that promise. It is in payment of the bribe—an honorable thing as honor goes among bribe givers. The payment is purely voluntary. The worker has no say in the matter; the employer is under no pressure in the labor market. Wages raised under such circumstances may indicate an employer's generosity, or, as in this case, his fidelity to a corrupt promise; but it does not indicate that wages generally are rising. The labor market is still glutted, and labor as cheap as before. Moreover, steel workers' wages have been reduced since the presidential election more than the amount of this increse.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.

In the face of the fighting near Manila, it cannot any longer be pretended that no one in the United States is seriously proposing for this country a policy of conquest and imperialism. The administration itself is committed to it — committed in blood. Apologists for the foreign policy of the administration may now join the frank advocates of imperialism, and put forth arguments in its behalf; but they cannot continue to claim credit for both intelligence and sincerity while insisting that questions of conquest and imperialism do not confront the nation.

Imperialism has already cost us the lives of scores of our patriot soldiers, whose enlistment against the Spanish monarch, in the cause of humanity, has been taken advantage of to send them to wounds, disease and death against the Philippine republic, in the cause of oppression. It has cost us the blood-guiltiness of slaughtering by machinery thousands of Filipinos—women and children as well as men—whose sole crime against us is resentment at our crime against them. It has placed upon us the shame of sweeping away with fire and shell the unfortified villages of a people whom our own investigators describe as peaceable and amiable when not oppressed.

And its advocates are arrogant. The temporary thoughtlessness of the American masses in appearing at first to welcome the glory of imperialism, has emboldened them to the point of denouncing as traitors those public men who, faithful to the principles of our republic, use their influence against forcing an unwelcome government upon a foreign people. The flag is waved aloft as a fetich, and we are told that we must follow it whether it continue to represent republicanism or be turned into a symbol of piracy. The applause and offers of cooperation of the tory party of England—the same party that sneered at Washington as we are taught to sneer at Aguinaldo, and which is and always has been distinctly imperialistic—are made much of. Imperialism is the new policy that we are invited—no; ordered—to adopt. Having assumed to buy Spain's title to the sovereignty of a distant archipelago, the president issues his proclamation commanding the people to abandon their own republican government and submit to him; and he follows it with a carnival of slaughter and glorification of slaughter so shocking to the moral sense as to awaken the American nation from its hypnotic stupor.

There is no longer any mistaking the direction in which the administration is going. For the sake of opening up new fields of exploitation to American plutocracy, the principle of government by consent of the governed is to be abandoned. We are to file away the declaration of independence as obsolete, and Lincoln's noble ideal of government "of the people, by the people and for the people," is to perish in the flames of Filipino villages.

This policy of ours, we are told, is not new. Imperialism, it is urged, is only a new name for an American policy which is as old as the American government itself. And we are reminded of the Northwest Territory, of the acquisition of the Louisiana country and of Florida, of the annexation of Texas and the conquest of New Mexico and California, of the Oregon treaty, and of the purchase of Alaska, as instances of imperialism in the history of our country. The implication is that these incidents are precedents for the present contemplated conquest of the Philippines.

Even if that were true it would count for nothing. A free people, cherishing their freedom, will not allow themselves to be shackled with any precedents that are morally bad. The real question is not what our country may have done on occasions in the past, but what it ought to do now. If it be wrong to subjugate the Filipinos, the fact that we have heretofore subjugated other peoples can neither justify nor excuse the wrong. As the Springfield Republican well says, "lapses from the strict rule of government by the people" do not constitute "a reason and argument for general indulgence in further lapses and finally for its abandonment altogether."

But in truth there is no precedent in the history of the American republic for the Philippine policy now being pursued.

Preliminary to an examination of the pretended precedents that are cited, let us briefly outline the Philippine policy which they are held to justify.

We were at war with Spain. Spain claimed sovereignty over the Philippine islands. Repeated rebellions against her authority had occurred, and one had been adjusted by treaty not long before the outbreak of our war. Spain having dishonored that treaty the rebellion broke out afresh. It was in progress when Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila bay. And this rebellion continued until the Spanish were subdued and nearly driven off the archipelago, a regular republican government having meantime been established by the Filipino people.

The latest Filipino victory was at Iloilo, the last point of importance which the Spanish held. This victory left Spain in possession of only about 50,000 square miles of territory, occupied by about 300,000 inhabitants; while the Filipino republic was acknowledged by the inhabitants of 167,000 square miles, numbering more than 9,000,000 souls.

That was the situation in the Philippines when Spain assumed to cede the archipelago to the United States.

The treaty by which the cession was to be made, reserved no rights to the inhabitants. By its terms "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of the ceded territory were to be determined by congress, and no obligation was to be assumed by the United States either to

establish a free government for or over them, or to admit them to the constitutional rights and privileges of American citizens. From the terms of the treaty, from one public speech by the president, from the speeches of administration senators and representatives, from the refusal of the majority in the senate to adopt a declaration of policy guaranteeing self-government, from the manifest opposition of the president to the adoption of such a declaration, from the Napoleonic proclamation of sovereignty promulgated by the president through Gen. Otis to the inhabitants of the Philippines, from the futile attempt in December and the successful one this week to capture Iloilo from the Filipinos, from the aggressive warfare being waged now by the president in the islands of Luzon and Panay—from all these and numerous other considerations, not omitting the perpetual clamor of the administration press, there is but one inference to be drawn, and that is that it is intended to subject the Philippine islands to the arbitrary rule of congress, without giving to their inhabitants any representation, or throwing about them any of the guarantees of the American constitution. That would be imperialism.

Nothing of the kind was ever before attempted by the United States, as a brief examination of the history of its territorial growth will show.

Turn to a map of the United States. Draw a line from the Pacific ocean along the northern boundary of California, Nevada and Utah to the Rocky mountains and then northward along the Rockies to the Canadian line. The northwest corner of the United States thus cut off, together with a vast Canadian territory abutting it, was once known as the Oregon country. The right of sovereignty over it remained an open question until 1846. We shall recur to this section farther on.

Meanwhile, draw another line on the map. Beginning at the Gulf of Mexico let it skirt New Orleans to the east and then follow the Mississippi river to its source, running thence in the direction of Lake Winnipeg to the Canadian border. The territory to the west of this line belonged, at the outbreak of our revolutionary war, to the kingdom of Spain; that to the east of the line belonged to England.

At the close of the revolution England relinquished to her former colonies all her American possessions south of the present Canadian line except Florida, then extending to the Mississippi river, which was transferred to Spain. Thus the United States, upon coming into existence as a nation, had Canada for its northern boundary, the Mississippi for its western, and a slightly irregular line running east to the Atlantic from the Mississippi river at the mouth of the Red, as its southern.

That part of this territory which lies between the Mississippi and the Allegheny mountains was then claimed by some of the states as their property; but they surrendered it to the general government. Pursuant to the terms of this surrender an ordinance was passed by congress, in 1787, under which so much of the country surrendered as lies northwest of the Ohio river was organized into the Northwest Territory. This was the first territorial government of the United States.

As the organization of the Northwest Territory is cited in support of the present policy of imperialism, it will be necessary to notice its character.

The ordinance under which the territory was erected, while providing a civil government and guarding civil rights, enabled the inhabitants, as soon as they should number 5,000 free males of full age, to organize their own territorial government, with the right, among other things, to send a delegate to congress. It moreover ordained that from three to five states should be formed of the territory, each to be admitted into the Union, when it should have 60,000 free inhabitants, "on an equal footing with the original states." Meantime the territory was to be part of the United States. Here, it will be observed, was a bona fide adoption of the American principle of government by consent of the governed.

It is true that Indian tribes were not reckoned among the governed. But neither were they governed. The regulation of Indian tribes by our government has always been by means of treaty. Though we have outraged the Indians, we have nevertheless dealt with their tribes as independent nations. It is true also that among those entitled to self-government, only free men were counted; but at that time we had not grown morally as a nation up to the point of abolishing slavery, and it is not for us now to find in these shortcomings of our predecessors, excuses for receding from the advances that they did make. Taken as a whole, the Ordinance of 1787 is a precedent against and not in favor of the imperialism that would crush the Philippine republic and govern the Philippines as an American satrapy.

The same observations apply also to the steps by which the country south of the Ohio was advanced, in some cases directly to statehood and in others through the condition of territories into that of statehood. The idea of self-government was always in the foreground. It was the principal object aimed at, and it was accomplished with all possible speed. To the south of the Ohio as to the north, as soon as a territory had enough inhabitants to give it dignity as a sovereignty, it was admitted into the Union as a state upon an equal footing with the other states.

Up to this point there was not the least semblance of imperialism, nor even of territorial expansion. We were dealing exclusively with territory the inhabitants of which had freed themselves from that colonial system of Great Britain which we are now seeking to imitate in the Philippines. We had added nothing to our original domain. The Mississippi was still our western boundary, as it had been that of the colonies since 1763.

But early in the century we did adopt a policy of what may be called expansion.

Spain had secretly ceded the western valley of the Mississippi—the eastern part of the second division which the reader has been asked to mark off upon the map — together with the western arm of Florida, to Napoleon. This was called the Louisiana cession. It gave to the Corsican conqueror of the world a point of vantage at the mouth of the Missis-

sippi, and control of our whole western border, and could not be regarded by the United States with indifference. No question arose as to whether we should add to our territory or not; the vital question was whether we should rid ourselves of a menacing neighbor. A consideration of self-defense settled that question, and having opportunity to buy off Napoleon we did it. Thus the Louisiana country became ours. But in acquiring that country, we stipulated to vest in the inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizens.

We have since then, pursuant to the original intention, erected sovereign self-governing states throughout all that region, except in the Indian territory, where we recognize self-government among the Indians.

To refer to the Louisiana purchase as a precedent for the Philippine subjugation is to distort history to base uses. The Louisiana purchase may be called "expansion." But it was more like the expansion of a city which extends its borders, than of an empire which reaches across seas for possessions. In no sense was it imperialistic.

The difference between expansion and imperialism is distinguished by Bourke Cochran when he says:

> Expansion is the peaceful development of our political system by widening the area of its authority. Imperialism is the forcible exercise abroad by our government of powers denied to it at home.

Under that sound definition, our Philippine policy is one of imperialism, while the Louisiana purchase was expansion.

The Florida purchase, also, was expansion and not imperialism. We bought Florida of Spain in 1821, under a stipulation to accord to its inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizens.

Immediately after buying, we organized a self-governing territory there, and within 25 years we exalted the territory to sovereign statehood. With the acquisition of Florida, as with that of Louisiana, we merely extended our borders, making the newly acquired country part of the United States. In no respect whatever was the Florida acquisition analogous to that of the Philippines.

The coming of Texas into the Union is the next event cited as an American precedent against the American doctrine of self-government. But Texas came voluntarily into the Union, as a full-fledged, independent state. If the Filipino republic were knocking at our doors for admission, the annexation of Texas might be cited as a precedent; but instead of knocking for admission it is fighting for independence.

We did not assert any sovereignty over Texas until she sought annexation; nor then until we had vested in her and her citizens the same rights that all our other states and their citizens enjoyed. The annexation of Texas may have been expansion; it was not imperialism.

Now comes an event of which, though it offers no precedent for imperialism, we may nevertheless be ashamed. It is the Mexican war. With a boundary dispute between Texas and Mexico for an excuse, but with slavery extension as our real purpose, we engaged in war with our southern neighbor. As a result of that war, we not only carried the Texas boundary from the Nueces river southwrad to the Rio Grande, but we acquired, mostly by conquest though partly by purchase, all that remained of what Spain had originally held in the territory now known as the United States. Again we stipulated, however, to accord to the inhabitants all the rights, advantages and immunities of American citizenship.

This stipulation has been honored; and, with the exception of Arizona and New Mexico, all the territory has been erected into independent states. Even in Arizona and New Mexico, there are territorial organizations which embody the principle of self-government in spirit, and conflict with it in practice only in slight degree.

Bad as were our motives for bringing on the Mexican war, there is nothing in the whole history of our territorial expansion that grew out of it, which can in good faith be cited as a precedent against the doctrine of self-government.

Recurring now to the Oregon country, the northwesterly of the three parts into which the territory now comprised in the United States was divided at the outbreak of the revolution—as at the outset of this little historical excursion we asked the reader to indicate them upon his map—we shall find that the United States and Great Britain were in dispute over it until 1846. Great Britain then withdrew her claims to so much of the Oregon country as lay north of the forty-ninth parallel, and the United States withdrew hers to so much as lay south of that parallel. Thus the United States completed the extension of her area from ocean to ocean and from the gulf to Canada. But a self-governing territory was immediately organized in the Oregon country, and with the growth of population independent states were erected there.

The Oregon treaty, also, is referred to, as a precedent for imperialism. It is as weak a precedent as any of the others. There was no element even of conquest in this case, and as in all the others the self-governing principle was recognized from the start.

The next and last precedent is that of the purchase of Alaska in 1868. In this there is some resemblance to the Philippine project. Alaska is separated from the rest of the United States, as the Philippines are; no territorial government has been erected there; no exaltation to statehood was contemplated at the time of purchase. If Alaska had had a population of several millions; if they had been resisting Russian tyranny and had about succeeded; if they had organized a republican government and were seeking recognition as a self-governing sovereignty—if in these circumstances we had bought Alaska and had treated the Alaskan republic as rebellious and insisted upon subjecting the people to a state of vassalage, then the Alaskan acquisition might with some show of reason be cited as a precedent for what we are trying to do in the Philippines. But there was no such condition. Only a few thousand people inhabited Alaska when we purchased that country; and they did not then make nor have they since made, even so much as a protest. We did not con-

quer them; we have exercised no autocratic powers over them. What we really hold there is not a people but an uninhabited country. That country is regarded as part of the United States, not as an unannnexed estate; and such of the inhabitants as are not members of tribes, are vested, under the treaty of cession, with all the rights of American citizens.

The analogy between the Alaskan purchase and the Philippine conquest disappears upon comparison.

The great fact that runs through the history of our territorial development, is the plain recognition shown therein of the fundamental principle of American government. The so-called precedents for imperialism are in reality monuments to our fidelity to the doctrine of the declaration of independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and to the spirit of the federal constitution that all men who come within the jurisdiction of the United States shall come as citizens and not as subjects.

The manifest intention as to the Philippines, is, on the other hand, to take the islands as American property in perpetuity, and to reduce their inhabitants to a state of vassalage. This intention is obvious from the treaty alone. It is the first treaty of cession to the United States which has not in terms secured to the inhabitants who wished them all the rights of American citizenship. The Filipinos are to depend upon the good will of congress, not for rights, for they are to have none, but for privileges. What their political condition was under Spain, what the condition of the American colonies was under England, what her conquered provinces were to Rome, that in principle is to be their condition under the United States. Their autocratic ruler is to be a congress sitting thousands of miles away, a congress in which they are to have no representative and to whose constituents they are to be not fellow citizens, but alien subjects.

There is no precedent in our history to lend color of right to such a policy; and to every principle of government to which we have appealed, and profess still to appeal, it is revolting.

NEWS

The center of interest is still in the Philippines, the most important event of the week being the capture of Iloilo. Immediately after the battle between the Americans and the Filipinos at Manila, reported last week, orders were received by Gen Otis, from Washington, to reenforce Gen. Miller at Iloilo, on the distant Island of Panay; and on the 9th reenforcements were accordingly sent, with instructions to Gen. Miller to take the town. Upon receiving his instructions, Gen. Miller demanded the surrender of Iloilo by the evening of the 11th, at the same time warning the Filipinos to make no demonstration in the interval. But the Filipinos prepared to defend, whereupon an American gunboat opened fire upon them. They replied, and Gen. Miller then bombarded the place. There was no effective reply, and the American troops suffered no loss. The casualties among the Filipinos, if any, are not reported. They withdrew from the town, and the Americans took possession. At last reports the Filipinos were entrenching themselves in the suburbs, out of effective range from the warships, with the purpose apparently of resorting to the same harassing tactics that they have pursued near Manila. In the afternoon of the 12th, the day after the capture, the Americans made a reconnoissance in force toward the outlying town of Jaro. They were met, say the reports, with "a severe and well directed fire;" but, advancing, drove the Filipinos through Jaro to the open country beyond. No reports of casualties have been received.

Gen. Otis's official report of the taking of Iloilo, which bears date the 13th, is as follows:

Gen. Miller reports from Iloilo that town taken on the 11th inst., and held by troops. Insurgents given until evening of 11th to surrender, but their hostile actions brought on engagement during the morning. Insurgents fired native portion of town; but little losses to property of foreign inhabitants. No casualties among the United States troops reported.

Following is Admiral Dewey's report:

Petrel just arrived from Iloilo. That place taken by our force Saturday and now occupied. No prisoners. No casualties on our side. Insurgent loss not known, but believed to be slight. They attempted to burn town, but foreign property generally saved by our force.

This is the second movement of the Americans upon Iloilo. The first occurred in December and was reported in No. 39 of The Public. On that occasion American troops were dispatched from Manila to take Iloilo from the Spanish; but the Filipinos forced the Spanish to surrender before the Americans arrived, and the latter made no attempt to drive the Filipinos out. But with their warships they remained in a hostile attitude before Iloilo until the bombardment and capture of the 11th, reported above.

At Manila, fighting has been continuous since the battle of the 4th, which we reported last week. According to the dispatches received at the time of that report, the Filipinos had then been driven from their former line on the outskirts of Manila to distances several miles into the country; and the last fight, which occurred at Caloocan on the 8th, had resulted in their complete rout. It was stated also, in the official report of this fight, that Aguinaldo had applied for a cessation of hostilities, an application which Gen. Otis declined to answer. It now appears, however, upon Gen. Otis's authority, that no application for a cessation of hostilities has been made, and that no accredited representative of Aguinaldo has yet entered the American lines. It also appears that Caloocan was not captured until the 10th.

Taking up the thread of the Philippine war where it was dropped in these reports on the 8th, we find that on the 9th Admiral Dewey drove the Filipinos from San Roque, a village on the neck of land that connects the peninsula of Cavite with the mainland south of Manila. Following is the report he gives, bearing the same date:

After continued interference and intimidation of our workmen I ordered armed insurgents to leave San Roque by 9 this morning. They left during the night, a few remaining, who burned the village this morning. It is now occupied by our troops. All quiet.

At this time Filipinos were concentrating between Caloocan and Malabon, two villages about six miles north of Manila, and but a short distance inland from the bay shore. On the following day, the 10th, in the afternoon, the American fleet shelled Caloocan, and soon afterward an attack was made from the land side, the Americans burning the native houses as they advanced. If the Associated