

stead of being "ladrones," as the local newspapers are forced by the American military censor to call them, are detachments of the Filipino army, fighting for independence. When defeated in warfare, according to the rules of the game, Aguinaldo reorganized his army into small companies and ordered a guerrilla warfare. Everywhere on the best of terms with the people, these companies make it dangerous for foreigners to go beyond the outposts of a garrison, and so hold the country against American subjugation, except in the immediate presence of American soldiers with loaded guns.

Such is the hopeless situation as Mr. Ade reports it, and he gives excellent reasons for its being so. The Filipinos have no confidence in the Americans; do not believe that they tell the truth; regard every fair promise as some new trick to deceive them—suspicions that have been excited and confirmed by the vindictive spirit and merciless conduct of the American troops. Our only friends in the Philippines, according to Mr. Ade's observations, are the European business element, and one savage tribe, the Macabebes, who are hereditary enemies of the civilized Filipinos.

Mr. Ade sums up the Philippine question in three principal aspects, as follows: In the United States: "What is our duty toward the Filipinos?" With the army: "How can we stamp out the insurrection?" And with the advance guard of American business men in Manila: "What shall we do to make money?" To the Filipinos there is still another aspect. It is how to drive out the foresworn nation of mankillers and money hunters, which has displaced Spain as the cruel autocrat of their long suffering country.

When Senator Spooner, speaking on the floor of the senate, was asked what he proposed to do with the Filipinos after enforcing upon their peo-

ple the authority of this government, he hotly replied:

To give the people honest, even-handed justice and good government; to protect life and property; to fill the land with schoolhouses; to give the people such part in the government as they may show themselves fitted for; to maintain the laws so honestly and firmly that no man, however rich, shall be beyond their reach and no man so humble that he may not have their protection.

Mr. Spooner was altogether too hot to be judicial or even senatorial. The Filipinos themselves protected life and property, until the Americans devastated their land and slaughtered their people as even the brutal Spaniards never did. That they did protect life and property is proved by the official report of Leonard R. Sargent, American naval cadet, and W. B. Wilcox, American naval paymaster, who spent two months in the very heart of the Filipino republic in Luzon a few weeks before the American tornado of death and destruction set in. Sargent wrote to the *Outlook* (September 2, 1899, page 17) that he and his companion had returned to Manila after their extended tour in the interior, "with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which" they "found the natives to be leading under the new regime." As to schoolhouses, Luzon was always well supplied with them before the American holocaust. And if Mr. Spooner succeeds in giving the Filipinos just laws so maintained "that no man, however rich, shall be beyond their reach, and no man so humble that he may not have their protection," he will perform the political miracle of extending to the Filipinos a government such as no civilized nation enjoys. If Mr. Spooner is possessed of this miraculous power, he should give his own countrymen the benefit of it to begin with. But it is to be feared that Mr. Spooner, in his heat, outspoke himself.

This seems to be one of Senator Spooner's defects. A few days before, he grew very warm because Senator Hale, one of the republican senators from Maine, referred to the

American defalcations in Cuba as a lesson to the Cubans of "fraud, speculation, cheating, misappropriation of revenues, stealing, a carnival in every direction of corruption and fraud." So badly rattled at that indictment of our Cuban occupation was Senator Spooner, that he made the tactical blunder of saying it was tiresome for him to be called upon from the republican side of the senate "to reply to a democratic speech"! His angry remark, as it appears in cold type, must look to Senator Spooner like one of those things "one would rather have put differently." To the unsophisticated republican reader, at any rate, it must certainly have a bitter flavor. It reads too much like a defiant confession that it is regarded as a party obligation among administration republicans to characterize administration frauds tenderly. It might even suggest to the irreverent that Mr. Spooner regards it as the function of democrats to denounce rascality in high places and of republicans to palliate it.

Well was it for the public, however, that Mr. Spooner grew thus warm with Senator Hale, for it brought from the latter a declaration that needed to be spoken from his side of the chamber. Said Mr. Hale:

I think there are very powerful influences in this country—largely located in New York city, largely speculative and connected with money-making enterprises—that are determined that we shall never give up Cuba. I think that the time will never come unless something earnest and drastic is done by congress that the last soldier of the United States will be withdrawn from Cuban soil. I do not think the president favors holding Cuba. I discovered very powerful influences—commercial, mercantile, money and political—that are opposed to our ever withdrawing from Cuba. I take up the newspapers that are foremost in the large cities and I find every day intimations and hints that we are never to withdraw from Cuba.

What Senator Hale said, the people, including hosts of sorely disappointed republicans, have long been thinking.

There is an accumulation of good reasons for believing not only that exploiters of the administration but the administration itself has long contemplated grabbing Cuba. Did not the president in his special message of April 11, 1896, ask for authority to establish a stable government in Cuba without recognizing Cuban independence? Did not the administration ring in congress oppose to the last that clause of the joint resolution of April 13, 1896, which recognized the independence of "the republic of Cuba?" Did not the administration evade the plain intention of that resolution by refusing to recognize the republic of Cuba? Did it not further disregard both the spirit and the terms of that resolution by subverting the republic of Cuba? Instead of obeying the resolution of congress, signed by himself and part of the law of the land, by recognizing and establishing the republic of Cuba, the president has maintained for nearly two years an American military autocracy there on pretense of organizing another republic in Cuba, because the one recognized by a law of congress did not suit him. Why has he done this? What does it portend? Does not his policy with reference to Porto Rico and the Philippines answer the question? Bound with regard to them by no specific requirements of the Cuban resolution of congress, but only by its spirit, he assumed to annex them. These are acts which, in accordance with familiar rules of proof, throw light upon his purpose. It is only by men's acts that their motives can be ascertained, and every day in the criminal court rooms that method is availed of. Taking McKinley's whole Cuban-Philippine-Puerto Rican policy together, viewing it in the light of his actions, and considering it with reference to the joint resolutions of 1896 recognizing the independence of the republic of Cuba, and there is enough evidence to convince any unbiased jury that Mr. McKinley has all along intended to deprive all these countries of independence. Senator Hale's suspicions are

not unfounded. American troops will never be withdrawn from Cuba if Mr. McKinley can prevent it.

At a recent sale of part of the site of the Auditorium Annex, Nos. 9 and 11 Congress street, Chicago, that tiny piece of ground brought \$135,000. A little figuring upon this transaction may enlighten those bucolic victims of newspaper misrepresentation who think that "farmers own all the land." The piece of ground in question is  $34\frac{1}{2}$  by 102 feet in area, or 3,480 $\frac{1}{2}$  square feet. The sale, therefore, was at the rate per acre of \$1,698,840. As the average value of Illinois farms, as shown by the Illinois labor report for 1894, is \$2,050, one acre of Chicago land located as the Annex site is is equal in value to 828 improved Illinois farms. The fraction of an acre actually sold for \$135,000 is equal in value to 65 such farms. Observe that the price paid for this city lot was merely for the land. No interest whatever was conveyed in the improvements. It was land, nothing but land, precisely the same sort of soil as that in which farmers raise corn, and only the soil; yet its purchaser has acquired a monopoly in the earth as valuable as a monopoly of 65 farms would be. Is it not time, then, when inquiries as to American landlordism are being made, to turn public attention somewhat to these vast holdings in cities? When measured by value, most of our land is in cities, and not in farming districts. The farmers, even proprietary farmers, own comparatively little land, measuring land by its value instead of its area. And it is value, not area, that counts in land monopoly.

At the recent race conference of white southern democrats, held at Montgomery, there was nothing really remarkable in the inclination exhibited to agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. The men who urged this are not democrats in

truth. If they wear the democratic label, that is chiefly because it is an inheritance from those ante-bellum days when the slave oligarchy controlled the democratic party in power as the trust oligarchy now controls the republican party in power. They know not Jefferson, with his theory that all men are created with equal rights, any more than the administration republicans know Lincoln with his theory of government by the people governed. It would be remarkable if men like these did not agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. They have long wanted it repealed, and now the time for agitation must seem ripe. Have not the administration republicans invited just that agitation and indicated their disposition to support it? All this talk in the north about putting inferior peoples under tutelage, all this regret for the "mistake" of elevating the negro to equal political rights, all this official sympathy with England in her war of subjugation against the Boers, all these efforts to conquer the brave little "niggers" (as they call them) of the Philippines, all this turning away from democratic ideals—what does it mean and from whom does it come? It comes from northern republicans who have forgotten Lincoln, and it means that white men must govern and black men must serve. This is part of the "white man's burden." It means essentially more than that. Not only must white men govern black men, but the rich must govern all. Plutocracy and imperialism, these two in one, rising together above the northern political horizon as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, but black with a menace to equal rights, are what southern aristocrats of the ante-bellum type see to encourage their proposed assault upon the fifteenth amendment. Toombs democrats of the south and Hanna-McKinley republicans of the north are finding common ground upon which to meet. Political equality of the masses, black and white, is the object of their attack. They clasp hands now upon the doctrine that "superior" races must govern; in a