

# The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1900.

Number 120.

**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.

Since Lyman Abbott regards the axiom that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed as a baseless assumption, it would be interesting to know his opinion of the golden rule. The doctrine of consent in government is but an application of the golden rule to politics.

It will delight Mr. Hanna, though it cannot surprise him, to learn that the "Commercial and Financial Chronicle," a Wall street trade paper in whose estimation the stock exchange is the center of the moral universe, sticks to his presidential protege. With the indorsement of that paper, Mr. Hanna's corruption fund is assured.

With some 60,000 troops in the Philippines, Gen. MacArthur finds himself unable to hold our Philippine subjects under control. From every department of the islands, said an Associated Press letter of June 12 from Manila, published here on the 16th of July, "more soldiers" is the demand which is coming to Gen. MacArthur." Imperialism is an expensive military luxury.

With the apparent purpose of making it appear that the famine in India is not due to the exportation of Indian products, a New York dispatch is in circulation which states that there have been no exportations of wheat from India since the famine was officially announced. This fact is said to be reported by the weekly cable returns of the New York produce exchange. But it makes no difference whether there have been exportations

of wheat. It is not particular exports, but excessive exports in general that contribute to the impoverishment of India.

A majority of the stockholders of the National Wall Paper company, known as the wall paper trust, have decided to dissolve. This decision was made on the 17th at a stockholders' meeting in New York. The reason for it is that the trust was unable to stand up against outside competition. No better example could be desired of the truth that trusts not buttressed by legalized monopolies are of few days and full of trouble. No trust can long resist outside competition with no better weapon than organization. To succeed, it must have, either directly from the government or indirectly as the lessee of some governmental beneficiary, a monopoly of trade, transportation or land. Monopolies of trade are made by protective tariffs. Monopolies of transportation are made by railroad franchises. Monopolies of land are given by title deeds. These are the things that make trusts possible. Mere organizations in restraint of competition cannot long survive. Of that fact the dissolution of the wall paper trust is one more illustrious example.

It is well that the policeman's statue that used to mark the spot of the so-called anarchist riot at the Haymarket in Chicago has been removed. It were better buried. But since it will no longer falsify the history of the riot, its existence above ground is of little importance. Standing where it did, as a riot monument, it perpetuated a falsehood. "I command peace!" says the statue. "I command this meeting to disperse!" said the policeman whose interference with a peaceable meeting precipitated the riot. As the fact that the meeting was peace-

able until attacked by the police, and the further fact that the police commanded it to disperse, are matters of unquestioned and indisputable public record, the inscription on the police statue, in so far as it alludes to the riot, is, as it was intended to be, a brazen lie.

According to a dispatch from Deadwood the output of gold from the Black hills will be one-third more this year than any previous year. The increase is attributed to recent discoveries and improvements in the cyanide process for treating low grade ores. Two years ago, says the dispatch, it was unprofitable to mine gold ore that yielded less than ten dollars a ton, but now a profit can be made out of two-dollar ore. These improvements are equivalent to the discovery of new gold mines, and if their promise is realized we may expect a reversal of political parties in the next monetary campaign. The gold men will be fighting for silver as the only honest money, while the silver men plead for the rights of the debased gold dollar. Only Mr. McKinley will be unchanged. He will continue to dodge and straddle.

Although the fate of the foreign legations in Peking is still uncertain, notwithstanding persistent reports of a horrible massacre, some light is breaking through the mist in which the general situation is enveloped. The outer world begins to understand the origin and nature of the conflict. Evidently the boxers' uprising is a revolt against the Chinese government. It was engendered by the government's policy of conceding Chinese territory and other privileges to foreigners, and is made formidable by the excitation throughout China of that brutal instinct which is characteristic of all peoples, including our

own, the instinct of contempt and hatred for "outside barbarians." In the beginning the Chinese government tried to suppress the uprising. But when the foreign powers bombarded the Chinese forts at Taku, their wanton act created an entirely new situation. The Chinese government was thereby forced to assume toward the powers a warlike attitude. To have shown friendliness toward them after that would have been to the people positive proof of treachery. The bombardment instantly made the boxers' cause the cause of China. From the Chinese point of view the situation may be appreciated by imagining the effect upon our own people of a naval assault upon American fortifications under similar circumstances. Our nation would be a unit instantly in resisting the common enemy. It was so in China. The revolt of the boxers became a secondary matter when the powers made war upon the empire. For a time the fiction of assisting the Chinese government in putting down an insurrection may be kept up. But China rejects the assistance; and the fact, already patent, must soon be acknowledged, that they are at war with her.

There is a point up to which this war may be justified, in spite of its having been wantonly begun by the foreign powers. That point is the relief of the foreign legations and the rescue of foreigners from massacre. If the Chinese government is unwilling or unable to protect these places and people from outrage, it is within the right of the powers to march through the country to their relief. But the rescue once effected, or the massacre once completed, so that relief ceases to be a factor, all present justification for war is at an end. At a later time, when the heat and bitterness of the period shall have passed and the confusion have had opportunity to disentangle, demands for indemnity and assurances for the future might be properly made and in some circumstances justly enforced if possible with arms. But now the sole consideration is one of rescue.

There can be no justification for a passionate war of retribution or vengeance. Such wars do not serve any useful purpose. They only minister to some of the wickedest cravings of the human heart. Neither can there be any justification of a war in aid of the Chinese government in putting down domestic violence, except for purposes of rescue. With the domestic affairs of the Chinese empire the powers have no right to meddle. And clearly they have no right to make the present emergency an excuse for a war of conquest. To rescue endangered foreigners and for that alone can foreign troops be justified in firing a shot upon Chinese soil.

Yet the spirit of retaliation is in the air. We who call ourselves Christian and civilized respond like barbarians to the impulse of vengeance and racial hatred. To be sure, we appeal in testimony of our good intentions to the precepts of religion, but so does the barbarian. His is another religion, that is all. And it is a safe guess that at the worst it is no more vicious than ours can be made by letting the devil interpret that saying of the Prince of Peace: "I came not to bring peace, but a sword." With a common sense interpretation this saying is an expression of a simple fact which in one of its phases every martyr for truth's sake since time began has experienced. But in the mouth of canting bishops of the strenuous sort it becomes a commission to kill and lay waste and conquer in the name of Him who said: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The cry for vengeance goes up from press and pulpit in one monotonous note. In London we are told, diplomatic and parliamentary circles are calling for a war of vengeance. A member of parliament is quoted as saying that the powers must "crush the reactionaries or get out of China." One New York paper, the Tribune, demands "the sternest possible retribution." The emperor of Germany puts on his armor to chastise the Chinese. A Chicago

bishop, devout and lowly as becomes his sacred office, wants China "humbled and punished" at any cost. In Shanghai a mass meeting of Americans calls for retribution. And so the barbarous cry goes on. If the nations keep out of a terrible war of blind hate and revenge in China it will be in spite of Christianity and civilization, as they are taught.

It need hardly be added that the spirit of revenge in which a war in China would be waged, would serve the objects of even worse motives. The member of parliament from whom we quoted above, makes the motive threefold—"vengeance, commercial establishment and zeal for Christ." And he says this not as a grim humorist, but with the serious piety of a Sunday school superintendent. Something in the same line is said by the strenuous bishop already mentioned. He looks for ultimate peace, but "peace by conquest." All through the cry for vengeance upon the Chinese there runs this strain of sordid selfishness. Conquest is the ultimate object—conquest for vengeance, conquest for commerce, conquest for proselyting. Thus far the United States has in this respect been guiltless. The American admiral at Taku refused to participate in the attack upon the Chinese forts. Secretary Root has limited the right of invasion to purposes of rescue, and when urged to increase the American troops has objected that the object of rescue and relief does not warrant additional reinforcements. In other respects, also, the purpose of this government appears to be to refrain at any rate from prosecuting a war of conquest in China. But there are substantial reasons with respect to the other powers for the complaint of the Chinese minister at Washington that they have sacrificed their ministers to the mob at Peking in order to make a crisis to serve as an excuse for the dismemberment of the Chinese empire. And while our government has not yet manifested a disposition to avail itself of this crisis to secure a share in the spoils, there are indications that it may yet do so.

Not the least significant of these is afforded by Congressman Hull, of Iowa, chairman of the house committee on military affairs, who is in close personal, political and official touch with the administration. In an interview published in the Chicago Record of July 17, Mr. Hull said:

I have no doubt that the democratic members of congress will vote for any measure looking to the suppression of lawlessness in China and securing reparation to this government. Any party which would oppose a vigorous course in these circumstances would be swept out of existence, and the party which advocated letting the other powers do the work to be done in China and then we step in and claim part of the fruits would meet a similar fate.

If it is not intended to make the war on our part a war of conquest, why should our chairman of the committee on military affairs be so solicitous to put us in a position to step in, after the work is done in China, and "claim part of the fruits"?

When the imperialists "plead the baby act" by trying to shift responsibility for imperialism upon Mr. Bryan, they expose an unsuspected consciousness of the weakness of their cause. Yet that is what they are doing. Because he advised the adoption of the Paris treaty rather than advocate an amendment which would have involved a nominal continuance of the Spanish war, they charge him with responsibility for the policy of imperialism which McKinley has erected upon the basis of the treaty! Mr. Bryan's advice as he gave it is printed in full this week in our department of Miscellany.

Mr. Bryan may have been wrong in advising the prompt adoption of the Paris treaty. He is not inerrant, like the great and good protege of Mr. Hanna. But if he was wrong, many other anti-imperialists were wrong also. As it has turned out, they do seem to have been mistaken. It would have been far better to force an amendment of the treaty, no matter how long that might have kept up the Spanish war nominally, than to have given McKinley an excuse for

destroying infant republics, subjugating distant peoples, establishing crown colonies and turning the republic into an empire. But who could have foreseen that President McKinley would have done this? Senator Hoar did, indeed, foresee it; but Senator Hoar, as a copartisan and personal friend of McKinley's, was in an advantageous position to know what to expect from such an administration. Bryan was in no such position. He could only infer that the foundation principles of the republic would be respected even by McKinley. The imperialists are in a bad way when they raise this defense. But by no such baby plea can they shield themselves in the coming campaign from full responsibility for the policy of imperialism.

To urge that the McKinley crown colony policy is not imperialism is only to "plead the baby act" in another way. Two federal judges, one in New York and one in Chicago, and both republicans, have recently decided, one as to Puerto Rico and the other as to the Philippines, that these lands are not within the protection of the American constitution, but are foreign countries subject to the sovereignty of the United States. That is the relationship that McKinley is trying to perpetuate, and it is the essence of imperialism. It is the relation that the empire of Rome established with her provinces. If "imperialism" is a distasteful term to our fastidious imperialists let them use another. They might prefer "forcible annexation," "criminal aggression" or something of that kind. But they would be no better off. It is not the name but the essence of the thing that shocks the republican sense of America; and the essence of it is that Mr. McKinley would have the American republic extend its sovereign power over peoples to whom it denies citizenship rights, and who would therefore be American "subjects."

With reference to the boast of the republican platform, commented upon

at page 181, that "in the short three years of the present republican administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094" has been rolled up, we are asked to explain why that increased excess means increased impoverishment of the country. This is the question:

Of course the persons who manufactured (or grew) and who sold those exports got paid in money, and it was to their advantage to sell them. Then why was it not an advantage to the country at large?

Undoubtedly it was to the advantage of the producers, all things considered, to sell their products. Else they would not have sold them. It is true, also, that they got money or its equivalent in return for their goods. But it by no means follows that the country is richer. To understand this more clearly, consider a tributary country,—such as Palestine, for instance, under the Roman empire. The producers of Palestine got pay for their products, and it was to their advantage to sell them; but the tribute that went out of the province as excessive exports to Rome was of no advantage to Palestine. She was impoverished by it. So with Ireland. The producers there get pay for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them; but the rents that go from the island as excessive exports make Ireland poor. This is true also of Egypt. The fellahin are paid for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them; but the interest on Egyptian bonds held abroad is a form of tribute which tends, by making excessive exports, to impoverish Egypt as a whole.

Keeping in mind the principle suggested above, turn to our own country. Our producers are paid for their products, and it is to their advantage to sell them. But some of these producers pay rent to an Astor or a Lord Scully, and products to the amount of the whole or part of that rent are exported, because these men live abroad. That makes no direct differ-