

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

ALICE THACHER POST, Managing Editor

Vol. IX.

Number 442.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1906.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Ownership of Natural Wealth.....	577
Bryan and Some of His Recent Friends.....	577
Bryan and Sullivan.....	577
Cause of Higher Rents.....	577
American Intervention in Cuba.....	577
The Revolutionary Cause in Cuba.....	578
Annuling Cuban Independence.....	579
Cuban Civilization.....	579
A Labor Union Problem.....	579
Senator Bailey and the Railroad Question.....	580
The Independent Ticket in Chicago.....	580
Judge Windes' Traction Decision.....	580
Legitimate and Illegitimate Fortunes.....	580
Elementary Civics.....	581

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The United States Intervenes in Cuba.....	583
Politics in the United States.....	584
Mr. Bryan's Speaking Trip.....	584
Progress of Chicago Traction Movement.....	584
Municipal Ownership Questions in Seattle.....	585
The New San Francisco.....	585
Progress in Russia.....	585
News Notes.....	586
Press Opinions.....	587

RELATED THINGS:

Our Mother's Store (verse).....	588
The Human Heart is Sound.....	588
A Foolometer.....	589
Public Ownership as a Suffrage Educator (Winslow).....	589

SERIAL:

The Confessions of a Monopolist (Howe).....	590
---	-----

BOOKS:

Songs of Russia.....	597
Coniston.....	597
Books Received.....	598
Pamphlets.....	598
Periodicals.....	598

CARTOON:

The Tug-of-War in the Republican Camp.....	598
--	-----

EDITORIAL

Ownership of Natural Wealth.

The richest silver deposit in the world is reported to have been discovered in Canada. The vein is said to be six feet thick, and so soft at the top that it can be worked with a steam shovel. It is a wonderfully rich gift of nature to mankind. The Standard Oil Company owns it.

+ +

Bryan and Some of His Recent Friends.

Whatever any one may think of the merits of Mr. Bryan's railroad ownership ideas, no one can

deny that his announcement of them has operated to drive off unwelcome hangers-on whose support would alienate sincere men and subject his own sincerity to question. It has done this smoothly and effectively without his having to tell the not-wanted that they were trying to climb into the wrong band wagon.

+ +

Bryan and Sullivan.

Mr. Bryan did a good job when he held up Roger C. Sullivan to the national gaze as a type of the man whose presence officially in the Democratic party stultifies party principles and does the party harm. He could not well have done this with any other Democratic official of similar character, for all the other corporation agents in the Democratic machine have title to their positions in the party. Sullivan alone has a bad title, and this has enabled Mr. Bryan properly to demand his retirement. But the opportunity open, Mr. Bryan has utilized it effectively to declare his own position not only with reference to Sullivan but to all other Democratic officials who are also corporation agents.

+ +

Cause of Higher Rents.

Noting the increase of rents in New York, an exchange attributes it to increase in the price of house-building material. That is doubtless an element. But the last assessment of the Borough of Manhattan discloses another. The site values alone of Manhattan have increased \$180,000,000 in two years. This increase in the cost of house sites goes far to parallel the increase in the cost of building materials. It is enough to build 1,800 houses costing \$100,000 each.

+ +

American Intervention in Cuba.

What would Americans of the early '60's have thought if Louis Napoleon, reminding them of their indebtedness to France for their independence, had warned them that he would intervene to prevent anarchy if they went on with their civil war? It is hardly necessary to ask. Americans of that time would have defied Louis Napoleon if strong enough to fight him and one another at once, and they would at least have denounced him roundly if too demoralized and weak to fight him. They would certainly have realized the incongruity with their independence of such an assumption on his part. And the present generation

would look at the matter in the same way. We should all say at once that ours was not an independent country if any foreign ruler, however much we were indebted to his country historically for our independence, could, with the slightest claim of right, have made such pretensions regarding us at the time of our civil war. Yet, what we should have resented on the part of Louis Napoleon toward ourselves in the middle of the nineteenth century, we are applauding President Roosevelt for doing toward the Cubans at the beginning of the twentieth.

+

The only difference between President Roosevelt's action with reference to Cuba at this time, and such a supposition regarding Louis Napoleon with reference to the United States nearly half a century ago, is that the Cuban constitution authorizes the United States to intervene in Cuba under certain circumstances. But this clause was arbitrarily forced upon the Cubans by our government, and was finally accepted by them upon an understanding which leaves to us no more right to put down civil war in Cuba now than Louis Napoleon would have had to put down civil war in the United States in 1861-65.

+

Let us recall the circumstances under which the intervention clause of the Cuban constitution was adopted. As an amendment to the army appropriation bill in the United States Senate on the 25th of March, 1901, the following clause, paragraph 3 of what is known as "the Platt amendment" (vol. iii, pp. 762-63), was adopted as a condition of our assenting to Cuban independence:

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

This clause was incorporated into the army appropriation law, and naturally enough the Cubans objected to it. Their objection was not only natural but it was right. For the United States had at the outbreak of the Spanish war solemnly declared that—

The United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and assert their determination, when that is

accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

But upon representations officially made by President McKinley, through Secretary Root (vol. iv, pp. 104, 122), the Cubans accepted the superimposed conditions. These representations were to the effect that the Platt amendment had for its object simply the guaranteeing of the independence of Cuba, and did not "contemplate interference with its government or the exercise of a protectorate or of sovereignty," and also that intervention would take place only "when independence is endangered by outside powers, or grave interior disturbances creating anarchy" occur. It is now asserted, of course, that the Cuban civil war does create anarchy; or, as President Roosevelt puts it, will "assuredly throw" Cuba "into anarchy." But there is no more reason to anticipate that result in Cuba now, than there would have been in the United States in 1861. Under existing circumstances American intervention is equivalent to the establishment of an arbitrary protectorate. It is not improbably the forerunner of an application to Cuba of the colonial policy under which we govern the Philippines.

+ +

The Revolutionary Cause in Cuba.

That the Cuban revolutionists are not creating disorder wantonly is fairly evident from their address to the American people, in which they object to American intervention. The question is their question, they say, a question of their rights and duties, and one that they themselves must settle; and they ask us, and fairly ask us, to consider that this question is "fraught with more consequences to Cuba than momentary commercial loss or gain," for it involves their constitution and their liberties. We fear they are talking into wooden ears when they make this appeal. Most Americans, though not as much under the spell of the devilish type of commercialism as they were a few years ago, still find it difficult to realize anything more momentous to any people than commercial loss or gain. But it certainly is worth while for us, before intervening in this foreign family quarrel, to consider whether the Cuban revolutionists may not possibly be right. They justify their civil war upon the ground that under the empty name of a republic, the shackles of the overthrown Spanish dominion have again been imposed upon them, that their constitution has been cast aside with contemptuous egotism, that the royal laws of the ancient regime have been revived and issued with the very forms and words of the royal Spanish decree, and that absolutism