

plank advocating the establishment of a large permanent debt represented by interest-bearing bonds, this platform would make a very good one for the republicans. And that suggests a question. If the democrats ought to adopt a republican platform, why not become republicans and have done with it?

NATIONAL EXPANSION.

We must be prepared, as the war with Spain draws to a close, to encounter a tremendous movement for the acquisition of new territory. In various ways, this movement is already making itself felt.

Puerto Rico, we are told, must be made a spoil of war, and as "the inhabitants are incapable of self-government" we must take permanent possession and set up there a complete colonial establishment. The Hawaiian islands have long been ours for the asking, and now the war affords an excuse to ask. Off in the far Pacific are the Philippine islands, which, having been captured, must be retained, so we are urged, if for no better purpose than as a penal colony for American convicts. All this is not only advocated by the jingo press generally, but so important a personage as Senator Elkins—and he is a very important personage when matters of this kind are under consideration, for the same reason that the vulture is of importance when carrion is a subject of dispute—gives it his enthusiastic sanction. Our foreign policy is to undergo a radical change, he says, and not merely the Philippines and Puerto Rico and Hawaii must be ours, but we must even acquire a coal-station in the Mediterranean. He would have us launched at once upon a career of national expansion in which we should rival England and throw a deep shadow over the continental nations.

But a more important personage in this connection than even Elkins, more important because as the London Daily Telegraph truly says he "is credited with shaping the policy of the administration more than any other man," has pronounced in favor of the expansion idea. Indeed, he goes beyond Elkins. He would not be satisfied with expanding our territory, but insists upon treating the

new domain as a possession—attached to the union, but not and never to be of the union. Senator M. A. Hanna, for it is to him that we refer—whom else could be meant as the man who "is credited with shaping the policy of the administration more than any other man"—was interviewed in the London Telegraph of May 11, and in the course of this interview he said that "when the time comes, our policy will be made clear, to the effect that statehood is to be restricted to the present limits of our nation and is not to be extended to territory separated from the country, even when it is so close as Cuba." Yet he was sure that new territory would be acquired and our whole foreign policy reversed.

From Mr. Hanna down to the little hangers on, it is evidently understood among all jingoes that we are to take advantage of the war—which by the way they opposed as long as they could see in it only a measure for freeing a subject and outraged people—that we are to take advantage of it to seize upon outlying territory and go into the subject and outrage business on our own account. Not exactly on our account either, but in our name and on account of the land grabbing interests which really own this country and are sighing for new countries to conquer.

This is a policy which Americans must promptly denounce before the United States is committed to it. We have gone into the war not to conquer new territory for the benefit of land grabbing "sooners." Our object is to free Cuba. Incidentally we shall be justified in driving the Spaniards off this hemisphere. So, incidentally we shall be justified in driving them out of the Philippines. And by Spaniards let us explain for the benefit of careless readers, that we mean the Spanish government. We have no hostility to Spanish men and women. They are in our eyes like all other men and women, whether Philippine islanders, Cubans or Americans, common brethren made in the image of one God. But while we may drive the Spanish government off this hemisphere and out of the Philippines, we have no right to make ourselves the proprietors of the people whom we find in any part of the world which has been claimed as Spanish

territory. For our own sake, we should be unwise to annex those more or less distant parts of the world to our own country; and alike for our own sake and for the sake of the people there, we have no right to make ourselves their masters. Not only would that be an invasion of their natural rights, but it would be in contravention of our established policy of recognizing the natural right of all communities to govern themselves.

Back of this itch for territorial expansion is as we have already intimated a hunger for land. That he who owns the land owns the people who must live upon it has come to be a well-recognized principle of monopoly. The monopolists themselves recognize it better than anyone else, and land grabbing has become the substitute throughout the civilized world for slavery. No man wants great quantities of land merely for the land. It will yield him nothing unless he works it, and he cannot work much of it himself. He wants it so as to command the labor of others by withholding land from them unless they will work upon starvation terms. When men work upon starvation terms, the employers of men can thrive. Through the ownership of land, then, the virtual ownership of men is secured. And it is in order that some of our citizens may exploit the people of Cuba, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico and of the Philippines—not only those who are there, but those who may be colonized there from here—that this great expansion movement is being put under way; put under way not by a conscious conspiracy, perhaps, but in obedience to that impulse which runs through the sensitive nerves of monopoly as electricity through a wire.

"Expansion" is only a pretty name for monopoly. Shall we stand silently by, then, while the blood of our brothers and sons is used to fertilize the idea? Now is the time to speak, before shrewd schemers succeed in playing upon patriotic sentiments to the further undoing of American democracy.

CITIZEN SOLDIERY.

Incidental to an adverse comment last week upon the increasing demands for a large standing army, we