

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1902.

Number 246.

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.

Much as Mr. Balfour's methods in the Venezuelan case resemble pettifogging, one must concede the marvelous cleverness with which he has utilized them to baffle Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt has studiously endeavored to save the Monroe doctrine by evading a direct issue upon it. But Mr. Balfour, with the cunning of a Tombs lawyer, has led him into a position where the direct issue seems unavoidable except by an absolute back down.

The first and supreme opportunity was missed by Mr. Roosevelt when he acquiesced in the "pacific" naval demonstration of the allies for the collection of public debts from the harassed and bankrupt South American republic. A word of friendly protest then would in all probability have prevented the Anglo-German expedition and broken up the disgraceful alliance. Or, failing that, it would at any rate have put Great Britain and Germany into the awkward position of defying the wishes of a powerful and friendly nation and of committing the first overt act of hostility.

But another, though much inferior, opportunity arose, and of this Mr. Roosevelt did essay to take advantage. The "pacific" blockade of Venezuela could be objected to without directly raising the issue of the Monroe doctrine, and Mr. Roosevelt set in motion the appropriate diplomatic processes. It was here that Mr. Balfour's pettifogging came into play. Both Great Britain and Ger-

many had all along insisted that they were not making war upon Venezuela. The ultimatums were but civil notices to settle. The seizure of the Venezuelan vessels was "not a measure of war" but only a provisional something or other to "enforce ordinary courtesy." The bombardment of Cabello was strictly "pacific," and so the blockade was to be. But when Mr. Roosevelt intimates the unwillingness of the United States to recognize a blockade not made in the prosecution of war, Mr. Balfour suddenly abandons his "pacific" masquerade, concedes that there is no such thing in international law as a "pacific" blockade, and declares that actual war exists. To be sure, there has been no formal declaration of war; but how, blandly asks Mr. Balfour, can you seize ships and bombard forts, unless there is war?

So the blockade is to be made effective as a war measure, and the United States, no longer able to object that it is unlawful, but forced by Mr. Balfour into the position of a neutral, are obliged to warn away their merchant ships from Venezuela and to look on while the European powers make wanton war upon her, reserving the right to interfere only if Venezuela territory is occupied "permanently," whatever that may happen to mean, and in contravention of the Monroe doctrine. How Mr. Roosevelt can any longer conserve the Monroe doctrine except by casting the United States in the role of an aggressor, and raising that issue directly, it is very difficult to see.

Without at this time discussing the merits of the Monroe doctrine, one or two observations regarding it are necessary in view of the kind of comment the newspapers and some public men

are making. It is urged, for instance, that if the United States is to guard the American republics from European conquest, it ought to make itself responsible for their good behavior. The absurdity of this contention is transparent. The United States guards the States of the Union against all foreign aggression, yet it is not responsible to anyone for their good behavior. So long as their behavior is within their reserved rights of sovereignty, the United States are not answerable for them, yet will not permit a foreign attack upon them. Though no foreign power can collect debts with warships of any of the States, the United States makes no guarantee of any State debt. Why, then, should the Monroe doctrine, which makes the United States the self-assumed guardian of neighboring republics, impose upon them any obligations to answer for debts or other shortcomings of those republics?

The fact is that defaults by these small republics in the payment of their debts, are among the contingencies that have entered into the bargains under which their debts have fallen into foreign hands. The bonds of Venezuela have been bought by foreign speculators for a song because they might be paid, or they might not. Possibility of default and repudiation was among the factors that fixed the market value. To say that non-payment of such debts constitutes an outrage upon the nations whose speculative citizens hold them, and that it justifies war, either pacific or bellicose, is to say what is not only absurd, but what is apt to be malignantly so.

Prof. Jenks's report to the secretary of war on the question of Chinese labor in the Philippines has attracted the attention and excited the

hostility of Samuel Gompers, Ernest H. Crosby, Daniel Harris, A. J. Boulton, Charles B. Spahr and Henry White, all representative men, who have issued a public letter denouncing Prof. Jenks's recommendations. They quote the recommendations, which propose empowering the Philippine Commission to legislate regarding the admission of Chinese labor under contract. The details have evidently been nicely adjusted with a view to creating and maintaining a system of coolie slavery in our Asiatic "possessions." Employers of "not less than, say, twenty-five laborers," would be allowed, under Prof. Jenks's system, to import "Chinese under contract for a period of not over three years," and the employers would be required to give bonds to secure proper treatment of their imported Chinese coolies, as well as for their security and employment at the work specified in the contract, and their return to China at its expiration, unless "the contract is renewed under the special permission of the government granted separately in each case." Over this system of coolie slavery an inspector or "protector of the Chinese," appointed by the governor of the Philippines, would preside, to rigidly enforce the law by, among others things, preventing the imported coolie from "absconding and going elsewhere in the islands as a regular inhabitant." In other words, what the delectable Prof. Jenks calmly proposes is that large employers in the Philippines shall be allowed to establish a system of term serfdom, the serfs to be bought for importation and reexported at the end of their terms, being meanwhile closely confined to their masters' domicile. Commenting upon this iniquitous proposal, the gentlemen named above justly define it as meaning "the establishment of the contract system of coolie labor in its most objectionable form, in many respects resembling slavery." Little by little the real purpose of the policy of imperialism discloses itself to those workingmen who voted for a "full dinner pail" in 1900, with no

thought or care for the "obsolete" rights of man they were thereby trampling upon in the Philippines. Prof. Jenks's proposals are abhorrent, but they are in the regular order of evolution under the duty and destiny policy.

A valuable contribution to the subject of figure cooking in the statistical kitchen at Washington has been made by the Baltimore News. One of the reports of the bureau of statistics of the treasury department had shown for 1901 a great increase in American exports to China—an increase of 350 per cent. in six years. This compared favorably, from the "favorable balance of trade" point of view, with British and Russian exports to China, the latter having increased only 60 per cent. and the former only 25. But the Baltimore News was skeptical and investigated—with impressive results. It learned that the period from 1895 to 1901 had been selected because our exports to China were exceptionally low in 1895. They could consequently be compared with those of 1901 with an effect almost spectacular. If the figure-cooks had gone back four years and begun with 1891 instead of 1895, the increase would have been much smaller, for the exports to China in 1891 were two and a half times as great as in 1895. Or, if they had begun in 1897, they would have been obliged to record, instead of an increase of 350 per cent., an actual decrease of 12½ per cent. This exposure shows much delicate skill on the part of the figure cooks, but of what public use are figures so cooked?

Down in Delaware there is a Republican of the name of Addicks, who has all over the country a bad name as a political corruptionist. The bad name is doubtless well deserved. But in condemning Addicks and his offenses one should be careful to avoid creating the impression that the conditions Addicks is fighting are altogether pure. In a recent interview Addicks is reported as saying:

In 1893 there were five or six thou-

sand disfranchised Republicans in the State. The law required each voter to pay a poll tax of \$1.20, and if on election day he was eighteen months in arrears he found himself on the delinquent list and unable to vote. Those five or six thousand Republicans were kept from exercising the franchise by every conceivable device. The State was wholly Democratic. The courts and the boards of tax levy and the sheriffs were Democratic. Even the privilege of serving on juries was used as a Democratic prerogative. There never was a more absolute despotism in this country. Not only were the Republican Negroes and poor whites strictly held to their poll-tax responsibilities, not only were they falsely charged with dog taxes, but when they wanted to pay and qualify themselves for voting the tax receivers would evade them, sometimes even leaving the State to prevent payment in time for voting. On the other hand, it was not uncommon to find Democratic officials giving Democrats receipts for taxes they had not paid, in order that they might vote, and afterward declaring the receipts to be errors.

Whatever may be said about Addicks, his indictment of the Delaware oligarchy is true. The difference between him on the one side and the highly respectable gangs with which he has come in collision in Delaware politics, is only that their rascalities are garbed in traditional respectability. Low type of public character as Addicks is, it is questionable if he is not doing good work in breaking up the gangs of respectable rascals. As for democracy, the Delaware Democrats don't know what it means. Look at Judge Gray, for instance, and consider the game which that Delaware Democrat played for a judicial appointment at the hands of a Republican President. If the press were to make as much of those circumstances as they do of Addicks's political performances, Addicks would begin to look white by contrast.

Secretary Shaw is reported as advocating the abolition of customs houses at points where business is greatly disproportionate to the expense of keeping up the establishment. One custom house, for instance, costs the government about \$250 for every dollar of duties it collects; and there are others which resemble it, though the ratio of receipts