

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1898.

Number 16.

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.

Now that we have taken Santiago, what of it? If Spain makes terms of peace, it will not be because she has lost Santiago, but because she has lost her navy. It is true, of course, that Cervera forced Santiago upon us as a necessary point of attack, by rushing his squadron into that harbor. We were compelled to attack Santiago because it sheltered Cervera. Otherwise Santiago would have been of no importance to us. It was not, and is not, a key to the situation in Cuba. The key to the situation there is now, as it was at the beginning, the city of Havana. To take that is to take Cuba. To take that is to drive Spain out of the West Indies. To take that is to end the war. Why then was not Havana instead of Santiago attacked before Cervera's squadron got into West Indian waters? Gen. Lee, when he left Havana, said the city could be taken, in its then comparatively defenseless condition, within five days. That was a full month before Cervera's fleet arrived. But the attempt was not made, and now, with Santiago in our hands, we are as far removed from the capture of Havana as ever. We are even farther removed, for Havana has been thoroughly fortified meanwhile, and Santiago affords no better base for attack than Florida did.

Whether Gen. Miles ever becomes lieutenant general is a small matter in comparison with the respect of the American people which he has earned by his generous conduct towards Gen. Shafter in connection with the surrender of Santiago. To a smaller man, the temptation to take command

and reap the military honors incident to the surrender would have been great and probably irresistible. Miles was Shafter's superior; he came upon the ground before Toral was ready to submit; he brought orders fresh from Washington, and he was in every other respect in excellent position to assume command. But if he was for a moment tempted to do so, he restrained himself. By doing that, he at once won popular respect and proved himself worthy of it.

The contrast between Gen. Miles's behavior toward Shafter, and Admiral Sampson's toward Schley is striking. Sampson's opportunity was pretty much the same as Miles's. It was rather better. Sampson, it will be remembered, is only a captain; but pursuant to the policy of favoritism which has disgraced the management of the war at Washington, he was, without reason and upon the flimsiest of pretexts, early raised in temporary rank above all his superiors, including Schley. But the fortunes of war did not favor him as the fortunes of politics had done. While he was watching Cervera in the region of the Virgin islands, Schley was bottling up that suave Spaniard in Santiago bay. Then Sampson came to Santiago and virtually reduced Com. Schley to a captaincy by taking command of the fleet. But the critical moment, when Cervera was slipping out of the harbor, found Sampson far off to the east on his way to a conference with Shafter, and gave to Schley the coveted opportunity to secure the prize of Cervera's fleet. Sampson had not been derelict. Though absent from the mouth of the bay, he was attending strictly to his duty. No possible blame could have attached to him; and though his temporary subordinate Schley won the honor of destroying the enemy's fleet, everybody

would have looked upon Sampson as justly entitled, as the commanding officer, to share the honor, had he been generous about reporting it, as Miles was with Shafter. Everybody would have felt moreover that he was to be more than forgiven for being a favorite of the political powers. But Sampson wanted to appropriate the credit which justly belonged to Schley. So he telegraphed to Washington a report which for two or three days left the public to suppose that the victory Schley's alertness and commanding skill had won, was all Sampson's own. It was he, according to his report—he and his fleet—that gave the American people the destruction of the Spanish fleet for a Fourth of July present. Schley, who had really directed the work, was unnamed; and by Sampson he remains unnamed to this day. The contrast between this behavior and that of Miles, calls for candid consideration.

Senator Teller has told a Chicago reporter that in his opinion "there is no more reason why a republic is not qualified to maintain colonies than a monarchy." But that point no one has disputed. Of the qualifications of the United States to maintain a colonial system there is no doubt. The real question is, in the first place, the moral right of a republic to assume the relation of a monarchy to peoples beyond its borders; and, in the second, the reactionary effect of such a policy upon the republic itself. The Roman republic was qualified to maintain colonies, and it did maintain them; but the Roman republic degenerated and became an empire. Are the American people ambitious to have their republic follow in the footsteps of the dead and buried republic of Rome?

Mr. Teller further says, in the same interview, that during all our history we have maintained colonies; and he points to our "territorial organization as a colonial one." Here he loses sight of the essential difference between a colony and what we call a territory. Our territorial system is republican, not colonial. What are our territories, what have they ever been, but what the name implies—territory, mere territory? They are denied statehood only while their populations are sparse. As soon as our territories have become populous enough to claim statehood, they have been taken into the union. Meantime such sparse population as they have had has been secured a full measure of self-government. Our territorial system has been republican. Something very different is a colony. That term, too, is significant. As it implies, a colony is more than mere territory; it is a community to which self-government is denied, within territory which it is never intended to admit to statehood. The difference between one of our territories and a colony is analogous to the difference between a young American citizen who upon coming of age acquires all the rights of citizenship, and an old-time slave who could never grow out of his status. What the imperialists propose to do is not to acquire mere territory, but to acquire dominion over communities which, already populous enough for statehood, are nevertheless to be held forever in subjection to federal laws in the enactment of which they are to have no voice.

It is only fair to Senator Teller to say, however, that he is not in sympathy with the colonial system. He declares himself, in the same interview, as being in favor of establishing local self-government both in Cuba and in the Philippines.

The underlying purpose of the colonization idea, the animating motive of this new imperialism that confronts us, was incautiously ex-

pressed by a New York promoter whom an omnipresent Chicago reporter caught "on the fly" for an interview. S. Fredericks is the name of the gentleman from New York, and as a promoter he knows well enough what he is talking about. His theme is the Philippine islands; his ambition, to interest capital in Philippine investments. Eloquently he describes the marvelous richness of those islands in "natural resources," and right acutely does he calculate the rich profits they would yield "under such stable governmental conditions as would be insured by American control." It is the "natural resources" that our imperialistic friends are after. With a colonial system under which, as the imperialistic press enthusiastically assures us, congress would exercise absolute control, what rich pickings would not Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines offer to American investors in "natural resources?" We should soon make of those hapless islands what England made of Ireland.

Nor would "natural resources" be the only pickings. Already it appears that a far-seeing little clique in Mark Hanna's bailiwick of Cleveland, O., has procured a charter for the "First national bank of the Philippines;" and if the United States were to appropriate those islands it would not be long before we should find congress making corporation charters and creating monopoly franchises at a startling rate. A seat in congress would then be worth more, "on the side," than a seat in the Illinois legislature or the Chicago board of aldermen during a Yerkes session.

The text of the speech made on the 4th of July at Leipsic by our ambassador to Germany, Andrew D. White, has just reached this country. It was well calculated to allay the prejudice which certain interests were working up in Germany against the United States, in connection with the war with Spain; and not the least composing part of it was that in which

Mr. White said: "Whether others know it or not, the men governing Germany know . . . that our motive in entering the war was not to grasp new territory." But suppose the imperialists should succeed, what then could Mr. White say? Could he explain that while that was not our motive in entering the war, the events of the war had made it necessary? Such an explanation is not to be thought of; Mr. White is no pettifogger. But what could he say? Could he do less than apologize for his 4th of July speech, admitting that those Germans were right who had believed that whatever our professions might be, our purpose in going to war was to grasp new territory?

The Chicago Times-Herald, which often displays profound wisdom in discussing subjects about which it has thought little and knows less, speaks owlishly of an astonishing demand which is to come up out of Asia as the result of our imperial policy. It is to be a demand for "things which labor alone cannot produce." Now the Times-Herald does not mean raw material; yet raw material is the only thing outside of man himself which human labor, and that alone, does not produce. We suppose that things produced by machinery were in the mind of the Times-Herald writer. It is a common notion that when labor uses machinery the products are not produced by labor alone; that machinery is a partner. This is one of the root fallacies of socialism. It is a fallacy of the most misleading type. For labor not only uses all machinery; it also produces all machinery. There is nothing for exportation either to Asia or elsewhere, except the rawest of raw material, actual territory—and that is non-exportable,—which is not produced by labor, and by labor alone.

Out of all the clamor for colonization and empire, Gov. Altgeld's voice rang true at the Illinois democratic convention. In a masterly speech in which on one hand he advocated the expansion of the American ideal

of republican government, he on the other hand warned his party against "those wild schemes of conquest and plunder which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire." For the democratic motto he advocated: "The natural development and supremacy of this continent, but opposition to spoliation and conquest."

Gov. Altgeld also prescribed on this occasion a test of party loyalty which the democratic party has long needed, pestered as it is with parasites who, capturing democratic conventions, promote their nefarious schemes by appeals to the sense of party loyalty. It is a fundamental democratic principle, said Altgeld, that "no party can compel a man to support a criminal for office." He therefore urged his followers, in every case in which a man regarded by the public as a boodler forces himself upon the democratic ticket, to make an independent democratic nomination, so that the democrats may have an opportunity to say at the polls whether they want such a man to represent them or not. Thus Gov. Altgeld makes a genuine distinction between loyalty to party, and submission to knavery. Party loyalty is sound doctrine. It is right that the members of a party should support their regularly nominated party candidate. The man who brags of scratching his ballot without just cause, brags of treachery. When the candidates of a party are fairly nominated, are honest men, and are honestly representative of the party principles, it is a political duty of all the members of their party to support them. But if the candidate does not stand for the principles of his party—if he is really in sympathy with the opposing party,—or if he has secured his nomination by means of fraud, or if he is a boodler, it is as much the political duty of the members of the party to defeat him if possible, as otherwise it would be to support him. Better that the candidates of opposition parties tem-

porarily succeed, than that one's own party should be discredited and demoralized by treachery or internal rottenness.

The state convention before which Gov. Altgeld spoke, acting probably under Altgeld's influence—if not directly, then indirectly, through the Jeffersonian democratic spirit which he has revived in the state of Illinois—made a pronounced declaration against the private ownership of monopolies. It was nothing less than a demand for "municipal ownership and control of all public franchises and all other natural monopolies, which of right belong to the people." This demand is more radical and far reaching than was probably intended by some of the men who agreed to it. To street car systems, there can be no doubt of its deliberate application. It binds the democratic party of Illinois to put an end to the swindling and corrupting system of street car franchises, and to substitute for it the system which has been introduced so satisfactorily in England and Australasia, that of municipal ownership. But it goes farther. In principle, at any rate, it calls for the establishment of publicly owned railroads, telegraphs and telephones. Nor would that mark the limit of its application. What are we to understand by "natural monopolies which of right belong to the people?" This certainly includes more than street car lines, railways and telegraphs. It includes every "monopoly which of right belongs to the people;" and most important among these—most important because it is the mother of all other monopolies and would make monopoly flourish in all its vigor though every other form of monopoly were abolished—is monopoly of land. The Illinois democratic platform of 1898 therefore lays down the principle, to which it pledges the party, that private monopoly of land shall cease. By what particular method this monopoly is to be supplanted the platform does not state. Nor was it nec-

essary to do so. But the principle for which Henry George contended is there distinctly asserted.

In nominating James G. Maguire for governor, the populists of California have shown good judgment. He is a candidate for the democratic nomination, and this action of the populists probably guarantees a union of the truly democratic forces at the California election. Upon no better candidate could the two parties concentrate. They could not concentrate upon another so good. James G. Maguire is a prominent lawyer of San Francisco. A blacksmith by trade, he worked his own way to the bar, where he made a record that put him upon the superior court bench when he was not yet thirty years of age. After serving with distinction as a judge till the end of his term, he contested his district as a democrat for a seat in congress. It was supposed that his prominence as a follower of Henry George, whose personal friend and pronounced disciple he had been for years, would lose him the election. On the contrary it won him a triumph in a district which straight-out democrats had been unable to carry. Once elected to congress, Maguire was returned again and again. The people of his district had found in him a consistent, unpurchaseable, and able adversary of the railroad monopolies which are a curse to California. It was a novel sensation, and they enjoyed it. Because of his record in congress, Maguire is now the most popular man in the golden state. His gubernatorial campaign, if the democratic convention does not fall a prey to railroad corruption funds and defeat his nomination, will be a battle royal of sterling democracy against monopoly pirates of the purest breed.

The secretary of the treasury has been reported as saying that the over-subscription to the national loan is a good sign of prosperity. Does Mr. Gage really believe that? Is it possible that he ever said it? How can he or anyone else infer that we are in prosperous times because people