

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1898.

Number 10.

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.

It is good advice which the New York Journal gives to the Cubans when it says to them:

Soon Cuba will be boss of itself and the Cubans will own their own lands. We say to the Cubans: Keep the lands for your descendants, and keep them public lands forever. Let the rents from them go to the government.

In that advice lies the secret to the retention by Cuba of her liberties when she shall have achieved them. If she allows individuals to own the island, the time will soon come when the masses in Cuba will be no better off under a republic of their own than they have been under the dominion of Spain. Neither will they be any more free. The old saw about writing the songs of a country would strike truer if it read: "Let me own the land of a country, and I care not who makes its laws."

No peculiar condemnation is passed upon the south when her mobs of "best citizens" are denounced as semi-civilized brutes for burning negroes at the stake; for mobs of "best citizens" at the north commit similar crimes. It is not long, for instance, since a negro was lynched by a lawless mob of Ohio's "best citizens." But, whether these outrages occur north or south, the community that tolerates them can make no just claims to civilization. The latest instance of this species of lawlessness has just occurred near Shreveport, La., where lawyers, sworn to uphold the law, actually made speeches of approval as the fagots blazed up and the fire eat into the burning flesh of the negro whose murder they were aiding and abetting. How can negroes be ex-

pected to obey law, when "best citizens" have so little respect for it?

It is neither good sense nor in good taste to criticise military officers for the management of affairs about which they are better able than civilians to form correct judgments. But the temptation is very great when our troops are fed upon winter rations, without fruit or vegetables, in a southern locality where fruit and vegetables are necessary to health and whence they are shipped daily to the north. Perhaps, however, criticism of this sort does not fall so much upon military officers, as upon the civilian sons of their fathers and nephews of their uncles who have been invested with shoulder straps through wholesale favoritism.

Newspaper report has it that President McKinley's plan of organizing a republican form of government in Cuba, a plan which contemplates the recognition of everybody living there—Spanish sympathizers included—is not approved by the insurgents. We should suppose not. Neither should it be approved by President McKinley, nor by any other American. This plan was represented not long ago by a significant cartoon in Puck. Though Puck is a professional "comic," the cartoon was not intended to be comic. It was published as a picture of what ought to be. A description of it, therefore, will assist in understanding what the papers describe as President McKinley's plan of organizing a republican government in Cuba. It represented a ballot box presided over by Uncle Sam, at which monarchists, autonomists and republicans were voting to decide whether the government should be a monarchy, a Spanish dependency, or an independent republic. That cartoon was well calcu-

lated to make an American's blood boil. And the plan attributed to President McKinley is no better. It is essentially the same.

Of course the republican form of government contemplates the right of every one, even of monarchists, to vote. But it does not contemplate the right of monarchists to vote upon the question of what form of government to establish at the close of a successful war for the establishment of the republic. The war settles that question. If what is called President McKinley's plan were put in operation, it would nullify the purpose of the war. The insurgents demand that the government to be set up at the end of the war shall be their government. In this they are right. There are but two governments in Cuba. One is the Spanish; the other is that of the Cuban republic. And unless we are fighting for one or the other, we are intruders. The United States will have no right to ignore the present Cuban republic when the Spanish troops are driven out of Cuba. By the almost unanimous vote of both houses of Congress two years ago, the Cuban republic was recognized. Both political parties in their platforms of 1896 expressed their sympathy for it in its struggle for independence. And the resolution of Congress which authorized the present war virtually recognized it in declaring that the people of Cuba "are" free and independent. This allusion could have been only to the Cuban republic. Nobody in Cuba outside of that republic either claimed or was trying to be free. This country is bound in honor, then, now that it has entered upon a war with Spain for the liberation of Cuba, to prosecute that war for the establishment of the Cuban republic. It would be scandalous if at the end of the war we helped the Spanish through civil

methods to recover what they had lost by war.

Let us for a moment put ourselves in the place of the Cubans. It will be easy. We might have been in the same situation a century ago. Suppose that at the end of the revolutionary war, France—which bore much the same relation to us that we now bear to Cuba—had insisted upon forcing us in forming our new government to cooperate with the Tories who had fought us to the bitter end. If France had done that, she would have done to us what the newspapers say President McKinley intends to do to the Cubans. The Cuban republic has a right to protest against thus having their Tories, who, even at this moment are fighting them, thrust by our government into authority in their government, when peace is declared.

One of the humors of later politics is the alacrity with which the organs of the extra good members of society resent epithets. They have devoted themselves industriously to the manufacture and dissemination of epithets supposed to be applicable to others. Who can forget the way in which all the turns were worked upon the harmless words "walking delegate"? Then there is "crank," which has done these organs so much service in the place of thought and argument. And when the plundered people of Kansas carried their grievances into politics through a third party, calling it appropriately enough the People's party, the organs of the extra-good promptly dubbed them "populists." Besides these, we have had "com-mew-nist," which did duty so long to describe any sort of social reformer whose arguments could not be answered off hand. "Socialist," as an epithet, serves the same purpose even now. But best of all is "anarchist," because to the thoughtless and ignorant it suggests violent intentions. All these terms and many more have been used abusively by the extra-good as verbal bludgeons to batter at arguments for social reform which

could not be easily answered with counter arguments. And what a good time the extra-good have had in swinging these bludgeons about. But one fine day, some fellow who had been abusively called "populist," or "com-mew-nist," or "socialist," or "anarchist," or may be all together, hit back at his tormentors with "plutocrat," and then it was suddenly discovered by the extra-good, for the first time apparently, that epithets are not arguments.

Senator Chandler, in the course of the senate debate last week on the war revenue measure, made a sharp criticism of the favorable balance of trade showing, which appears upon the surface of our treasury reports. Having figured out from the reports a balance of trade in our favor of nearly \$2,000,000,000 in ten years, and from the same sources shown that our net receipts of gold were only \$129,000,000, he wanted to know how the favorable balance had benefited us. This was a searching question. But it does not appear to have stimulated Senator Chandler himself to any excessive degree. He attempted to explain away the favorable balance by assuming that tourists spend \$100,000,000 a year abroad, making \$1,000,000,000 for the ten years, and accounting for the rest by supposing that half of it—\$500,000,000—has been paid to foreign carriers, and that the remainder has been returned to us in bonds. Thus Mr. Chandler omitted much the most important item, that of ground rents paid by American producers to foreign land owners. It is well known that a vast area of American land is owned abroad, land that has become very valuable, and from this fact it is an obvious inference that a large proportion of our exports are made up of rents, which are never balanced by imports. They are given to the foreigner outright. This is the chief item which keeps our exports in excess of our imports, and so produces a balance which is gravely described as favorable to us. That kind of fav-

orable balance of trade is enjoyed by Ireland, thanks to her absentee landlords.

About the question of favorable and unfavorable balances of trade, there clings a good deal of what for want of a better term may be described as economic superstition. It is generally understood that profit lies in exporting and loss in importing, wherefore an excess of exports over imports is called "favorable." Yet a moment's reflection should make it plain that the reverse of this is the truth. It is by receiving goods in excess of what they give out, not by giving out in excess of what they receive, that men get rich. The commonest country peddler of the fifties knew this and applied it to his business. When he swapped his wares with the farmer's wife for farm truck, he realized that the fewer wares he gave and the more truck he got—that is, the less his exports and the greater his imports—the better off he was. No professor of political economy or United States senator, his head muddled with the mere medium of exchange, could have convinced that peddler that it would improve his condition to give out his wares in excess of the farm truck he took in. And as with the peddler, so with whole peoples. Our foreign commerce does not consist in an exchange of goods for money. It consists in trading goods for goods. Money is only a medium of trade, not its object. A steady excess of exports, therefore, necessarily implies impoverishment.

This is so obvious when it is thought upon, and yet so seldom recognized by public writers and speakers, that one reads with pleasure in the Chicago Record's home study article on London as a trade center, by Seymour Eaton, that one of the reasons for the financial supremacy of London is that for almost half a century "England has been importing far more than she has been exporting." In all probability this is not merely one of the reasons; it is the one. We are apt to