

WHAT IMPERIALISM IS. TOLD BY A REPUBLICAN.

Editor of the Des Moines Globe Says Policy of the McKinley Administration is the Best Definition of the Term.

For this Reason His Newspaper Supports McKinley and Advocates a Constitutional Monarchy--Some Mighty Interesting Reading.

Special Dispatch to the Omaha World-Herald. Des Moines, Ia., Aug. 29.—Solomon, or some other one of the wise men, remarked once upon a time: "Behold what a great matter a little fire kindleth."

Honored by His Party. E. Chavannes, editor of the Des Moines Weekly Globe, is a republican, is the republican committeeman of his precinct, and his paper is the official organ of the Polk county board of supervisors.

Stacks of Letters. Mr. Chavannes had just returned from a visit to Devil's Lake when the World-Herald correspondent introduced himself.

"The World-Herald! Well, you people have been giving me some great advertising lately."

"Well, the size of my mail convinces me that the World-Herald is read closely by my republican brethren, anyhow. Why, I have in that desk hundreds and hundreds of letters and most of them are from men who claim to be republicans and ask me if the Globe is really a republican paper."

An Earnest Republican. Mr. Chavannes was shown an editorial appearing in the Lincoln Journal of Sunday, August 25, in which the Journal said, referring to Mr. Chavannes and the Globe:

"The joke of it all is that the Des Moines Globe is not in harmony with the republican party on expansion, but is training with the other fellows."

ADVOCATES MONARCHY. "Do you really favor a constitutional monarchy as the government for this country, Mr. Chavannes?"

"To be sure it is. I have hoped and prayed that this republic might be an exception to all rules and continue as

a free, liberal republic to the end of all time. But I clearly see that such a thing is now an impossibility. Others see it, too, but they are afraid to come out openly and say so. I am not. But what man can study history and then analyze the present and not be convinced that our tendency is that way?"

"Government, my dear sir, is founded on property and commerce. We can boast of civil rights and all that, but government is founded after all upon property. Men acquire property and then demand a government that will protect them in their property rights."

Supports McKinley. "Do you advocate the election of McKinley and Roosevelt?"

"I do. Why should republicans be afraid to admit it? They may deceive themselves but they deceive one else when they pooh-pooh at imperialism."

HE LOOKS AHEAD. "I believe that McKinley and Roosevelt will be elected, and that when they are elected the party will set up the claim that their election is a vindication of the policy of imperialism."

"For many reasons. Republicans claim that we must do business with the money of the world—gold. I agree with that statement. And I also believe that if we are to reach out and do a world wide business we must do it under the same form of government as the great business nations of the world."

IT MEANS IMPERIALISM. "Yes I would," replied Mr. Chavannes. "I would do so because I am a republican, and because I do not have any faith in the democratic party. But I am giving the republican national ticket my support now for the reason that I believe the election of McKinley means imperialism. By imperialism I mean just what democrats mean when they call republicans imperialists."

Mr. Chavannes stands well in Des Moines. His paper has an average

circulation of 1,800 copies each week. Many people may not think this a large circulation, but they should remember that outside of the weekly editions of three of Nebraska's metropolitan newspapers there are not ten weekly papers in Nebraska with a circulation of 1,800.

But while Mr. Chavannes freely confesses his political views, a lot of his fellow republicans are afraid to speak out so openly, and they fear that Chavannes' impetuosity may be disastrous to the g. o. p. For this reason republican managers are seeking to either close Chavannes' mouth or make it appear irresponsible. Following this line of policy the Des Moines Capital of Friday, August 24, contained a very bitter attack on Mr. Chavannes.

A Manly Statement. On this point Mr. Young says: I come now, my dear sir, to a personal matter, concerning a part of your article—one that you have forced me to notice and refer to.

I come now, my dear sir, to a personal matter, concerning a part of your article—one that you have forced me to notice and refer to. I refer to the charge you make of my insanity some years back. I suppose that you felt it your solemn duty to the great party to which you and I belong, to destroy what little influence or reputation I might have in the town in which I live.

Mr. Chavannes then refers to the fact that without solicitation on his part he was elected republican precinct chairman. He points out that he is supporting McKinley and Roosevelt, and adds:

I certainly had no idea of injuring the republican party when I wrote my articles on imperialism. My neighbors have, without solicitation on my part, elected me republican precinct chairman. It is a greater surprise to me, I think, than to anyone else, that my articles on imperialism should be so widely noticed, and it is unfair to republicans to class the Globe as a party paper.

Why do you favor a constitutional monarchy, Mr. Chavannes? "For many reasons. Republicans claim that we must do business with the money of the world—gold. I agree with that statement. And I also believe that if we are to reach out and do a world wide business we must do it under the same form of government as the great business nations of the world."

Why Not Be Honest? "By the way, do you, Mr. Young, think that we can properly operate such a great government as ours under a written constitution? I think not. Why should we fear a constitutional

monarchy? Our president now carries on war, he censors the press, a congress meets and adjourns without making any provisions for the proper government of 10,000,000 alien people, and nobody finds any fault with it, save some of Mr. Bryan's admirers.

Upon what theory except imperialism do republicans justify the possession of the Philippine Islands? For political buncombe, we may say: "We owed it to other nations to keep them." But if that be so, why then buy them? The other nations should at least have paid for them if we kept them for their benefit. How will this nation justify the great killing of these people, and among them some women and children, if we do not justify it on the ground that weak nations must be developed and governed by the strong? It will not do for us to put up the plea of revenge for the killing of some of our soldiers by the Philippines, if it were only men they killed that might do, but killing women and children must be justified, if at all, on better and higher grounds. We see no reason why the republican party should fear to adopt imperialism in name as well as in tendency of its course.

These are the sentiments of a McKinleyite who knows what McKinleyism means and is not afraid to admit the truth. WILL M. MAUPIN.

Professor McLaughlin on Imperialism.

Prof. J. Lawrence McLaughlin, of the Chicago University, who was the foremost and ablest exponent of the gold standard in the last presidential campaign of 1896, writes a terrific arraignment of McKinley's Philippine policy and predicts that if continued on present lines it will wreck the Republic.

Prof. McLaughlin is a strong writer and we should like to quote him at length but we have space for but one of his sledge-hammer blows against imperialism. He says: "Suppose an abolitionist in 1860 had bought a negro from a slave-holder. Would the fact that slavery was legal in the United States have prevented the abolitionist from giving the negro his freedom? Certainly not: it was only a question of paying a given sum to do a generous act. Likewise if we (like slave-holders) among subject-holding monarchies bought the sovereignty of the Philippines for \$20,000,000 are we thereby bound to follow the example of states against whose theories of subject colonies our very existence is a constant protest? Far from it. We can no more justify holding another race in subjection against their will than an abolitionist could reconcile his belief with keeping a slave he had bought. As a nation of freemen all equal under the constitution, we are stultifying ourselves morally and politically. We are showing to the world that our principles of government are as nothing in comparison with grasping land because it is said by our senators to be rich and fertile. The baseness of this philosophy should bring its own punishment and disgrace. Of course we can keep the sovereignty over the Philippines; we can crush them with our army; we can go on murdering them while defending their liberty as we were murdered by the British at Bunker Hill; we can go on losing thousands of American lives in this immortal campaign, but there is absolutely no reason under heaven why we should keep on doing it if we are willing to stop. Then I am asked: What would you do? At once I reply: Treat the Philippines as we agree to treat Cuba. Stop fighting and begin to set the Filipinos on their feet preparatory to turning over the government to them under a protection from foreign aggression. It is puerile to keep on talking about being in and yet yet being unable to get out, for the same reason any man who had gone into a lake to bathe might say: Being in, I can never get out. The real question is: Is he willing to get out? Is so, the rest is easy."

McKinley insists that the flag must never, never come down when it has once been raised—unless England wants it to come down.

MINNESOTA WHEAT INSPECTION.

(CONTINUED FROM SECOND PAGE.)

should start out in any other way with the pressure that is brought to bear on us we should get the grades down so low they would be below the standard, and if we once get below we cannot tighten up, we can never get back. There was never known such a thing as tightening up a grade.

"Q. In other words, the rule never worked both ways?"

"A. No, sir. Mr. G. A. Tunnell, then Chief Deputy Inspector at Minneapolis, was placed on the stand."

"Q. You have testified that early in the season you have to inspect closer?"

"A. Yes, at the very start." The committee in closing its findings from the evidence produced before it, made this statement: "From this it appears that nearly one-third of the crop has been marketed each year before the farmer is enabled to get the grade that his crop merits."

Who Got the Benefit? If the inspection from farmers' hands during the early shipping season, when the bulk of the grain left the farms, was severe, or, as dramatically explained by the republican ex-chief, the custom was "to press the grades down, press them down," who got the benefit? Apparently, the inspection out of dealers' hands for export was not "pressed down, pressed down," because eastern buyers sometimes found a state of affairs widely different. The Buffalo (N. Y.) News, of Feb. 17, last, contained an interview on the subject of Minnesota grades of the preceding season from Chief Inspector J. D. Shanahan of the Buffalo port, in which the latter was quoted as saying:

"When I was in the Northwest last spring (spring of '99), I endeavored to tell the people of Minnesota through the press that they could not sell No. 2 Northern or No. 3 Northern to eastern or foreign buyers by covering it with No. 1 Northern certificates, and it looks to me as though they had come to realize the fact." The condition here complained of took place prior to the spring of 1899, under republican inspection, as appears from the face of it. And yet the St. Paul Dispatch of Feb. 20, produces it as a condemnation of the Reishus' inspection, which did not begin until the August following Mr. Shanahan's visit. This is the only serious criticism that has ever been published in regard to the standing of Minnesota grades in the Eastern and foreign market, and the complaint is against republican inspection under a regime that "pressed down the grades" in the inspection from farmers' hands. The evidence is therefore corroborative of the charge that the inspection was in the interest of favored parties between the producer and the foreign buyer and against the interests of both the grower and the final consumer.

The reform in Minnesota grain inspection under Governor Lind is strongly reflected in testimony from two sources: First, by that of the wheat-growers who for the first time receive in the inspection from their hands the same just and liberal grades accorded to the grain trade; and second, from the market records of New York and Liverpool, where Minnesota grades go with the same even and uniform standard established by the inspection from the producer's hands. The world's market and the farm join in approval of an inspection that is at once uniform, accurate and honest, that knows neither fear nor favor.

Greater Economy and Efficiency. As showing the trend of economy in the administration of the state grain department during the past twelve months, the following comparison will serve as an index: Minneapolis Inspection Department, July, 1900, \$3,184.21, against \$3,896.77 for July 1899; Duluth Inspection Department, July, 1900, \$2,636.65, against \$2,906.82 for July, 1899; St. Paul Inspection Department, \$137.25 for July, 1900, against \$305.85 for July, 1899; pay-roll of general office at St. Paul, July, 1900, \$409.40, against \$558.00 for July a year ago. For the three inspection departments and general office pay-roll, the total for the month was reduced from \$7,694.44 to \$6,367.51, a reduction of \$1,326.93, or 17 per cent.

For the twelve months ending with July 21, last, the cost of the entire department is as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Total cost of Grain Department, including Board of Appeals, \$294,538.36. Less expenses of Board of Appeals, \$14,820.03. Salaries of two helpers detailed to bring samples to Board, \$1,500.00. Net cost of inspection and weighing departments, \$278,218.33. Year ending July 31, 1899 - Total cost of inspection and weighing departments for year ending July 31, 1899, \$270,730.01. Excess of cost of last year of Clauson's administration over first year of Reishus' administration, \$7,488.32. The Change in Inspection Fees. During the last 32 months under the republican administration of Mr.

Clausen as chief inspector, there was a shrinkage of \$102,032.44 in the fund standing to the credit of the department, under an inspection and weighing fee of 15c per car, making an increase in the fee imperative in order to save the department from bankruptcy and from being a charge upon the taxpayer. The fee accordingly was raised to 25c. Even with a 20c fee there was a loss of \$37,042.42 in 1894 and with a 25c fee there was a loss of \$4,917.22 under republican administration in 1895; so that 25c was judged to be none too high to place the department upon a self-supporting business basis. The additional burden of \$15,000 to \$20,000 placed by the last legislation upon the department to support the new State Board of Appeals necessitated an increase in the fee, even had republican precedent not disclosed the \$100,000 shortage in the two and one-half years prior to Chief Inspector Reishus' appointment.

Efficiency in the Weighing Department. An example of the increased strictness and general efficiency achieved under the present administration is shown by the statistics of the weighing department. Minnesota export wheat is weighed out at Duluth and weighed in "on arrival" at Buffalo, the other end of the lake route.

Comparison of the Duluth and Buffalo weights, therefore, shows the accuracy of the Minnesota Grain Department officials in weighing. The following table tells a significant story. The loss in lbs. per 1,000 bushels for the past seven crop years follows:

Table with 2 columns: Crop Year and Loss per 1,000 bus. 1894, 35 lbs; 1895, 30; 1896, 30; 1897, 30; 1898, 17; 1899 (last republican year), 17; 1900 (Lind administration), 8.

In other words, the loss in weight during the republican administration of the Duluth department ranged from 17 to 36 lbs. per 1,000 bushels as against the bagatelle of 8 lbs. under Governor Lind's new regime. The average loss in six years of republican administration was 25 lbs., which is three times that of the first year of the new control. This shows that the new broom sweeps clean in weighing as in inspection, while being a less heavy burden upon the taxpayer, and a source of far greater justice to the producer and general business public.

Comparative statement showing the expenses of the inspection and weighing departments for the crop years ending August 31st, 1899 and August 31st, 1900, and the expenses of the Board of Appeals for the year ending August 31st, 1900.

Table with 2 columns: Year and Total Expense. 1899-1900, \$221,405.07. 1898-1899, \$186,581.00. Total Expense, \$407,986.07. Saving for year 1899-1900, \$6,622.25.

STANDING ARMIES ARE A MENACE.

Standing armies always have been and always must be fatal to free institutions. To realize the utter incompatibility of Militarism and republicanism we have but to look at France. When we recall the first French republic scattering the combined forces of Europe through the valor of its volunteer armies, how pitiful is the spectacle of the third republic covering in fear of its own standing army, incapable of wielding any influence abroad, impotent even to do justice at home.

The experience of this country proves that a citizen soldiery is invincible against foreign aggression or domestic insurrection, while all history shows that a mercenary soldiery has never been so formidable to any country as the one which supports it.

A standing army in the long run has always become helpless against foreign foes, but it has always remained of deadly efficiency against domestic liberties. The soldier in war may be a hero, the soldier in peace is either useless or dangerous. The camp may be a school of virtue and patriotism, the barracks are always asylums of laziness and often hotbeds of vice. The moral law is binding on nations as well as on individuals. A violation of it by either is always followed by retribution, slow, perhaps, but inexorably stern. He who draws the sword will perish by the sword, and the republic that establishes a standing army to smite freedom in other lands will live to find her own liberties trampled in the dust under the feet of a mercenary soldiery.