

There is an accumulation of good reasons for believing not only that exploiters of the administration but the administration itself has long contemplated grabbing Cuba. Did not the president in his special message of April 11, 1896, ask for authority to establish a stable government in Cuba without recognizing Cuban independence? Did not the administration ring in congress opposite to the last that clause of the joint resolution of April 13, 1896, which recognized the independence of "the republic of Cuba?" Did not the administration evade the plain intention of that resolution by refusing to recognize the republic of Cuba? Did it not further disregard both the spirit and the terms of that resolution by subverting the republic of Cuba? Instead of obeying the resolution of congress, signed by himself and part of the law of the land, by recognizing and establishing the republic of Cuba, the president has maintained for nearly two years an American military autocracy there on pretense of organizing another republic in Cuba, because the one recognized by a law of congress did not suit him. Why has he done this? What does it portend? Does not his policy with reference to Porto Rico and the Philippines answer the question? Bound with regard to them by no specific requirements of the Cuban resolution of congress, but only by its spirit, he assumed to annex them. These are acts which, in accordance with familiar rules of proof, throw light upon his purpose. It is only by men's acts that their motives can be ascertained, and every day in the criminal court rooms that method is availed of. Taking McKinley's whole Cuban-Philippine-Puerto Rican policy together, viewing it in the light of his actions, and considering it with reference to the joint resolutions of 1896 recognizing the independence of the republic of Cuba, and there is enough evidence to convince any unbiased jury that Mr. McKinley has all along intended to deprive all these countries of independence. Senator Hale's suspicions are

not unfounded. American troops will never be withdrawn from Cuba if Mr. McKinley can prevent it.

At a recent sale of part of the site of the Auditorium Annex, Nos. 9 and 11 Congress street, Chicago, that tiny piece of ground brought \$135,000. A little figuring upon this transaction may enlighten those bucolic victims of newspaper misrepresentation who think that "farmers own all the land." The piece of ground in question is $34\frac{1}{2}$ by 102 feet in area, or 3,480 $\frac{1}{2}$ square feet. The sale, therefore, was at the rate per acre of \$1,698,840. As the average value of Illinois farms, as shown by the Illinois labor report for 1894, is \$2,050, one acre of Chicago land located as the Annex site is is equal in value to 828 improved Illinois farms. The fraction of an acre actually sold for \$135,000 is equal in value to 65 such farms. Observe that the price paid for this city lot was merely for the land. No interest whatever was conveyed in the improvements. It was land, nothing but land, precisely the same sort of soil as that in which farmers raise corn, and only the soil; yet its purchaser has acquired a monopoly in the earth as valuable as a monopoly of 65 farms would be. Is it not time, then, when inquiries as to American landlordism are being made, to turn public attention somewhat to these vast holdings in cities? When measured by value, most of our land is in cities, and not in farming districts. The farmers, even proprietary farmers, own comparatively little land, measuring land by its value instead of its area. And it is value, not area, that counts in land monopoly.

At the recent race conference of white southern democrats, held at Montgomery, there was nothing really remarkable in the inclination exhibited to agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. The men who urged this are not democrats in

truth. If they wear the democratic label, that is chiefly because it is an inheritance from those ante-bellum days when the slave oligarchy controlled the democratic party in power as the trust oligarchy now controls the republican party in power. They know not Jefferson, with his theory that all men are created with equal rights, any more than the administration republicans know Lincoln with his theory of government by the people governed. It would be remarkable if men like these did not agitate for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment. They have long wanted it repealed, and now the time for agitation must seem ripe. Have not the administration republicans invited just that agitation and indicated their disposition to support it? All this talk in the north about putting inferior peoples under tutelage, all this regret for the "mistake" of elevating the negro to equal political rights, all this official sympathy with England in her war of subjugation against the Boers, all these efforts to conquer the brave little "niggers" (as they call them) of the Philippines, all this turning away from democratic ideals—what does it mean and from whom does it come? It comes from northern republicans who have forgotten Lincoln, and it means that white men must govern and black men must serve. This is part of the "white man's burden." It means essentially more than that. Not only must white men govern black men, but the rich must govern all. Plutocracy and imperialism, these two in one, rising together above the northern political horizon as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, but black with a menace to equal rights, are what southern aristocrats of the ante-bellum type see to encourage their proposed assault upon the fifteenth amendment. Toombs democrats of the south and Hanna-McKinley republicans of the north are finding common ground upon which to meet. Political equality of the masses, black and white, is the object of their attack. They clasp hands now upon the doctrine that "superior" races must govern; in a

little while they will clasp hands upon the doctrine that rich men must rule.

At the request of friends in Australia we publish the following letter on the subject of the South African war, with the assurance to begin with that our attitude toward this war is not only not inspired by anti-British feeling, but that we are as intolerant of that species of back-action patriotism as we are of the other kind. Our correspondent, Wesley Spragg, writing from Auckland says:

Your opinions upon the Boer war are, I have reason to believe, the result of imperfect information. None of us here who know you suppose that you are allowing unworthy anti-British feelings to dictate your words. We think you are in this, as in other matters, actuated by your love of right. That is, right as you see it. I do not want to thrust opinions upon you against your will, but it may be well for you to know that reformers here are in favor of the prosecution of the present war by British arms. With a desire to give you our opinion I enclose herewith an extract from a letter by Mrs. Lewis, sister of Schreiner, the Cape Colony premier, and a member of an ultra pro-Boer family. This letter expresses what is believed by us, with some knowledge and evidence to justify our opinions, to be a fair statement of the issues concerned in this war. Some of our fellows, single taxers and ardent reformers, have lived in the Transvaal and in Cape Colony, and these men confirm the charges contained in Mrs. Lewis's letter. Indeed the insolence, oppression and inhumanities of the Boers, of which they are personally aware, have positively scorched their memories. That there are no unworthy persons, with unworthy motives, upon the British side none of us here are so foolish as to suppose. We lament that the spending of British treasure and good British blood should be taken advantage of, as it inevitably will be, by grabbers of the various kinds, who will doubtless seek for and obtain privileges and will set up injustices. This wresting of a thing, righteous in itself, and in the main making for righteousness, is apparently incidental to even the best civilization of the century. While this is a matter for the keenest regret and one calling for the most strenuous efforts of reformers to correct wrong conditions, there is in our minds no question that the present war is one for the destruction of more brutal

oppression and a preparation for the advance of right, and consequently for the good of the human race. Your war with the Philippines, I agree with you, is quite inexcusable; and your Cuban war, as some of us saw it, was only feebly justifiable as compared with Britain's present position. Even your war of independence (which no one has more cause to be thankful for than we British colonists) was a hasty needless revolt by comparison. Your civil war, which resulted in the abolition of chattel slavery, is the nearest parallel to the present just war which Britain is waging in the interests of humanity in South Africa. The quotation attached is the important part of this communication.

Mr. Spragg's reference to the American civil war is not an apt comparison. The coercion of the southern states by the general government, whether right or wrong, was in no possible sense a conquest. Those states were voluntary partners with the other states in a federal compact. They insisted that the compact was not perpetual; the other states insisted that it was. There was no place to try that question except upon the battle field, and as a result the south was coerced to remain in the partnership. The slavery question, though the cause of the war, was not the issue. It was conceded on all hands that the north would have had no right to make war for the abolition of slavery; and Lincoln very cautiously defined his emancipation proclamation as a military act applying only to rebellious territory.

Aside from his comparison of the American civil war with the British war in South Africa, there is nothing whatever in Mr. Spragg's letter to challenge our position toward the latter. He appears, indeed, to rest his whole conclusion upon the extract from Mrs. Lewis's letter which he incloses, and of which he says that it expresses what is believed by him and his friends, "with some knowledge and evidence to justify" their opinions, to be a fair statement of the issues. We shall therefore print so much of the extract as can possibly, from any point of view, be

regarded as stating those issues. Mrs. Lewis says:

If ever there was a war for the Lord of Hosts, if ever there was a war for truth and right, for putting down of oppression and wrong, for the deliverance of a people powerless to deliver themselves, whose wrongs have cried up to heaven, until the Lord has come down to deliver them, this is that war. It is not the grievances of the Uitlanders, though they have been very real, and have called for justice; it is not what British subjects have had to suffer of indignities and wrongs, though they have been numerous under recent Transvaal administration; it is not the insult to England's power and prestige shown by the refusal to concede her moderate demands for justice to be done to her subjects, followed by the unparalleled act of defiance contained in the Transvaal war ultimatum—it is not these things, however they may justly stir the national heart, which call upon us as Christians to bring the united force of God's people, by the power of believing in prayer, to bear upon this war question. British soldiers are dying on African soil to-day to put an end to atrocious wrong. For over 200 years the progenitors of the Transvaal republic and their descendants have crushed, maltreated, and, as far as they have had power to do so, robbed of all rights belonging to them as fellow human beings the colored peoples of this land. On every side individual brutalities were being committed on defenseless victims, and that not by Arab slave drivers, or Moslem oppressors, but by a professedly Christian and highly religious people, who, with the Bible in their hands, and loud profession of faith and prayers, were practicing barbarities, in peace as well as war, which put to shame the records of what the savages of this land have inflicted, even in war time, upon white races.

If that "is a fair statement of the issues concerned in this war," as Mr. Spragg says it is, then the cause of the British is fully as bad as we had supposed. Observe that the whole indictment is not only vaguely general, but one which might be made against any people where slavery had prevailed and the enslaved class remained distinct after having been emancipated. If Mrs. Lewis were to read the story of American slavery for 200 years prior to 1864, and then hear an account or two from eyewitnesses of the horrible mutilation and burning of negroes at the stake in some parts of