

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1900.

Number 143.

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.

President McKinley's Philippine commission has decided that all laws enacted in the archipelago shall be expressed in the English language. In other words, English is to be official. Such coercion regarding language has always been considered as one of the grossest acts of tyranny by conquerors in their government of subject races. The most effective measure for the subjugation of a people is to impose upon them laws in a foreign tongue.

What news is this from Mexico? A money panic because of the heavy exportation of silver dollars! "The banks have plenty of money," say the reports, "but it is all in gold and American and British currency and worth nothing except as collateral." That we should ever have lived to see this day!! Plenty of gold money in the banks of Mexico, but the country on the verge of a money panic because silver money is scarce! And gold money good only for collateral!! What can the matter be? Is Mexico living in the looking glass, where everything is reversed?

The German emperor has a rough and ready mode for remedying the overproduction of physicians. He has issued a decree lengthening the period of medical study. This is done not to improve the professional standard, but simply to prevent overcrowding in the profession! Why not use similar means to prevent overcrowding at the bar, in the pulpit, behind the counter, on the farm, in the factory—wherever, in short, there is over-

crowding, which, by the way, is in every employment on earth. There is one difficulty in the way. The leisure classes, who are also the influential classes, want the "lower" grades of employment to be overcrowded. If they were not overcrowded there would be no leisure class. At any rate there would be no pleasure in belonging to the leisure classes, for then they would be hoboos.

Of the merits of the case against District Attorney Gardiner, of New York city, upon which Gov. Roosevelt has removed him from office, no stranger to the circumstances is qualified to judge, and we pretend to no opinion. But one thing is very clear. The law that allows the governor of a state to remove from office any official who has been elected by popular vote is a bad law. It were better that an inefficient, even a corrupt, official should remain in the office to which the people have chosen him, than that the efficiency or honesty of an elective officer should be determined by another officer who may be, and in this case was, a violent opposing partisan. When the people elect, only a popular tribunal—a jury—should have power to remove. Roosevelt's behavior in this matter should not escape notice. He acted like a ruffianly police judge. Neither ought his appointment to fill the vacancy he himself created to be overlooked. To give to the matter an air of non-partisanship, he, a republican making an appointment to fill a democratic vacancy, appointed a democrat. But that appointment loses some of its atmosphere of fairness and takes on an appearance which can be described only by a harsher term, when the fact appears to be that the democrat appointed is a McKinley democrat.

It is evident that in their overtures to China the allied powers intend either to humiliate or to conquer. They probably intend both. The "irrevocable" terms upon which alone they declare their willingness to withdraw their armies from China are such as no government would accept unless conscious of its own impotence. Not only must an apology in peculiarly humiliating form be made to Germany for the assassination by a Chinese mob of the German minister, but a monument bearing an apologetic inscription must be erected where the assassination occurred. One of the objects of this requirement is to impress the Chinese with the awful power those "foreign devils" must possess when they can subject the "son of heaven" to such humiliation. Another requirement of the same character is that which demands the erection of an expiatory monument in every foreign graveyard that the Chinese have desecrated. Possibly such humiliations may smother the anti-foreign sentiment of China, but they will not dissipate it unless Chinamen differ enormously from other people. And is there not something like a brilliant display of impudence in forcing the Chinese thus to atone for desecrations of foreign graveyards, when foreigners have repeatedly desecrated Chinese graveyards with impunity? A wonderful government, indeed, must that of the Chinese empire be if, after submitting to these and kindred indignities, it can enforce obedience upon a people whose anti-foreign prejudices already violent are thus further inflamed.

But the powers have not stopped with demands that are humiliating, not even with such as call for the punishment of Chinese dignitaries for

what a Russian paper smiles at grimly as the novel crime of "treason against foreign nations." They require a huge money indemnity. The amount is left to future adjustment, but it will doubtless be big enough to give the powers a long lease of military occupation while China takes the measures necessary for furnishing satisfactory guarantees of payment. Nor is that all. With the legation quarter at Peking perpetually fortified and garrisoned; with all the Chinese forts from Peking to the sea destroyed; with the right of the allied powers to perpetually occupy with military forces any points from Peking to the sea which they may designate; with the right of importing arms and munitions of war denied to China—and these are among the "irrevocable" conditions—with these advantages secured by a treaty to the powers, what possibilities of defense would the Chinese have when the powers had agreed upon a scheme of partitioning the empire and concluded that the time for action was ripe? None. There is no disguising it—indeed, the representatives of the powers do not seem to have tried to disguise it,—the joint note of the powers to the Chinese envoys is a bald proposition for the establishment over the empire of an international suzerainty. When that shall have been firmly established dismemberment will be a simple process, provided only that the powers agree upon their portions. The Chinese government and people will have ceased to be a party in interest. The distribution will concern them only as the distribution of loot by brigands concerns the owner who looks on in silence, being gagged, and without resisting, being bound.

We fail to find in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, as amended by the senate, any substantial grounds for objection. If Great Britain accepts it, the United States need not complain. The treaty as now framed would abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which gives Great Britain a right

to dictate with reference to the Nicaragua canal, and would relinquish to the United States all power over construction, ownership and operation. Very wisely, as it seems to us, provision is made for preserving the neutrality of the canal and for its use by all nations upon equal terms under all circumstances. The United States ought not to have the right to make the canal part of its warlike equipment. This great waterway should be maintained primarily as a channel for commerce. At the same time, since it is to be built and operated by the United States—and all may agree that no European power should be permitted to join in the enterprise—the United States ought to be invested with full power to protect it. This power is acknowledged. There does not appear, then, to be anything objectionable in the treaty. Nor is anything of vital importance omitted.

Yet all is not bright in connection with the matter. So far as international relations are concerned, we of this country may be content with the proposed treaty as the senate has amended it; and Great Britain has no just reason for feeling otherwise. But there are ample reasons for disquieting fears with reference to certain home relations. Instead of itself building the canal and owning and operating it, our government purposes investing a private corporation with that authority; and out of this relationship no end of trouble will probably arise. We shall have in worse form a repetition of our experience with the United States bank in Jackson's time, and with the Pacific railroads at a later day. The government will furnish most of the capital, while the corporation ring will reap all the profits. Worse still, this powerful ring will invest the lobbies of congress and the vestibules of the white house, and the people will fall a prey to a greedy and powerful Nicaragua canal corporation. What will be needed most with reference to the Nicaragua canal should the treaty

be finally ratified, is a vigorous agitation for government construction, government ownership, and government management of the canal.

It would appear that the Baptist ministers' conference of Philadelphia is a patriotic rather than a Christian organization, one which loves colored bunting more than the neighbor. A member, Rev. Dr. Poteat, introduced to the conference at its meeting on the 17th, Sixto Lopez, the Filipino envoy, with a request that he be heard. This request was seconded by Rev. L. Sensholes. We mention these two names for much the same reason that Lot's is mentioned in connection with Sodom and Gomorrah. Mr. Sensholes urged with reference to the Filipino question that "all reports that we have had from the other side have been garbled," and asked if it would not "be better to give a hearing to this man that we may determine the truth." But the truth was not what the conference wanted. One Wayland Hoyt, a doctor of divinity, thought that it would be virtually an acknowledgment of a traitor to listen to Mr. Lopez. It is to be hoped that Mr. Hoyt knows more of divinity than he appears from this remark to know of law. Since one must owe allegiance to a country before he can commit treason against it, Mr. Lopez, who has never, directly or indirectly, actually or constructively, owed allegiance to the United States, can hardly be regarded legally as a traitor. If he were a traitor it would be the duty of the authorities to have him promptly prosecuted. The function of traitor baiting ought not to be relegated to the Philadelphia conference of Baptist ministers. But Mr. Hoyt's objection proved sufficient. The conference summarily refused to hear Lopez. It had a right, of course, to refuse. We make no complaint of its action. But the reason for the action has precious little of the flavor of Christmas season.

Against the narrow patriotism of