The Treaty Signed

The treaty of peace between Spain and the United States was signed by the Commissioners of the two nations in Paris on Saturday evening last. In an editorial on another page is given The Outlook's interpretation of the nature and meaning of the principal provisions of the treaty. As a matter of diplomatic form and precedent it was decided by the Peace Commission that the text of the treaty should be kept secret until it was duly submitted for approbation to the Senate of the United States and the Cortes of Spain. The chief stipulations of the treaty are, however, in substance, well known. It is understood to consist of seventeen articles. These deal, first, with the main agreements as to the relinquishing of Cuba by Spain, the cession of Porto Rico, the lesser Spanish West Indian Islands, and Guam, and the cession by Spain of the Philippines on payment of $20,000,000 by the United States; secondly, with the release of prisoners of war and political prisoners, the surrender of public buildings and property, the national status of Spaniards remaining in ceded territory, the mutual abandoning of public and private claims for indemnity, the commercial privileges conceded for ten years to Spain in the Philippines, and a few other minor topics relating to the carrying out of the principal provisions. Of these, perhaps the most important is that under which the United States undertakes to return to Spain the Spanish troops now in the Philippines at the expense of the United States. Nothing is included which is not directly or indirectly covered by the provisions of the protocol under which the Commission acted. Later proposals by the United States (as to the Carolines and other matters) are left for future negotiation after the treaty has been ratified and friendly relations resumed. A memorandum of protest filed by the President of the Spanish Commission, Señor Montero Rios, has been given to the press. It begins with a protest against what the Spanish Commissioners describe as “the refusal of the Americans to surrender the securities deposited in the treasuries of Cuba and Porto Rico by private Spaniards,” with the comment, “Never has a civilized nation committed such an act of violence.” Precisely what is meant by this is not at this writing clear; but American citizens will need positive evidence before believing that the sentence just quoted correctly describes any action taken by our Commission. The other protests of the memorandum are against our final demand for the Philippines, the reference in President McKinley’s Message to the destruction of the Maine, and the position in which Spaniards are placed who desire to remain in Cuba. It is believed that by the first of the year the treaty will be before the United States Senate, accompanied by a special message from President McKinley. Spanish papers admit that there is no course possible for the Cortes but to ratify the treaty. A Cabinet crisis in Madrid is quite probable, but there is little fear of a revolution in the capital.

Certainly the indications of the President’s policy thus far give little ground for the apprehension of those who have imagined that under his lead we were setting out on a career of imperial conquest and military government. The action of General Wood in Cuba in opening schools and appointing civil and native officials in Santiago is a presage of our probable policy in Cuba. That, however, is not American territory, and action there might be thought not to indicate what it will be in what are really “our new possessions.” But now the papers tell us that General Henry is pursuing the same policy in Porto Rico; that he intends to hold elections for Mayors and
the selling of tickets at low rates for railroads which are anxious to secure passengers at these rates, but do not care to inaugurate a rate war by offering cheap tickets at their own offices. Mr. Bland, of Missouri, said that the purpose of the bill was to legalize the pooling of passenger traffic, since the roads could fix rates as they pleased if ticket-takers could no longer serve as agents in effecting reductions. Mr. Upton, of Iowa, declared that "the measure ought to be entitled 'a bill to suppress competition in passenger traffic.'" If his party passed it, he said, it would mark the beginning of its downfall. Despite these protests, however, the bill, largely because of the number of petitions that had been worked up in its favor, was passed by a vote of 119 to 101. Among the petitioners in its favor were, of course, the railroad labor organizations, which had been persuaded to take the position that a bill increasing fares for the public would increase wages for themselves, though experience seems to show that increased fares, whenever they involve decreased traffic, result in the lowering of wages.

A Socialist Mayor

The significant event in the municipal elections in Massachusetts last week was the victory of the Socialists in Haverhill. Their candidate for Mayor received nearly 2,300 votes, as against 1,900 for the Republican, 900 for the Democrat, 900 more for a Conservative Independent, and another 100 for an Independent Socialist. This remarkable overturn of the Republicans took place, not in a community of German immigrants, such as furnished nearly all the Socialist votes six years ago, but in the most American of the larger places in Massachusetts—a place in which there are practically no Germans at all. The cause of the revolution was largely, of course, the severe cuts in the wages of shoe-operatives which have taken place in the last two years. A few years ago, however, the dissatisfaction which these cuts caused would have inured to the benefit of the Democrats. That the Socialists should now reap the fruits is explained by the Haverhill "Gazette," a Republican paper, on the ground that the people are looking with indignation upon the unfeathered increase of aggregations of capital controlling the necessities of life, and the unwillingness of the Legislature to permit municipalities to obtain the public control of the natural monopolies furnishing them with water, light, and transportation. "Either," it says, "we must have more equitable laws or more Socialists." Apparently, therefore, the extreme opposition of individualists to the alleged Socialism of public ownership of monopolies is sowing the seeds of real Socialism. Municipal ownership does not mean Socialism, as it respects the right of every capitalist to every dollar he has actually lent to the public, and merely prevents the payment of interest on capital never invested. By refusing to permit a moderate step in the direction of public control, the reactionaries have turned public sentiment in favor of the radicals.
the trial of France. The man is significant chiefly because he happens to be the person about whom the battle is being fought between reason and unreason, intelligence and passion, civil authority and militarism; and there is every reason to hope that France will acquit herself well in this grave crisis.

England and France

The English Government has determined, apparently, to leave no possibility of further misunderstanding of its policy on the part of the French Government. The British Ambassador at Paris, Sir Edmund Mason, at a dinner on Tuesday evening of last week, cast aside the usual diplomatic reserve and declared that the idea that Great Britain was unduly submissive and prone to make impolitic concessions of which advantage could be taken was now thoroughly exploded. The outburst of public feeling in Great Britain provoked by the Fashoda incident had made it plain to all Europe that England would not concede beyond a certain point, and that she could no longer be trifled with; and the Ambassador urged upon France the wisdom of abstaining from what he called "a continuance of the policy of pin-pricks which must inevitably perpetuate intolerable irritation in England." He expressed the hope that such ill-considered provocation as the design to thwart British enterprise in Africa by petty maneuvers would be abandoned. Such plainness of speech at such a place as Paris, from such a person as the British Ambassador, may be taken as definite notice that the English Government is weary of the policy of irritation which successive French Ministries have kept up during the past few years.

The Policy of Pin-Pricks

The speech of the English Ambassador has been followed by a speech from Mr. Chamberlain in the same tone; and these speeches in turn were preceded, as the readers of The Outlook will remember, by a very frank speech from Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. The English Government is not far wrong in its position. The French Government had a perfect right to take its own line of policy and to oppose the English projects; but it has made a great blunder in the manner of its opposition. Its course has been one of constant irritation ending in constant failure.

Not long ago a French publicist, writing for one of the Paris papers, as quoted by the New York "Tribune," declared that the French "have inaugurated the policy of playing tricks on Great Britain—a policy which had no definite object and which was bound to turn out badly. We now find ourselves confronted by a people who have at last been exasperated by the continual pin-pricks which we have given them." At every point, instead of resolutely meeting the English Government, the French Government has endeavored to interpose vexatious obstacles to the success of the English designs; and the English people are evidently as thoroughly wearied by this short-sighted policy as is their Government. England will make no further concessions; nor will she patiently endure any further pin-pricks. It is worth while in this connection to call attention to the fact that France has taken quite as much land on the African continent as Great Britain. There has been constant friction between the two Governments on the coast of Newfoundland for years past, and it is claimed that the French have broken every treaty stipulation. Their appearance in the Soudan was simply the culmination of a long series of vexatious but indecisive interferences at many points.

On the eve of his departure on his picturesque pilgrimage to the Holy Land the German Emperor reprimanded the Regent of Lippe-Detmold for the form of a communication which the Regent had addressed to him. The Emperor now returns to find that he has aroused the antagonism of all the smaller Princes of the Empire. The question at issue is minute: the reference of the question of the succession in Lippe-Detmold to the Federal Council by the Prussian Government. The German dynasty has two difficulties constantly confronting it: first, the growth of anti-absolutism among the German people, taking the form, for the most part, of Socialism; and, second, the jealousy and fear of the smaller States which are united under the general government of the Emperor. The Empire, it must be remembered, is a Federation of smaller States; the States and their rulers have certain privileges; of these privileges they are very jealous, and rightly so. Prussia has never been popular with them; and the extreme