

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 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 Ladrone 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