column of the left center was to proceed due north from Ponce to Arecibo, a town on the north coast about 30 miles west of San Juan; and Gen. Schwan, commanding the left column, was to move along the southern and western coast to Aguadilla, whence he was to turn to the east and join Gen. Henry at Arecibo. In this way the various Spanish garrisons of the island were to have been captured or driven into San Juan, which was to be the point of attack.

On the 11th Gen. Wilson, with the column of the right center, had got no farther than Coamo, which he captured on the 9th, as reported last week; but some of his skirmishers pursued a party of Spanish engineers who were attempting to destroy bridges to the north. The pursuit was so close that only one bridge was destroyed, and that the Americans repaired. On the following day, the 12th, Gen. Wilson advanced along the road toward Aibonita, near which, at Asomanta, he was met with a heavy artillery and infantry fire to which he replied with artillery, quickly silencing the enemy's battery. The American casualties were 1 killed, and 3 wounded. Gen. Wilson demanded a surrender, explaining to the Spanish, under flag of truce, that peace negotiations were almost concluded and that their position was untenable. The Spanish commander asked until the next day to decide, in order that he might meantime communicate with the governor general. While Gen. Wilson with the column of the right center was making his way toward Cayey, the left column, under Gen. Schwan, was on the way to Mayaguez. It met a body of Spaniards at a small town called Hormigueros, three miles south of Mayaguez, and after a brief engagement, in which the Americans lost 1 killed and 16 wounded, put them to flight. The Spanish force consisted of the Mayaguez garrison. This engagement occurred on the 10th, and on the morning of the 11th Gen. Schwan took possession of Mayaguez, which the Spanish had abandoned. Mayaguez is the third important city of Puerto Rico. It has a population of 20,000, and lies on the western coast about midway of the width of the island. From this point Gen. Schwan moved toward Linares, near where he fought a bloodless engagement on the 14th, just before getting news of peace. No news

has come from Gen. Henry, whose column—the left center—was to have advanced direct to the north coast, except that he has been notified of the peace; but the conclusion of the peace was just in time to prevent a battle to the extreme right, between the Spanish and the column under command of Gen. Brooke. Gen. Brooke was advancing on the 13th in three columns toward Cayey to join Gen. Wilson, when he came upon a Spanish force strongly entrenched, three miles out of Guayama. One of his batteries unlimbered its guns, loaded them with shell, and had just received the order to commence firing, when a message came in from Gen. Miles announcing the proclamation of peace. The American troops were therefore withdrawn to Guayama and the battle, which had promised to be a sharp one, remained unfought.

So, upon the cessation of hostilities, the left flank of Gen. Miles' army was in possession of Mayaguez and moving upon Lares; the left center was somewhere in the interior, having apparently met with no adventures; the right center was at Hormigueros near Aibonita, and the right flank was still at the starting point—Guayama.

The news of peace did not reach the Philippines in time to prevent the bombardment and capture of Manila. There is still no cable connection with the mainland, and Consul General Wildman, as soon as he was advised of the peace, at Hongkong, chartered the steamer Australia to carry the news to Dewey. She put to sea on the 13th, while a typhoon was blowing. Her arrival has not yet been reported, but she could not have prevented the bombardment, for that occurred on the very day of her departure from Hongkong.

The surrender of Manila was demanded by Dewey and Merritt on the 7th. The Spanish commandant asked for 24 hours' delay, which was granted; and at the expiration of that time the attack was deferred. It was begun, however, on the 13th, at 9:35 in the morning, which, by Washington time, was about 10:30 on the night of the 12th, six hours after the signing of the protocol. The attack was opened by a bombardment from the fleet directed at the Malate fortifications. Under Admiral Dewey's orders no shots were to be fired at the city unless the ships were fired upon; and as there

was no response to the firing of the fleet, no bombardment was made except of the Malate fort. At 10:40 the American troops advanced and at 10:55 they had captured the Malate fort. Admiral Dewey then moved toward the city menacingly, and signaled for surrender. The Spanish at noon asked for a conference, which was granted; and at 2:20 the report was returned to Admiral Dewey that the surrender had been made. The American flag was raised over the city at 5:43. In the land attack the American loss was 9 killed and 39 wounded. The navy lost nothing. Unverified reports put the Spanish loss at 150 killed and 300 wounded.

Captain General Augusti was not in command at the time of the surrender. He and his family arrived at Hongkong on the 15th. There is some mystery connected with his departure, but the latest accounts indicate that he resigned his command or was relieved of it prior to the bombardment. He came to Hongkong on board the German war vessel, Kaiserin Augusta, and sailed for Europe on the 17th on board the German Lloyd steamer Prinz Heinrichs.

The last act of war in Cuba occurred on the 15th. That morning the American gunboat Mangrove, in ignorance of the suspension of hostilities, went into the harbor of Caibarien and bombarded that town. She fired 87 shells and solid shot, three of which fell on the Spanish gunboat Hernando Cortes, smashing her engine. The garrison and people of the town took to flight and were unhurt. The fire was replied to by the Spanish gunboat Cauto Intrepido, but without effect. Early in the afternoon the Mangrove started to leave the harbor but ran aground, and while waiting for flood tide was boarded by a Spanish flag of truce party and notified of the proclamation of peace.

The reports of last week that the Cubans under Garcia had invested Holguin are confirmed; but there are no assurances yet that Garcia has taken possession, though it was reported at Key West on the 13th that the Spanish forces there under Gen. Luque had been ordered to evacuate. Gen. Garcia had demanded the surrender of the town, but on the 9th the Spanish had made no reply to the demand, and were still in possession. Concurrently with the receipt of the foregoing news at Key West, it was re-

ported at Santiago that Gen. Garcia had given his army a furlough of 30 days.

In the military department of Santiago, created by the president last week, as reported in our last issue, and to the command of which Gen. Henry W. Lawton was appointed, Brig. Gen. Wood retains his position as governor of the city of Santiago and Gen. Ewers becomes governor of the city of Guantánamo. Santiago city is being cleaned, and the sick rate and the death rate are falling. During the week following the surrender the deaths in Santiago city averaged 190 a day; on the 15th they had fallen to 30. Among the troops the total number of sick has fallen from 2,830 at our last report, to 1,516 on the 16th, and of fever cases from 2,043 to 1,139. The deaths for the same period increased from 61 to 94.

Late last week returning troops from Santiago began to arrive at Montauk Point, the eastern extremity of Long Island, which, as stated in our last issue, has been selected for their home encampment. Among the first to arrive were Roosevelt's rough riders. They landed on the 15th, accompanied by Gen. Wheeler. On the transport Grande Duchesse, which arrived on the 16th, a fifth of the troops had fallen sick, two of them with yellow fever. Gen. Wheeler is in command of the Montauk encampment.

All fears, whether real or feigned, that the Cubans may not acquiesce in the peace arrangements were put at rest on the 13th by an announcement from the war department that T. Estrada Palma, the head of the Cuban Junta in the United States, had, in the name of the Cuban provincial government, accepted the armistice. Estrada and Assistant Secretary of State Meiklejohn, were in conference on that day upon the subject of the relation of the Cubans to the president's proclamation of peace, when Estrada gave his assurance of satisfaction. He cabled the president of the Cuban republic accordingly as follows:

Bartolome Maso, President Cuban Republic, Santiago, Cuba: I have this 13th day of August, 1898, accepted, in the name of the Cuban provisional government, the armistice proclaimed by the United States. You should give immediate orders to the army throughout Cuba suspending all hostilities. Preliminary terms of peace, signed by representatives of Spain and the United States, provide that Spain will re-

linquish all claim over and title to Cuba.

In the Orient, the relations of Great Britain and Russia appear to be more tense than last week. The British press makes an impression, at any rate, that a colossal war is imminent. It is not easy for the American reader, unlearned in the intricacies of European diplomacy, to grasp the situation from the disjointed cable news which falls under his eye. About all that is evident to him, and that only in a general way, is that Russia is elbowing England out of China, and that England proposes to fight rather than get out. We endeavored last week to explain the difficulty, though without tracing it to its origin. This controversy relates back to the treaty of Tient-sin, which Lord Elgin in behalf of England, and Baron Gros in behalf of France, negotiated with China in 1858. That treaty guarantees to British subjects equal rights with the subjects of all other nations, throughout the Chinese empire, and affords the foundation for the now familiar policy of the "open door." Pursuant to this policy England claims the right for her subjects, which she accords to all other nations, of engaging in commerce upon an equal footing throughout the whole of China. Opposed to that policy is the policy of marking out "spheres of influence" in different parts of China, placing one region within the sphere of one nation's influence, another within that of another, and so on. In effect, the latter policy is one of partition. It would end in parcelling out China among the European powers. These two conflicting policies, that of the "open door," and that of "spheres of influence," appear to have become confounded in the English mind, which probably accounts for the confusion that the cable reports of the Anglo-Russian situation induce in the American mind. At one time we find English sentiment aroused over some Russian trespass upon English preserves, and at another it is aflame for the principle of the "open door." But the policy of the "open door" and that of the "sphere of influence" are quite inconsistent, and when their antipodal character is grasped and clung to, the cable reports become more humorous.

Understanding that the policy of the "open door" is in irreconcilable conflict with that of acquiring "spheres of influence," of parcelling out China, it is easy to interpret the

purpose of the present ministry as declared by Lord Salisbury in the house of lords on the 1st. Intimating that the government would not engage in the railroad business in China, he said it was "prepared to defend to the utmost every contractual right that English subjects might acquire." This means simply that the ministry do not intend to go to war to protect any supposed sphere of British influence in China, any parcelling out of territory, for railroad building or what not, but that they do intend to go to war, if need be, to protect the contracts of Englishmen made anywhere in China, under the general concession of equal rights conferred by the treaty of Tient-sin. In other words, it is proposed to fight not for "spheres of influence," but for free trading throughout the Chinese empire—for the "open door."

The immediate cause of the Anglo-Russian difficulty relates, as we explained last week, to a proposed railroad from Tient-sin to New Chwang, on the north shore of the Gulf of Leaton. Capital for the construction of this railroad was to be provided under contract with the Hongkong and Shanghai bank, an English institution. This brought on interference by Russia, the proposed railroad being within what she has marked out for her "sphere of influence." Through secret diplomacy with the Chinese foreign office, she called for conditions which would prevent the road's ever falling under British control, by means of mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, conditions which made a British loan impossible and in effect abrogated the contract for the loan already contracted for with the Hongkong and Shanghai bank. Last week we were able to report that it was rumored that the Chinese foreign office had assented to Russia's demands. The rumor is now confirmed. On the 11th, the London Times published a dispatch from its Peking correspondent announcing that the Chinese foreign office had given formal assent to all the conditions demanded by the Russian charge d'affaires, M. Pavloff, regarding the contract for the New Chwang railroad extension loan, those conditions being in direct conflict with the terms of the signed contract for the British loan. Mr. Balfour, the first lord of the British treasury and government leader in the house of commons, being questioned on the same day in the house as to the correctness of the Times dis-

patch, admitted that its statements were substantially true. He added that the matter was "engaging the serious attention of the government," a remark which is accepted as an intimation of warlike preparations. This confirmation of the rumor that China had at the instigation of Russia abrogated a contract for the British loan to the New Chwang railroad, was quickly succeeded by another London Times dispatch from Peking stating that under like influence the Chinese government had sanctioned a Belgian loan for a railway line from Peking to Hankow, notwithstanding the opposition of the British minister and without giving him the benefit of a further conference on the subject, which had been promised.

To throw further light upon the action of China described above, it now transpires, upon the authority of the Shanghai correspondent of the London Daily Mail, that a secret treaty has for some years existed between Russia and China, which amounts to nothing less than an offensive alliance between the two countries. In this treaty China undertakes to regard Russia as having a preponderating influence in all questions of commercial and internal policy, and that Russia is to support China against demands for an "open door" policy. Russia finances China in internal developments; China permits Russia preferential rates in certain areas; and all railways in the joint interests of the two countries are to be under the practical control of Russia. Russia assists China in the development of her land and naval forces, and China cooperates as an ally.

In the midst of the excitement over the state of affairs in China, parliament was prorogued. This took place on the 12th. The queen's speech at the prorogation expressed her sorrow over the war between Spain and the United States, spoke of the leasing of Wei-Hai-Wei and certain positions adjacent to Hongkong, referred to the adoption of penny postage between the United Kingdom and the colonies, mentioned the continuance of the plague in India, and expressed her gratification at the enactment of the county councils measure for Ireland, but said nothing about the Russian complications. The session of parliament thus ended on the 12th of August, had begun on the 8th of February.

At the recent parliamentary elections in New South Wales, the ministry were very nearly defeated. The new parliament stands 63 for the ministry, including about 20 labor members, and 62 in opposition. Mr. Reid, the premier, went into power several years ago as a free trader, and has made New South Wales more nearly a free trade country than any other on the globe. He has been twice endorsed by popular vote upon this issue with strong working majorities in parliament. His bare majority of 1 at the late elections is referable not to his free trade policy, but to the attitude of his ministry regarding the federation of the Australian colonies. The federal constitution was defeated at the polls by the vote of New South Wales, the ministry opposing it. This opposition was not to the idea of federation, however, but to certain features of the proposed federal constitution.

The difficulties between Italy and the Republic of Colombia, of which we have recently given fragmentary reports from time to time, are at last adjusted. When the Italian fleet entered Colombian waters and demanded immediate payment of the award which President Cleveland, as arbitrator, had given against her upon the claim of the Italian citizen Cerruti, Colombia appealed to the United States. Intercession was thereupon made by the United States, and on the 11th the Italian ambassador at Washington informed the United States that Italy would give Colombia from five to eight months, within which time to settle all the claims of Cerruti's creditors—within the limits of the award—which should be duly proved, but required an immediate and categorical answer. This proposition was at once transmitted by the United States to the Republic of Colombia, and on the 16th the latter promised a satisfactory settlement within eight months, depositing \$500,000 by way of guarantee. The Italian fleet was thereupon ordered out of Colombian waters.

Indications of revolutionary disturbances in Spain leak out, though the censorship is so strict that no definite or entirely reliable news from that quarter is available. A dispatch of the 13th from Madrid told of a Carlist uprising in the Province of Castillon de la Plana, regarded at first as unimportant, but which appeared then to be more serious than the gov-

ernment was disposed to admit. Troops were pouring into the district, and the censorship was tightened. Several newspapers had been compelled to abandon publication, the censor striking out nearly every line of news from their columns. None of the official organs of either the Carlists or the republicans were then being published. On the following day, the 14th, it was reported that a perfect reign of terror prevailed in Madrid. The press censor examined whole newspapers before publication, in consequence of which some appeared with many columns blank, and others had suspended publication altogether. Several republican editors had been thrown into prison and others had fled. Foreign correspondents were prevented, under penalty of expulsion, from telegraphing the truth. A Carlist revolution was believed to be inevitable.

An extraordinarily exciting political convention gathered in Milwaukee on the 17th. It was the republican convention of the state of Wisconsin, the delegates to which had been chosen after a hard anti-monopoly fight throughout the republican party in the state. The railroad interests had concentrated upon Gov. Scofield for gubernatorial candidate, while the anti-monopolists supported R. M. La Follette. These were the candidates over whose naming the party campaign before the people had been fought. Scofield, the monopoly candidate, was nominated by 620½ votes to 436½ for La Follette. The anti-monopolists secured concessions in the platform to the extent of a demand for a law against transportation passes for public officials, and for another to enforce equal taxation against all persons, corporations as well as individuals. But they had made their hardest fight at the primaries upon a demand for a platform plank establishing a system of party government which should require republican nominations to be made directly by the voters of the party instead of at caucuses and conventions. The convention defeated them on this point also, merely demanding in vague terms that the defects of the present caucus system be removed by "such legislation as will secure to every citizen the freest expression of his choice in the selection of his candidate."

NEWS NOTES.

—The receipts at the Omaha exposition were sufficient to pay off \$50,000 of

the floating debt besides meeting current expenses.

—The Portugal ministry resigned on the 15th.

—Madame Demorest died at New York on the 11th.

—The commissioners to Hawaii sailed from San Francisco on the 11th.

—A cyclone in South Dakota on the 15th killed seven people near Gary.

—A large meeting was held at Chicago on the 16th in memory of Bismarck.

—Crude petroleum rose on the 17th to 97 cents a barrel, a rise in six months of 65 cents.

—The entire business portion of Wheatland, Cal., was destroyed by fire on the 12th.

—The sultan of Morocco, who was born in 1871 and became sultan in 1894, died on the 13th.

—The Canadian wheat crop is by far the largest this year of any in the history of the Dominion.

—The president has announced his intention of mustering out of service from 75,000 to 100,000 volunteers.

—Great Britain has taken formal possession of the Santa Cruz and Duff islands in the South Pacific ocean.

—The cost of the war thus far is estimated to be \$150,000,000, of which \$98,000,000 has been actually expended.

—Col. John Atkinson, right-hand man to Gov. Pingree in the lower house of the Michigan legislature, died at Detroit on the 14th.

—The discoverer of the use of laughing gas as an anaesthetic, Dr. Gardmer G. Colton, of New York, died abroad last week. He was 84 years old.

—Rear Admiral Kirkland died at Mare Island, near San Francisco, on the 12th, from heart failure consequent upon a surgical operation performed on the 8th.

—Col. Hay, the American ambassador to England, has accepted his appointment as secretary of state, to succeed Mr. Day, who goes upon the peace commission.

—The cotton thread manufacturers are forming a trust with a capitalization of \$18,000,000, to include all the important plants and to control four-fifths of the output in America.

—Robert P. Porter, superintendent of the census of 1890, has been appointed a commissioner to examine and report upon the finances, banking systems, and customs laws of Cuba and Puerto Rico.

—Judge Howe, of New Orleans, president of the American Bar association, which assembled at Saratoga on the 17th, made a strong plea, in his opening address, for arbitration as a substitute for war.

—Booker T. Washington offers to educate at Tuskegee university a number of the most promising negro young men and women of Cuba, and asks for funds for the purpose, at the rate of \$150 a year for each student.

—The Cleveland strike against reduction of wages in the wire nail factories is still in progress. The attorney general of Ohio refuses to proceed against the factories under the anti-trust law, on the ground that he has no evidence that they are organized in a trust.

—A successful test of Simon Lake's new submarine boat terminated at Baltimore on the 11th. It had completed an experimental trip of two months, during which it traveled more than 1,000 miles on the surface of the water in all kinds of weather, and made numerous satisfactory demonstrations beneath the surface.

—To circumvent lawsuits for "black-listing," railway superintendents are considering the advisability of giving to discharged employes a "discharge card" stating the cause of discharge. The plan contemplates the idea, of course, that no employe shall be hired by any road without showing his discharge card from another road.

MISCELLANY

THAT STRANGE THING.

For the Public.
Think not, O Toller, that because
Down old Morgarten's slope
The peasant hurled his steel-clad foe;
Because beneath long fallen tow'r
The implements of torture rust—
That thou, forsooth, art free!

Thou sayest true, of kings and courts
And their rough tools, thou'rt quit.
No titled chieftain rides aside,
Laying mailed hands upon thy gain;
Thy herd is safe, thy harvest whole;
But—tell me not thou'rt free!

The feudal yoke, the autocrat,
The modern party boss,
The landlord and the plutocrat—
These are but phases of thine ill—
But prints upon the trail of that
Strange Thing thou dost not see.

Democracy throws down its vote
Defiant in its strength;
Exultant, boastful of its deeds.
Yet, Industry, thy recompense
Elusive in the distance flies,
And ever flies, from thee.

Intoxicating are the lures
That stimulate the chase!
Civilization? crust and gall;
Democracy? a juggler's dream—
A tinsel garb—a cheap disguise
For abject slavery.

Within a self-created maze,
O Toller, thou dost grope;
Cutting new pathways to get free.
More mystical the tangle grows,
While folded 'neath thy girdle lies
The key to liberty.

F. HARMER.

"A CRIMINAL AGGRESSION."

The annexation of any of the Spanish colonies would be not only a repudiation of all the virtuous professions of disinterestedness with which, in entering upon the war, we commended our conduct to the judgment of mankind, but also, according to President McKinley's language, "by our code of morality, criminal aggression."

I know there are people who wave all this sneeringly aside as "Sunday-school politics," or "mawkish sentimentality." What is this despised sentimentality? To the liar every insistence upon strict veracity appears disgustingly sentimental; to the swindler every rule of scrupulous honesty in business; to the corrupt politician every effort for the purification of politics; to the demagogue every appeal for peace and good will, and every protest against taking an advantage at the expense of national honor. A good deal more of that sentimentality, or Sunday-school politics, would not at all hurt us. We are often told, and very loudly just now, that the business of the world is not carried on upon such high-toned principles. If it is not, it ought to be. The human race would be much better off if it were. And this great republic, which stands before the world as the representative and champion of all the good attributes of democratic government, could do no better service to mankind than by setting a good example in this respect.

But, leaving all idealism aside and looking only at the "practical" aspect of the case, what will be the consequences if, in spite of our virtuous proclamation that this was to be a war of humanity and not of conquest, we annex any of the Spanish colonies? What answer will there be when those who predicted that this Yankee war of liberation would in time unmask itself as a land-grabbing scheme, come with their "I told you so!" Of what avail will then be those specious subterfuges about "changed circumstances" and "new responsibilities," and all that? What shall we have to expect when we again make before the world such beautiful speeches about our uncontrollable sympathy with the oppressed and about our unselfish devotion to humanity and civilization? They will be received with a broad grin by some, with a contemptuous shrug by others, but by nobody with respectful confidence, not even by our own people. Nobody will trust us again. For, after having turned this war, which was so ostentatiously advertised as a war of humanity, into a war of self-aggran-

dizement, this nation will have lost its moral credit. And it is very doubtful whether any American now living will ever see that moral credit fully restored. What patriotic man can desire this?—Hon. Carl Schurz, in Chicago Record.

A FABLE FOR CRITICS.

A slender, white-robed Girl stood before a large concourse of people, waiting to sing. Her face was bright with a glad, unknowing smile, her eyes shone with expectancy as the prelude was played, and, when she sang, the clear, high, birdlike voice floated forth with little effort, and the people listened. After she had finished they applauded politely and murmured, "She is very pretty." They never mentioned her singing at all. But Those Who Knew looked at her with cold eyes and said, "The Eternal Amateur." The young Girl, disappointed, looked towards Fame, who stayed far off and kept even her face averted.

* * *

Years passed. A Woman, still young, stood before an audience, larger and better informed than the last. The color of her cheek was heightened by art, and in her scarlet dress she looked like some gorgeous-hued tropical flower. There was no uncertainty and no expectancy. She had been for years in a land where Art lives nearer to her children than in ours, and all that could be taught by masters she had learned; and more, for she had tasted of the Cup of Error, and in her eyes lay Knowledge of the Ways of Men. When she sang, her rich, full, sensuous voice delighted the ears of the people, who shouted bravos and showered flowers at her feet. And even Those Who Knew listened with interest and said, "She is a great Singer." But the Woman, who, during the song, had looked only at the people, turned at its conclusion towards Fame, who came no nearer, but who no longer kept her face averted, and at times seemed to listen.

* * *

More years went by. An audience, which crowded every niche of an immense building, stood waiting breathlessly for a Woman to sing to them. Time had changed her, but she was only more beautiful. Her cheek was quite pale, but her eyes shone with the Light of Stars as she stood patiently in her black gown, waiting to begin. All haste and eagerness and desire to please, and intention of any kind, were gone. Great Love had touched her, and Great Grief and Death, and made her human. She no longer looked at the people or at Fame, but Upward.

All her work and knowledge of Evil and Good and Love and Hate had moulded her voice into perfect melody, as with passion and pain and joy she sang, "I Know that My Redeemer Liveth." When she finished, the people shouted and applauded, and Those Who Knew said at last, with sobs in their throats, "She is a great Artist." And, amid the multitude, Fame came and knelt at her feet, and offered up to her a laurel wreath; the Woman looked down at her and said gently, "Who are You?" And the answer came, "I am Fame."

"Pardon me," the Woman said, "I had forgotten you."—Elinor Macartney Lane, in Life.

NO MAN IS SAVED ALONE.

Extracts from a commencement oration, given at the Kansas State Agricultural College, June 9, 1898, by Prof. George D. Heron.

There is no way for an individual to practice his social ideal, if he has one, until it is realized by society; he can only exhaust the possibilities of his life in bringing about the realization; he can plant his life in the common life and die, that he may not abide by himself alone, but may bring forth the fruit of a redemption which shall be to all the people.

An individual cannot practice national ownership of land, except the land be owned by the nation; if his zeal be at bottom a spiritual self-deceit and cowardice, he will spend his time devising ways whereby he may individually escape the curse of private ownership; if his zeal be social and Christian, born out of love for his brethren, he will spend his life in bearing away the curse from his nation, and from the world. An individual cannot practice the public ownership of utilities, except public utilities be publicly owned; his Christian sacrifice does not lie in keeping his hands clean of privately owned public economies, but in helping the people to own their economies in common. A Russian cannot practice political democracy except Russia become politically democratic; his service for freedom does not consist in his moving out of Russia, but in making Russia free. A slave cannot practice freedom except his shackles be broken, and his freedom be secured in the freedom of his brethren; for no man's liberty is safe so long as there remains any sort of a slave upon the earth. A man cannot escape the slavery of the wage system, except the system be abolished, and there be no hirelings under the sun; indeed, to pay the best possible wages to the largest possible number may be the precise

Christian sacrifice required of the consistent opponent of the wage system.

There is no individual redemption from social wrong; only a social redemption will free each individual at last. There is no way out of the social pain and shame, out of the communal sin and guilt, save deep through it, to the other side. In whatever the social salvation of the individual may lie, it does not lie in the individual ex-
trication and escape, for that way is the way of selfishness and death.

If the theological doctrine of the incarnation is a moral fact, and not a mere metaphysical definition, it means that God himself is living in the life of the common man, bearing the sins of the downmost life as his own sins, suffering the sufferings of the people in his own heart, breaking their bonds and oppressions by the passion of his love in the midst of them. The coming of God in Christ is the disclosure of God as the innermost presence of every human prison house, in every historic tyranny and wrong; it is the disclosure of the suffering love of God as the making force of history, as the real power that is leading the collective life through successive forms of material captivity to a common spiritual kingship and liberty. God himself, so we see in Christ, will have no righteousness or freedom that he may not have in the common life of man; the soul of God will not be satisfied until we are satisfied in being like him. There is a sense in which God, as well as his witness, cannot "practice what he preaches," cannot "do the thing he talks about," until the whole human life cooperates with him in the practicing or doing. "God has become free," Lacordaire used to say, "with the liberty of the citizen." . . .

Private property in righteousness is the worst form of private property. The search and conservation of a righteousness for one's self is the one real sin. He who orders his life for the saving of his own soul is precisely the opposite of all that makes a Christian, whatever else he is, however religious he be. In so far as the Church has preached Christianity as a religion for the saving of one's soul, it has preached the supreme apostasy and lie. The follower of Christ is not one who seeks to escape the sin of the world, but one who lives to deliver the world from its sin; one who lives to bear away sin from the necks and souls of his brethren. There is no final salvation of any man from sin, until the last prodigal sets his face homeward. There is no ascending into heaven, save through descending into hell, to fight with the

to keep from getting blown away. My stomach flapped up and down on the ground, and sweat poured out—it was hot enough, with no shade, for that any way.

I knew and told myself over and over again that if I was killed I should never know it; and I wasn't afraid of being killed—consciously, that is. But I knew that I didn't want to be wounded, for I felt all the time that if I were to be wounded my fate in that battle would be decided. It was the uncertainty that knocked my nerve endwise. I would think of those hopeless and horrible wounds that don't kill outright, but let one linger without attention for hours—for help is too precious on these occasions to be wasted—and I wondered if I would have strength of mind enough to blow my brains out at once should I get such a wound. Well, it was the worst hour I ever spent. It seemed ages.

Other experiences differ from mine. But the man whose stomach did not thump on the ground when we went under fire that first time, is a liar. Afterwards, for the next two days, the officers could not keep us lying down; we were always up on our hands to see what was going on.

Sometimes we would advance a few hundred yards and lie down or crawl closer into the bushes as a battery of artillery rattled past. The fire kept up, slowly getting hotter, as we moved forward. The road became choked with men. Officers from a score of regiments moved among us, shouting the most confusing orders. With the noise of orders, shells and bullets, there was the greatest mess of sounds you ever heard. The only thing to do was to follow your company man in front of you, he the man in front of him, and so on. Companies lost half their men or more, through the men's mixing in with other companies; and officers wandered about looking for their commands. The bush was higher than our heads, and we couldn't see a thing yet. We could hear the liveliest kind of firing on all sides, though, mixed in with that of a Gatling battery scattered along the front.

These bullets do not make a sound like the old style "ping," but something like the light stroke of a whetstone on a scythe, or the striking of a telegraph wire with a stone. It is exactly like a long drawn "TSe-eethe," starting sharply and drawing itself softly out. These bullets see the through the air literally. But it's a mighty vicious sound.

I was at the rear of our company, among the smaller men, and we always

get the bad end of things. When we finally moved forward, nearly half of us got mixed up with company F of the regulars, and we couldn't tell "where we were at." Hearing yells for company F, which is our own company in the 71st, we followed only to find that we were among the regulars. Presently, seeing company M of the 71st, we stopped and reported to its captain. By this time I had my nerve. I had seen our own officers doubling, and ducking, and rubbing their noses in the dirt; but the regulars we saw were walking coolly about, smoking, and apparently totally unconcerned about their chances of being hit. I remember it did not occur to me until afterward that when I went over to report to the captain of company M, I got up and walked over; for at first, when we fell out of the regulars, we had instinctively dropped. After that I sat up and looked about, and tried to enjoy things.

Company M was lying down behind some bushes, waiting for orders. I saw several men hit, but though the fire was all one could ask for in the way of severity, men didn't drop often. Here and there one would stagger, and stumble to the ground, shivering if badly hit, but usually acting as a man does when first stung by a bee—but just for a second. Then he would drag himself into the bushes or try to get to the rear for help. One man of company M was killed within two feet of me, and another but six feet away was plugged clean through the knee joint. All the men I saw hit acted in the same way. When they were killed outright, they simply "dropped as if they had been shot," their guns tumbled out of their hands, and they lay as they fell. If they lived for two or three minutes they usually took a peaceful position as if they were about to have a nap upon the ground.

About ten minutes after we had joined company M, the company was ordered back into the road and forward to the firing line. Where that was no one knew. The trail grew narrower as we advanced toward what we now know as the "bloody ford," and we were obliged to march single file, one regiment at a time. The dead and wounded lined both sides of the road, and though it had not rained that day—it was then about 2:30 p. m., I believe—the road was in places simply muddy with blood. The dead officers were decently covered with a blanket; files attended to privates. Sometimes we would strike a dead artillery horse with traces cut, and hear a stray bullet go "chug" as it struck the carcass.

By the way, when anyone was hit, you could always hear the bullet go "chug."

The "bloody ford" was one of the hottest places of the battle, with the exception of San Juan hill and "Hell's Pocket," where the main road crosses the San Juan river. We were close behind our own company at the ford, though we didn't know it. Three of its officers had been picked off here in five minutes. The water was only knee deep, and as we gained the other side we left the brush behind us, and came in full view of the fight.

On the edge of the little plain that now stretched before us to the foot of San Juan hill, we formed in company formation and marched across. I have heard that the way in which these two companies—F and M, of the 71st—formed and marched across the plain won special commendation from the regulars; though they said it was all "damnon sense," as we were under fire. The hill itself had already been taken; but a cross fire was kept up upon us as we climbed it. It is very steep, though not high. Upon reaching the top I rejoined my own company and was with it from there on.

At the blockhouse on the hill I patched up a couple of wounded men under a shed. Bullets were still flying, but I was pretty well used to them now. All the troops here were regulars except our two companies. It was fine to see a regular officer come out into full view of the Spanish, smoking a cigarette, look them coolly over through field glasses, and then retire and give an order about firing or aiming. They did not expose themselves unnecessarily; but when it was necessary they did it in such a business-like way that it gave one confidence immediately.

The fire slackened before sundown, and by sunset the battle was over. That night we worked entrenching ourselves on San Juan hill. During the next two days there was some firing, but little advancing. We were shelled several times, but no damage was done. Most of the work for our army was cleaning out the sharpshooters in our rear. They fired on the Red Cross, on ambulances jammed with wounded, on wounded men, on surgeons, on anything in sight. Whenever we went down to "Hell's Pocket," the main road ford across the San Juan, where we got our water, we were fired on, and could hear the bullets cut the bushes near us. We had to be protected each trip by sharpshooter guards. These guards we could see in squads from the hill, ducking about on the plain below. Now and again one of the squads would

stop, fire together, and then rush forward, as the body of a Spaniard toppled out of a tree ahead of them and crashed down through the branches.

Since the battle there has been nothing eventful or very interesting. Burying parties at first, and water details or work, in a gradually dying out stench, filled in the time. A succession of truces made things monotonous, and everyone's nerves went to pieces with it. Even the surrender, when at last it came, excited only mild enthusiasm; it had been expected so long. The nights and evenings and mornings are cool, but in the middle of the day the heat is frightful until cooled by the regular heavy rain. After three days, we moved from San Juan hill to the camp near Santiago, where we have been a long time—it seems ages—and we all want to go home. Sickness of a mild malarial form, but very uncomfortable, broke out a fortnight ago, and is now slowly going away. It knocked out everybody; me too—I had it four days. Some companies had only six men for duty, and at one time Lowe and I and one other were doing eight men's duty. We have been among the healthiest of the lot.

THE SPANISH LESSON.

The "dying" of a nation is a tragic sight. The dying of Spain, the discoverer and once the owner of the greater part of the Western Hemisphere, her death throes upon the very spot where Columbus landed and where he lies buried, is a tragedy which this nation could not watch unmoved, even were it not the instrument used to give the death blow.

But Spain presents not merely a tragic spectacle to the people of the United States—it furnishes also a lesson and a warning. This country is called upon to end the long agony, but Spain has been wounded unto death by her own sons. She is a dying nation because of internal corruption and dishonesty, and the description of the causes of her ruin has an ominously familiar sound to American ears. We have in Spain the spectacle of a nation which conducts its government upon the principles which control Tammany Hall and the republican and democratic machines. Not only its civil service, but its army and its navy have for generations been treated as "spoils," and the result is before us. We know well what incompetency, what weak inefficiency are the necessary outcome of such principles, and it is not to be wondered at that Spain has failed in every direction.—Josephine Shaw Lowell, in *The New York Times*.

SEEN AND HEARD IN CHICAGO STREETS.

Four or five little boys and a dog sat in a row on a low coping last Saturday evening, talking over the war. Very quiet and deliberative were they, for no one can be more impersonal and unimpassioned than your quite little boy whose intellect has just become his dominating power. The dog was motionless but alert, and at least imitatively deliberative. He kept the alignment true, looked straight before him, and listened carefully. If his powers ended there he did not betray the fact.

We heard only fragments of the conversation, but imagination supplied the application of the remarks.

At first they were probably discussing some promotion which they thought undeserved, for one stated with disapproval:

"He ain't done no bravery."

A few minutes later they must have got to the results of the war, for one asserted:

"They will have to do whatever we want them to."

To that a deep-voiced little boy added as the impressive finality:

"But Cuba will be free. We shall have made Cuba free."

They were only children.

ALICE THACHER POST.

There has spread among men and women of the dilettante temper the belief that to know the results and products of the past simply as curios and relics is to share the culture which these things of beauty and skill embody and preserve; and this false idea has helped to spread abroad the feeling that culture is accomplishment rather than force, and that it is for the idle rather than for the active and creative. There never was a more radical misconception of a fundamental process, for culture in the true sense involves, as a process, the highest and truest development of a race, and, as a product, the most enduring spiritual expression of race genius and experience. The culture of the Greeks was the highest form of their vital force; and the product of their culture was not only their imperishable art, but their political, social, and religious organization and ideals. Their deepest life went into their culture, and the most enduring fruits of that culture are also the most significant expressions of their life.—*Outlook*.

An old countryman came into a small town in Arkansas a week or so ago. He lived in the woods, and his last visit to town had been made at the close of the civil war. The little coun-

try place was then full of soldiers, and now after 30 years the first thing the old man saw was a militia company marching to the depot on their way to the encampment. He looked in amazement and muttered audibly: "By gosh, them durned liars told me Lee had surrendered, an' here's that dratted war still a-goin' on!"—*Chicago Inter Ocean*.

"Never mind, dear," I said to my little girl, having vainly endeavored to persuade her to give one of her dolls to a child who had never owned one, "never mind! Perhaps some day you will be a poor little girl yourself, and then you will know what it is to have no toys."

"Yes, mamma," she sobbed, "I have thought of that, and that's the reason why I want to save all my things."—*Youth's Companion*.

Famous.—The New Butler — And when do you get up in the morning, sir?

The Professor—You can find that by looking in "Famous Men of the Time." —*Fliegende Blaetter*.

"The Truth is yours and it shall make you free."

So spake the Teacher in rapt prophecy: Alas, how well that other text is learned, From prophets stoned and faithful martyrs burned,—

If Truth alone can make us free in sooth, Freedom alone can give us perfect Truth. —John Basil Barnhill.

THE PUBLIC

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522, Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 316 American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069), Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St., West.