

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1898.

Number 26.

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.

Sir William Crookes, in an address before the British association, has warned the world that in 1931 the consumption of wealth will be in excess of the production. Strangely enough, the press regards this as a calamitous prophecy. Yet the same press has habitually ascribed poverty to over-production. How, then, can it regard as calamitous a prophecy that in 1931 the excessive production of wealth will be overtaken by a condition in which consumption will exceed production? For ourselves, we do not clearly see how consumption can ever exceed production. Things that are not produced cannot be consumed. That, at least, is our opinion. But suppose consumption should by 1931 only equal production, why cry about it? If it be true that poverty is caused by over-production, there would then be no poverty. Let us rather look forward to 1931 as a red letter year, when none will any longer starve from an excess of food, nor suffer exposure from a superabundance of houses and clothing.

A captain of German cavalry has murdered a sergeant, and it is understood that if he is punished at all it will be only with a slight reprimand. It is reported that the emperor has even expressed his approval of the murder. This is in the interest of military discipline. It seems that the sergeant had been assailed by the captain with villainous names for some supposed neglect regarding the cooking of food; whereupon the sergeant, who had a valid excuse, told the captain that he did not think he deserved such names, and, as a rebuke to this "impu-

dence" the captain hit the sergeant heavily upon the side of the head, knocking him against a wagon. The sergeant called to two of his comrades, saying: "You saw that I was struck." That was his mortal offense. The captain, in a rage, stabbed the sergeant with a saber, first in the leg and then behind the ear, from the effects of which the sergeant died. Americans would demand extreme punishment for such a murder. They are therefore inclined to think themselves more civilized than the Germans. But they, too, tolerate unjust treatment of private soldiers by officers, upon the plea of military discipline. The custom of making private soldiers the menials of officers, as a necessity of military discipline, is the same in principle. If private soldiers in the German army were the equals before the law of their officers, no such outrage as that of the German captain upon his sergeant could have been perpetrated with impunity; so if private soldiers in the American army were the equals before the law of their officers, they could not with impunity be turned into bottle washers and general drudges for military superiors.

But the most suggestive thing in connection with the murder of the German sergeant by his captain, is the difference between the way in which it is viewed—by the Emperor William for instance—and the way in which the murder of the Austrian empress was viewed by that apostle of divine right. Her assassination struck horror to William's soul; but the sergeant's assassination he justifies as a bit of military discipline. The difference is in the person, not in the crime.

Scribner's Magazine would hardly be classified, even by President McKinley's most partisan supporters, as

a "yellow journal," nor Richard Harding Davis as a manufacturer of "yellow journal" literature; yet in the October number of that magazine Mr. Davis, giving an account of his experience and observations at the battle of Santiago, justifies every important charge that has been made as to the mismanagement of the Cuban campaign. His article offers no argument. It is simply an array of facts, from which readers may draw their own conclusions. But these facts hold Gen. Shafter up to public gaze as an incompetent, and pillory the president as the original cause of the unnecessary suffering and loss of life at Santiago.

The facts Mr. Davis gives show that Santiago was not captured by Shafter's army, but was abandoned by the Spanish fleet. But for Cervera's unaccountable withdrawal, the American army, so Mr. Davis explains, would have suffered humiliating defeat or melted away. Even had it succeeded in getting possession of Santiago—a conquest of no importance in itself—Cervera could, as Mr. Davis says he threatened to do, have made its position there untenable. The mismanagement in this connection consisted in moving against Santiago instead of continuing Gen. Miles's plan of attacking the harbor defenses and, by removing the explosives, opening the way to our fleet to attack and destroy Cervera's, a plan which harmonized with the only honest and sane purpose of making any campaign at Santiago at all. This and all the other mismanagement of which Mr. Davis tells most convincingly, he ascribes to political favoritism. If that be its cause, the president's responsibility is established. He is commander-in-chief. He appointed the secretary of war. He also appointed the sons and nephews of po-

litical favorites to military positions over the heads of tried soldiers. Shafter himself could never have been in position to prove his gross incompetency at the expense of the health and lives of American troops but for the president's manifest partiality, or what amounts to the same thing, his assent to Alger's partiality. Let those who doubt the justice of our conclusions in this matter, read Davis's article in the October Scribner's; and then, by way of a "settler," let them read in the same magazine, the account by the British military observer, of the fighting at El Caney during the Santiago battle. These publications are formidable indictments.

For placing the responsibility for the disgraceful part of the war upon the president, we have been accused of partisanship. Since we lay no claim to infallibility, but only to such virtue as there may be in definitely expressing honest opinions, we freely admit the possibility of our being partisan, though we endeavor to be fair. But let it not be forgotten that there are two kinds of partisanship. It is partisan to attack a political adversary regardless of his merits, but it is also partisan to defend a political friend regardless of his faults. And of the two species, the latter is by far the most dangerous. By partisan assertions of faults in political adversaries where none exist, they alone can be injured at the worst, and even that is not likely to occur; whereas, by concealing or excusing the faults of political friends, the whole country may be made to suffer from incompetency or dishonesty. The true balance, however, is in avoiding both species of partisanship. That is difficult to do, but it is what all should aim at. And we are not conscious of deviating to either side when, in explanation of the mismanagement of the war, we point at the president and say, "Thou art the man!"

Why should the president be credited with the glory which attaches to the success of the war, but exonerated

from responsibility for favoritism which has caused the unnecessary loss of thousands of men? Why, especially why, when the source of that favoritism was the president himself? The New York Evening Post, one of the most ardent and effective of the advocates for Mr. McKinley's election two years ago, publishes and vouches for the truth of a letter from Washington which closes with these words: "If the president had been choosing a caterer for a camping party of a half-dozen friends, there are not a corporal's guard of these staff officers, whom he has chosen to transport and feed and clothe and shelter the soldiers of the United States, to whom he would think for a moment of turning over the comparatively simple job."

The staff officers above referred to are named by the same correspondent. Many of the names are not suggestive of the origin of the presidential "pull" that secured their appointment, but not a few are as significant as a barometer in August. Among the latter are such names as Alger, Blaine, Allison, Foraker, New, Sewell, Botkin, Elkins, McMillan, Goff, Flower, Scott, Longstreet, Brice, Milliken, Fairbanks, Coudert, Hobart. Most of these are the sons or nephews of republican friends of the administration, though some are sons or nephews of democratic hangers-on. But all are from civil life, and the names of all supply prima facie evidence of presidential favoritism. They are among the men to whose incapacity we are indebted for an army sick and death list which is to the casualties of battle in the shocking ratio of about 5 to 1. In all good faith let us ask candid republicans whether they think it unprejudiced fairness in this connection to defend the president, and partisanship to insist upon his responsibility?

To go a little further, what has the president done to fix the blame for the army mismanagement which is now conceded by all impartial men? As commander-in-chief he might have

set on foot a military inquiry accompanied with legal power to secure testimony; but he has in fact appointed a commission unknown to either the military or the civil law, and which therefore is utterly incapable of obtaining any testimony, oral or documentary, except such as may be volunteered. The first appointments upon this committee were in the main satisfactory to all who wish for a genuine investigation; but most of the original appointees declined the farcical task of serving upon an impotent commission, and the body as now constituted, made up entirely of men unknown to the nation, is described by the Washington correspondent of one of the least partisan of daily newspapers, the Chicago Record, as appearing to be unanimously "very friendly to the administration!" One of the members of this commission, Col. Sexton, known at the time of his appointment to be a friend of Alger, who stands next to the president in point of responsibility for the mismanagement of the war, has gone so far as publicly to announce at least part of his verdict, and a very important part, in advance even of such an impotent inquiry as he is charged to make. He told the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record, on the 23d of September, at Washington, that he had explicit confidence in Secretary Alger, that he was sure the secretary's statements were correct, and that he regarded much of the present discontent as being chargeable to the enterprising journals of the day. After all this, what is the president's request to the commission to trace the abuses to their source, even into the White House—what is that solemn admonition but part one of the shifting scenes in the farce.

Partisanship! The truth is that most active republicans of these days of Mark Hanna, are thick and thin partisans. Not only is a republican leader of high degree immaculate to them, though he be covered with slime from his own mudpuddle, but everybody else must regard him as im-