

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1902.

Number 216.

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 page.

Those of us who are for peace and for the things that make for peace—the vivifying peace of fraternity and not the deadly peace of moonlit battle fields—might prefer to symbolize the friendly relations of our country with France otherwise than by erecting a soldier's statue. We can nevertheless applaud the erection of the statue of Rochambeau as a testimonial of international good will. For Rochambeau's name appears in the history of our country as a deliverer and not as a mere military hero. The erection to his memory of a statue by Congress is significant, therefore, of what is more vital to us than respect for military renown. Rochambeau commanded the French forces which Louis XVI. had sent to the aid of the struggling colonies. By making the victory at Yorktown possible, he assured the triumph of the American cause and helped lay the foundations of American republicanism. The continental congress of our fathers loaded him with honors while he remained in this country, and it is a gracious act for us to attest our gratitude and fraternal good will to France by perpetuating his memory in a bronze statue at the capital of our republic.

But suppose that instead of our erecting this statue to Rochambeau, it were proposed to erect one to his royal master, the unfortunate Louis XVI., king of France. What would the American people be apt to say to that? How would they feel? Can there be any doubt that the thing would be almost universally repulsive? Would Congress dare make such an innovation? Would it dare erect to the honored memory of this king

of France a statue within the precincts of our national capital? Would it dare do this, even though Louis XVI. was in fact one of the most amiable of men? even though he was one of the best intentioned of monarchs? even though he was the only royal friend in a practical way that this country had in its revolutionary struggle? even though it was to his power, dictated by his good will, that our forefathers were indebted for Rochambeau himself and the troops he commanded? Or suppose that France were now a monarchy, governed by a king claiming descent from Louis XVI., and that this king offered to symbolize the traditional good feeling between the two countries by presenting to us a statue, not of Rochambeau who fought with Washington for our independence, but of the present king's amiable and royal ancestor, one of the European monarchs of the time when we rejected monarchy and set up a republic—a statue of Louis XVI. of France. Would the American people feel honored by such a demonstration of royal affection? The questions answer themselves. A statue of Louis XVI. in the public grounds of the capital would be intensely repugnant to American sentiment. But why should we object to a statue of Louis XVI. if we welcome one of Rochambeau? Why should we shrink from erecting a monument to the king if we applaud the erection of one to his servant? Upon what theory do we honor the French general who fought for us with Washington if we would refuse a similar honor to his royal master who sent him?

The simple answer is, because the royal master who sent him was a royal master. A monument to Louis XVI. would be a monument to a king. No matter what else it represented, the idea of kingship would be upper-

most. Of course this distinction goes only to the question of titular forms. But there are times and circumstances when forms are vitally important. Marriage ceremonies are only forms; but they certify a relationship the sanctity of which might easily be impaired in practice by neglecting the form. Coronations are only forms, but they symbolize kingly power by divine right. Titles of nobility are only forms, yet the framers of our constitution rightfully regarded them as of sufficient importance to be forbidden. For similar reasons the American people of today who would foster republican institutions would shrink from setting up in the American capital the statue of a European king. Only those decadent Americans who really have no faith in republican institutions and would restore monarchical government here, and those who are indifferent so long as their own larder is full, are disposed to tolerate any flirting with monarchical forms or ceremonies or examples. Americans who are loyal to republican principles want neither the substance nor the forms of monarchy. Conscious of the dangers that lurk in reactionary forms, they are impatient of conferring republican honors upon kings.

But if these are the sentiments of American republicans, what is the rest of the world to infer from the extraordinary offer of the Emperor of Germany to set up a statue of Frederick the Great at Washington? If it be true that a present from France of a statue of Louis XVI., the amiable king who was our one royal friend, would not be welcome because it would seem to symbolize a retrogression of republican sentiment in this country, why does the German emperor offer us a statue of a king who was not amiable, was not in any marked way our friend, and

was hostile to republican ideals not only in the mere fact of his kingship but in his record as well? It is true that friendly relations have long existed between the people of the United States and the people of Germany. It is to be earnestly hoped that they will continue unbroken and undisturbed while time lasts. It is to be hoped moreover that they will knit closer as time goes by. Of the propriety of fitly symbolizing this friendship there should be no question. But have the Germans nothing more fit to offer us than a statue of Frederick the Great? Were there no German members of the world's republic of literature to choose from? Were there no German leaders in science who have helped reveal the democracies of nature? Was there no German statesman whose statue in one of our public places would not hourly challenge our republican ideals and seem to signalize their decay? If there were none such, and this gift was designed as a genuine expression of the esteem of one people for another, then why was Baron Steuben overlooked?—Baron Steuben, the military pupil of Frederick the Great, who came over to our struggling colonies, though not at the command of his royal master but of his own will, and gave his military aid to Washington and his fortune to our hungry and ragged troops? The German people do not lack illustrious countrymen whose statues as a present to us would symbolize our mutual friendship without seeming to rebuke our principles of government? Why then does their emperor offer us a statue which symbolizes kingship in a form most repugnant to republican ideals? It is not to be inferred that he intended offense. He is self-centered and impulsive, to be sure, but his familiarity with affairs of state would have restrained him from offering a present of that character to a friendly nation without first ascertaining its acceptability. The offer must have been the result of a diplomatic understanding between Berlin and Wash-

ington. But this inference would only enlarge the scope of the question. It would not answer it. If it be true that American sentiment recoils from the forms of monarchy, this larger question arises, why has the government at Berlin offered and the government at Washington encouraged and accepted this gift?

There is but one reasonable answer. It must be because the gift is peculiarly symbolic of our recent tendencies toward imperialism. As no gift could be more incongruous with our republican ideals than a statue of Frederick the Great, so none could be quite so appropriate to our recent imperial policies. It must have seemed, both to the German emperor and the American president, to symbolize with perfection the new departure of the American republic. For Frederick the Great was notable as an exponent of the very kind of imperialism to which the party in power in our republic has committed us. Though it has been said in his behalf that he granted extraordinary liberties of speech to the Prussian people over whom he reigned, the true character of those liberties may be best understood by his own commentary when he said: "My people and I have come to an agreement; they are to say what they please, and I am to do what I please." This principle of government has been in vogue at the White House for four years. Senator Hanna invented it in its application to the United States, President McKinley dutifully adopted it, and President Roosevelt has inherited it. He applies it even to the question of accepting the statue. Though he cabled William that he would refer the matter to Congress, he has since decided that this is not necessary. Congress and the people may say what they please, but he will do what he pleases. The symbolism of the royal Frederick's statue at the American capital would be still more striking in another respect. Frederick's conquest of Silesia and his participation in the annihilation of Poland and

the parcelling out of her territory are by no means unlike the American assault upon the Filipino republic and her bloody conquest of the Philippine islands. Even in the detail of treachery to an ally, the comparison holds good; for of Frederick's conquest of Silesia it is said, we quote from Ma-caulay, that "without pretext, without a provocation, in defiance of the most sacred engagements, he had attacked the helpless ally whom he was bound to defend." Nothing but a change of names is necessary to make this quotation fit as closely to the imperialism to which President Roosevelt is committed as that which the great Frederick practiced. In this view of the matter we are obliged to acknowledge the entire appropriateness of the German emperor's gift and the consistency of the President's hasty and unauthorized acceptance. In any other view, we should hardly expect that the statue would be allowed to stand on public ground at the American capital longer than might be necessary for the American people to realize its significance as a royal symbol.

What a comic commentary on the theory of monarchical government, which finds so many advocates among persons who distrust popular government, is the coronation of the king of Spain. Here is a mere lad who talks about "my" people, who is assured of the good wishes even of republics for "his" people, and whose personal insignificance is enveloped in imposing robes and a glittering crown. He would not be trusted to teach a district school in Illinois, yet full-bearded men make themselves believe that he governs them and that if they were not so governed anarchy would reign. Of course he does not govern. He is a fiction. His royal crown and robes do all the governing that is attributed to him. They would do it as well if he stuffed them with straw and went to a bull fight.

The hopelessness of the anthracite coal strike is unintentionally foreshadowed by the final report of the industrial commission in its sum-