

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1902.

Number 245.

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 page.

The Venezuelan situation is by no means satisfactory to peaceably minded Americans who believe in the Monroe doctrine. For the invasion of Venezuela by Great Britain and Germany has raised the alternative of a war between this country and those powers, or a back down from the Monroe doctrine by this country, to the level of a reasonable probability. Should the assault which Great Britain and Germany have made upon Venezuela ripen into war, as now seems highly probable, they are almost certain to do something either in the prosecution or the settlement of the war which would give them a footing upon South American soil in contravention of the Monroe doctrine. We should then be obliged either to acquiesce or to fight.

Even the possibility of that alternative might have been avoided by polite diplomatic intimations from Washington. What Germany and Great Britain are trying to do is to collect private debts by ultimatums and ships of war. This should be abhorrent to American sentiment, and those governments should have been so advised. Had they been notified that the United States could not consider, without concern for the integrity of the Monroe doctrine, an attack upon a weak South American republic by powerful European monarchies for such a cause, they would not have made the venture.

But how will it be under the circumstances as they exist? The United States have assented to the war which the European powers have

now begun, and in assenting they have made only the bare condition that the Monroe doctrine shall be respected. With that encouragement from the United States, for encouragement it clearly is, Great Britain and Germany have begun a conflict in which, should it progress very far, they would do more than seize and destroy Venezuelan ships. They will occupy Venezuelan soil and acquire Venezuelan territory. When this has been done, an intimation of displeasure from the United States will come too late. To recognize such an intimation at that time would necessitate a backdown on the part of the invaders, which they in their military pride and the consciousness of having acquired a foothold, would not for a moment consider. Thenceforth the responsibility would be upon the United States of deciding whether to modify the life out of the Monroe doctrine or to become the aggressor in making war. Neither Great Britain nor Germany has a record at all reassuring for getting out of countries which they have once got into.

In the pulpit of Plymouth church, Brooklyn—Beecher's old church—the Rev. Newell Dwight Hillis preaches. If any one doubts that Mr. Hillis is a demagogue playing to the boxes, his sermon of November 9 last, on "Labor's War Upon Labor," which is being extensively circulated, should dispel the doubt. Purporting to be a pious and liberty-defending sermon, it is nothing less than a violent appeal to the prejudices of the classes that "chip in" handsomely when the contribution plate is passed.

Mr. Hillis's condemnation of labor unions may be left to the consideration of those organizations; but men in general who believe in human

rights will want to know what advice he has to give to the despoiled working class, looking to their protection from spoliation. It is at this point that the violent Mr. Hillis becomes as gentle as a cooing dove. Would they increase their wages? He tells them that the way to do it is to increase the quantity and quality of their work. Does any one suppose that Mr. Hillis really believes that if the quantity and quality of their work were generally increased by the working class, they would get better wages? Is he so simple as not to know that competition for a job at doing better work would then be as keen as competition is now for poorer work, or so ignorant as not to understand that it is competition for jobs and not quantity or quality of work that determines wages in general? "We can double the income from the soil," he tells the working class. But he carefully refrains from reminding them that those who own the soil and not those who do the doubling will get the difference.

One feature of the Hillis sermon is common to all that is being said and printed in behalf of non-union men. It is the fact that the speaker in no sense represents non-union men, though he speaks in their name. A criticism of Mr. Hillis and Whitelaw Reid, which Henry George, Jr., made a week ago in one of his excellent syndicate articles, goes straight to the mark. Mr. George asks who they are that make the plea and shed the crocodile tears for non-union men, and then he answers:

Not nonunion men. We hear a great deal about nonunion men, but never from them direct. If they do not speak who are their spokesmen? Let us apply this question to the two men we have quoted, Mr. Reid and Dr. Hillis. The fortune which bought Mr. Reid's newspaper for him and made him em-