

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1899.

Number 44.

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.

Having acquired a species of self-governing rights in their municipalities, the Irish are now reviving the land question. But this time they strike deeper than in Land League days. Then they demanded the land of Ireland for Irish tenants; now they are demanding it for the Irish people.

The postmaster of Chicago has decided to abandon his attempt to put postal clerks in livery. There was a suddenness in his change of mind which he does not explain, but which an editorial in the Chicago Chronicle does. The writer of this editorial had dug up a provision of the United States statutes—chapter 180 of the laws of 1879—which distinctly declares that “postal clerks, route agents, and mail route messengers, shall not be required to wear uniforms, other than a cap or badge.” The real feeling of the Chicago postal clerks, on the subject, may be inferred from the fact that at the annual election in their association on the 1st, 730 voted against uniforms and only 55 for them.

It is an indignation-arousing story, that which comes from Vienna, about the scientific experiments performed by doctors upon charity patients. Charges are publicly made and virtually confessed, that germs of infectious diseases have been injected into these patients to enable the doctors to study the progress of the disease, and that dangerous surgical operations—many of them ending fatally and others maiming the victims for life—were performed simply to give surgeons experience. One

instance is proved in which a doctor took bacilli from a decomposing corpse and injected them into 35 women and three newly born babies. The result is not disclosed. Patients on their death beds were tortured by painful experiments, either upon false pretenses or while lying helpless at the doctors' mercy. Not only is there no denial of these charges, but the doctors defend them, arguing that the same practice prevails in the charity hospitals of Berlin, Paris and London. One distinguished surgeon is reported as saying: “Tests must be made on somebody. Charity-hospital patients generally are available subjects.” Time was when the dead bodies of criminals were turned over to doctors for experiment, and that was regarded as barbarous. But here we have instances of the use for that purpose of the living bodies, not of condemned criminals, but of the innocent and unfortunate poor.

The most completely bottled-up city in the United States to-day, with reference to its newspapers, is Chicago. Every one of these papers belongs now to a newspaper trust; and the trust is subject to the will of three or four capitalists whose general business interests are so interlaced that whatever affects one affects all. The editors have no more influence than reporters and compositors in determining the policies of their papers. Independent journalism in Chicago is extinct.

This is the situation which Altgeld confronts in making his mayoralty campaign against the street car ring and the democratic reactionaries. At the beginning of his campaign there was one daily paper which exposed the rings and supported him, but the newspaper trust speedily got control of that, and silenced its editors along with the other editors.

One of the trust papers bewails the fact that Altgeld has injected into the municipal campaign a question of national partisan politics. “The contest ought,” it says, “to turn on local issues alone.” But the proprietor of that paper knows perfectly well that the contest cannot turn on local issues. He knows that Harrison's reelection would enable Harrison to control one-third of the democratic state convention in 1900; that the state convention would control the Illinois delegates to the national convention; and that if Illinois held the balance of power in the national convention, those delegates would dictate the democratic platform and candidates in 1900. This is one of the chief reasons of the ring for defeating Altgeld if possible. Harrison is acting in collusion with the Chicago newspaper trust and the bolters of the '96 platform. Incidentally, he is acting in collusion with the street car ring to put obstacles in the way of municipal ownership of the street car system. Altgeld is fighting him at both points. It is not Altgeld who has injected national politics into the municipal campaign; national politics were already in it.

At last the lower house of congress has been induced to authorize a large standing army. The probability is that the senate will give its sanction to the measure, and the president's approval is a foregone conclusion.

For a long time the supporters of militarism in this country had been trying to enlarge the regular army. But the people were shy. Fear of the dangers of standing armies was in the American blood. The war, however, gave the militarists their opportunity. They then found it easy to increase the army from what it had been since 1875, 25,000, to 61,000. But they

were compelled to agree, and to put it into the law, that at the end of the war the old limit of 25,000 should be resumed. The war is now practically ended, and, according to the terms of the law upon which the army was increased to 61,000, the war department ought to be arranging to reduce it again to 25,000. But just at this moment a new law is pushed through, a law which makes our peace army not less in number than 50,000, and empowers the president to raise it to 100,000 if he wishes to. He is reported by administration papers as expressing a desire for the full 100,000 army limit. An American standing army of 100,000 men is, therefore, now in sight.

Why this increase? We are no longer at war. Porto Rico makes no demand upon us for a greater military equipment. Cuba can be set up in business as an independent nation without it. For what purpose, then, is the army to be increased to four times its recent peace footing? The ready answer may be found, in part, in the dispatch of troops to the Philippines. What for? To preserve the peace there? No. The Philippine republic is preserving the Philippine peace everywhere except at Manila. There is no disturbance in the archipelago except what we are making. Why, then, do we send troops, more troops, and yet again more troops to the Philippines? There is but one explanation. It is not to preserve the Philippine peace, not to fight the Spanish war or any phase of it, but to enable the president to make a new war, an unauthorized war, a war of conquest against the Filipinos.

But that is only part of the answer to the question. The other part may be found in the rejection of Representative Cummings's proposed amendment to the army reorganization bill. He proposed that the president should not be permitted to send troops into a state to preserve the local peace, without a written request from the appropriate governor. His amendment was defeated. There was

no alternative. To have admitted such an amendment would have nullified a prime purpose of the measure. For one thing, a large standing army is needed by the plutocratic elements of the country, as a police force. State lines are to be obliterated, local government is to be ignored, the president with a great army behind him, subject to his arbitrary will as commander in chief, is to be raised to a position of irresponsible power. As President McKinley now assumes to govern Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines arbitrarily, by the force of a mere military machine, so, in the evolution of which the army reorganization bill is one of the processes, he or his successor will yet assume arbitrarily to rule our own states, even in such purely local matters as the suppression of domestic violence and the administration of domestic law. Already his friends call it "treason" to oppose his will as to the conquest of the Philippines; how long before he, with this vast military machine behind him, will arbitrarily punish all opposition to his will as treason?

We speak of the armaments of Europe as if they were burdensome; but if this army reorganization bill should become law, and the army be increased to the maximum of 100,000 men, no European state would be under a heavier military burden in time of peace than the United States of America. The secretary of the treasury estimates that \$144,000,000 will be needed for the army alone for the fiscal year beginning next July, and that \$47,000,000 will be needed for the navy—a total, without counting pensions, of \$191,000,000 a year in time of peace. Compare that with Russia's war budget in 1898, of \$148,640,191; with Germany's in the same year, of \$141,175,350; with France's in the same year, of \$123,517,681; with England's in 1897, of \$88,152,750; and with Austria's in 1897, of \$86,083,024. We are to lead them all. Which nations will hereafter be the typical victims of militarism, the nations of Europe or the United States?

It is true that the army appropriation asked for by the military committee of the house is only \$90,000,000—\$54,000,000 less than the estimate of the secretary. This reduction is accounted for by the explanation that the secretary estimated upon an army of 150,000 men, instead of 100,000. But does anyone suppose that the comparatively modest sum of \$90,000,000 will cover the expense? Is there any doubt that a large deficiency appropriation will be asked from the next congress? And even if that be not done, \$90,000,000 for the army and \$47,000,000 for the navy make \$137,000,000, which is not very much less than the war budgets of Russia and Germany, and considerably more than those of France, England and Austria. Besides, there are huge river and harbor appropriations to be charged to our military budget, as well as the pay of retired officers and nearly \$150,000,000 in pensions. Altogether, American military expenses in time of peace, are to make those of the warlike powers of Europe seem Lilliputian by comparison.

Once, upon the floor of the house of representatives, John Randolph of Roanoke rebuked a particularly atrocious sentiment, by exclaiming: "I envy the man who can entertain that sentiment neither his head nor his heart." A similar retort might be made to the newspapers, professors and preachers who are now urging the United States to seize the Philippine islands and govern the inhabitants arbitrarily, in the face of our national principle that governments derive their just power only from the consent of the governed. These worthies ignore the moral argument, and urge this national stultification upon the ground that we have more than once been guilty of the same stultification heretofore in our history. Theirs is an argument on a par with what a man might make who, being tempted to steal, should shove the eighth commandment aside upon the plea that his father, his grandfather,