

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 American troops will never be withdrawn from Cuba if Mr.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 $10\frac{1}{2}$ 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