

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1898.

Number 15.

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 column of last page.

The Spanish government complains that the Americans destroyed their ships with "incendiary projectiles." They certainly did not use rubber balls. What did the Spanish government expect?

Our ambassador to Italy is authority for the remarkable statement that "a considerable body of men in Spain regard the Spanish colonies as an incumbrance to the waging of the war," and think that "when the colonies have been lost, the country will be in a better condition than ever for the struggle." Spain should have consulted this optimistic body of men before the war began. By divesting herself of only one of the incumbrances—Cuba—and allowing the people of that island to govern themselves, she could have prevented the war. What is Spain fighting for, if not to hold fast to her colonial "incumbrances?"

Some mystery hangs about the neglect of the government to furnish a complete list of the casualties at the battle of Santiago. It is now two weeks since that battle was fought, yet the friends at home of most of the American soldiers who were engaged in it, are, at this writing, still ignorant of their fate. A few have been named among the killed, a few more among the wounded, and only a few, if any, among the missing. As to the rest—and many more were lost,—unless their friends have heard from them directly, they don't yet know whether they are alive or not. A delay of two weeks in publishing full lists of dead, wounded and missing after a battle,

fought even so far away as Santiago, indicates incapacity or indifference.

Is it possible that Spain treats failure in her military service as equivalent to treachery? It begins to look so. When the captain of a Spanish gunboat captured in Manila bay went to Manila on parole it was reported that he had been condemned to death as soon as he appeared within the Spanish lines, and that Dewey saved him by threatening immediate bombardment if the unfortunate Spaniard's life were taken. This seemed so incredible that it excited no feeling in America other than incredulity. But later the Spanish governor in the Ladrone islands, who, with his mere handful of men surrendered on honorable terms to an American man-of-war and was carried a prisoner to Cavite, expressed his desire to remain an American prisoner. His reasons were that there was danger of his being shot for having surrendered if he placed himself within the control of the Spanish authorities. And now Cervera is reported in an interview as saying that not only is his military career ended, but for having surrendered his foundering ship to Schley he must expect, upon returning home, to be killed or to die in disgrace. There are grounds, it would seem, then, for believing that Spain expects her soldiers to die uselessly, even when nothing in reason is left to do but surrender, and that with the malignancy of the savage she holds them to this obligation on pain of capital punishment. If that be true, it is no wonder that Spain loses her battles so disastrously. Desperation is no substitute for heroism.

The plutocratic elements are once more sure that the silver issue—by which term they designate all that the Chicago platform of 1896 stands for

—is fading out. It is to be expected that in the midst of war, issues of peace will be obscured; but let no one imagine that we are yet through with what is implied by the silver issue. The masses of this country know that they are being plundered with the sanction of the law; and several millions of them have concluded, rightly or wrongly, that the principal leverage for this plundering is currency contraction. Until that belief is overcome, the so-called silver question, though it may now and then be obscured by more sensational questions, will not fade out. And that belief cannot be overcome with epithets, nor with financial dogmatism, nor even through corrupt political campaigns. It can be overcome in one and in only one way—by making clear to popular apprehension what it really is, if not currency contraction, that enables the few to rob the many. The silver issue was "fading out" in 1894, it will be remembered, and again in 1895; but in 1896 it swept plutocracy out of the democratic party, and came near carrying a plebeian president into power—would have done so, indeed, but for the interposition of Mark Hanna's election methods and corruption money. An issue which fades out only to reappear so startlingly needs close watching, especially in the fading season.

The animus of Hawaiian annexation was exposed in the senate just prior to the passage of the annexation resolutions there, by the way in which amendments in the interest of popular rights were voted down. One of these amendments was intended to secure for Hawaii the principle of manhood suffrage, that bedrock principle of the American idea of government. It provided that all native born male Hawaiians, over 21 years of age, and all naturalized aliens, be allowed to

vote in the elections in Hawaii. This amendment was defeated. When the question of annexation comes before the people of the United States for their approval, it will be well for them to bear in mind that the annexationists have put themselves on record as opposed to manhood suffrage.

Another Hawaiian amendment, which was promptly defeated, provided for the submission of the annexation question to the voters of Hawaii, and required that the resolutions should not be operative until a majority of those voters had approved them. If it is true that Hawaii offers herself for annexation, how comes it that the American annexationists are afraid to submit the question to the people there? They have never voted upon it. The sober truth is that a few men, mostly of American birth or antecedents, have secured temporarily the reins of power in Hawaii, and fearing that they may be soon deposed if the strong arm of the American government does not intervene, have connived to secure that intervention by inviting the American government to grab and govern the islands against the will of their inhabitants.

In view, however, of the anti-slavery history of the republican party, the most disheartening vote of all in connection with the Hawaiian question was that of the republican senators against an amendment to repeal the contract labor laws now in force in the Hawaiian islands. That amendment, too, was promptly voted down. The labor laws thus sanctioned by the votes of 41 senators, mostly republicans, are in reality, as every senator who voted for them well knew, slavery laws. Under those laws, large numbers of working people are brought into Hawaii from Asia, and hired out for long terms of years to planters. If the poor victims of this slave trade refuse to work, they are not only deprived of the pitiful wages which the planter has agreed to pay them, but they are arrested and fined. The employer may advance

the fine and take it out of the slave's wages, or the slave may be compelled to work out the fine on the roads. If he remains obdurate, he is sent to jail. A significant feature of these "labor laws" is a fugitive law. The labor commissioner of California reports that he has seen rewards offered for the arrest of fugitive "contract laborers." And as an indication of the fact that this labor system is in reality a slavery system, the slaves are numbered. The same labor commissioner describes the published rewards for runaways as containing photographs of the fugitive in convict dress with his number printed across it. This system of slavery we have now annexed, and in the process of annexation a majority of the senate directly voted to retain the system. The amendment proposed for its abolition, in conformity with our anti-slavery policy, was voted down in the senate, as already stated, principally by republican senators.

It is becoming more and more evident that the imperialists care nothing for American policies or principles. The Monroe doctrine they are ready to heave overboard, and the principles of anti-slavery, of local self-government and of manhood government, along with it. Even the solemn pledge given at the outbreak of the war that we have no other purpose with reference to Cuba than to secure a stable government for the island by its own people, is about to be violated, if the imperialists have their way. We are being pushed headlong into a crusade against the rights and liberties of neighboring and even of distant peoples, peoples who are struggling for the right of self-government; and a war begun for the liberation of downtrodden neighbors, our imperialists are turning into a war of unrighteous conquest.

At such a time it is encouraging to hear a voice that recalls the spirit of Jefferson's democracy and Lincoln's republicanism. In celebration of the Fourth of July,—and that memorable day could not have been better

celebrated,—the Cincinnati single tax club adopted an inspiring address to brothers of ours who are fighting for their liberty and that of their children to-day, as our forefathers fought for theirs and ours more than a hundred years ago. Every word of the address rings true, and we give it in full:

Our insurgent neighbors, who are so nobly fighting for national independence in the Island of Cuba and in the Philippine Islands, are entitled to a full and most explicit assurance from the United States government that the ultimate object of our invasion of those countries is not conquest, nor the annexation of territory, and that we do not intend or desire to force upon the people of other lands a government not their own, but that we seek in good faith to lend a generous and friendly hand to oppressed brethren in their heroic struggle for the right to govern themselves. The policy of despoiling any people of their territory, or of their right to institute or maintain the government of their own free choice would be apostasy to the principle laid down in our Declaration of Independence, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" it would be treason to that spirit of liberty and brotherhood which declares that "all men are born free and equal and possessed of unalienable rights." No man worthily represents a free government or the spirit of true Americans who contemplates "national expansion" by conquest. A smooth name does not alter the character of a crime; and, if there be any officer of our government so degenerate in political principle as to desire to establish such a policy, his first step toward this crime should be followed by immediate punishment. America's enthusiasm in this war is an enthusiasm for freedom and equal rights,—not an enthusiasm for plunder.

Believing, as true Americans must, in the principle of "no taxation without representation," we hold that our government has no right whatever to levy or collect taxes in foreign territory, nor to assume any functions of local control, not even the function of a "protectorate" or any other benevolent paternalism, unless under the free and express choice of the inhabitants of that territory.

The children of Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln send loving greetings to Gomez and Garcia and President Aguinaldo, and to all their compatriots in both hemispheres who have