

THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS.

CHIHUAHUA COLONISTS.

The Mexican state of Chihuahua, once looked upon as almost worthless for settlement and certainly inadaptable for towns and cities of considerable size, while it was regarded as suitable for a grazing country, is coming to the front rapidly as a home for thriving settlers. This is due, to a very large extent, to the industry and energy of people who have gone there from Utah, and hence there is a special interest here in the developments going on. The Mormons who have made settlements there have brought out canals, applying Utah methods to the cultivation of the soil, and have made veritable gardens out of what was before semi-desert. This has not been accomplished without much toil, privation, and patient, hopeful effort; and the application of these has achieved success. In the same connection it may be remarked that Mexico's leading government officials, noting by the results attained the desirability of Mormon colonists, have treated these with due kindness and consideration. There is therefore a perfect harmony of operation between the American colonists who have gone into Chihuahua from the Mormon settlements in Utah, Arizona, or other parts in these mountains.

That there is more "push" and energy about these American colonists than in the native town-builders of Mexico is readily conceded by the Mexicans themselves, and is quickly noted by all observers. Upon this point, the *Enterprise*, a newspaper published at the state capital, Chihuahua, remarks in its issue for July 23, that "thousands of dollars have been expended in building canals and irrigation ditches, elegant homes have been erected, and at the present time there are several towns in the state that are unique for their picturesqueness and American characteristics compared with other towns in the republic." The *Herald*, of El Paso, Texas, also refers to these features in a late issue, commencing an article with the remark: "Look here," said a man in Juarez yesterday, as he pointed to a number of baskets of fruit. "These came from the Mormon colonies of Mexico. Very little is said regarding that country, but the fruit speaks for itself. Every day the Sierra Madre brings in dozens of baskets of this fruit."

Referring further to the progress of the Mormon colonies in the state of Chihuahua, the *Enterprise* gives the following interesting information:

"President A. W. Ivins, of the colonization company at Colonia Juarez, who was in Chihuahua this week, paid this office a pleasant call and stated that there was every prospect for obtaining a municipal government at the principal colony town by next September. He went to Guerrero to perfect titles in the land office and is expected to return today. It is understood that the enterprising and broad minded officials of the state are in every way satisfied with the advisability of granting these settlers the full privileges of municipal government to be directed by themselves, and the settlers are naturally elated at the prospects thus vouchsafed. There are no more orderly, thrifty and prosperous communities in the state or nation than these settlements of Americans, and they are increasing in members and importance as the months go by. The Rocky

Mountain states have furnished the majority of these colonists, and other colony sites have been secured for more immigrants."

PORTO RICO.

By the official action taken by the Porto Rican junta asking for annexation to the United States, the insurgents of that island are placed in a position entirely different from that of the Cubans in relation to this country. The Cubans are fighting for the establishment of an independent government with officers of their own, while the Porto Ricans, well knowing the utter impossibility of, by their own strength, breaking the chains that bind them to the old country, ask for freedom as an American state. This should greatly simplify matters as regards the eastern island in the Antilles, whenever Spain is ready for negotiations of peace.

The white population of Porto Rico is said to outnumber the blacks by about 30 per cent, the majority being Spaniards or of Spanish descent. The rest are Germans, Swedes, Danes, Russians and French. It should not be difficult, therefore, to establish an American form of government there, should the island be ceded to the United States.

AS TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

There is in some quarters a fear that the policy of annexation which the war with Spain has developed in this country is a departure from the Monroe doctrine, as generally understood. It seems to be forgotten, though, that the civilized world has a right to expect of each member of the family of nations that it keep good order within its own jurisdiction, and that when, for some reason or other, a nation is unable to do so, it becomes the duty of others to interfere in behalf of the establishment of peace and a stable government. The greater nations of Europe have repeatedly done so, and the map of the world has been changed accordingly.

It needs no argument to prove that no nation—Monroe doctrine or no Monroe doctrine—can safely permit a nuisance to exist permanently on its very doorstep. When conditions become such as they have been in Cuba for the last two or three years, and when there is no evidence that these conditions can be altered by the responsible government, the United States owes it to the world to step in and do just what she has pledged herself to do. No other course is compatible with the honor of the nation.

To say that this course is contrary to the Monroe doctrine is to say substantially that this doctrine was framed for the purpose of preventing the United States from performing her plain duty and discharging the obligations toward fellow men, placed upon her on account of the power and wealth with which she has been entrusted. It is to say that we believe in the truth of a principle the application of which would prevent us from fulfilling the special mission given to us as a people in this age of the world. But that is absurd. The Monroe doctrine was framed for no such purpose.

According to that doctrine, this country should have no designs on European colonies in this hemisphere. And there has been no such design either. The war was undertaken in support of

our demand upon Spain that she "at once relinquish her authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw her land and naval forces" from that island. In enforcing this demand it was found necessary to occupy other Spanish territory. Some of this Spain most probably will have to cede to the United States as part payment of the enormous price in money and precious lives which the establishment of peace and a stable government in Cuba has cost, and still may cost, our people. And in all this there is nothing to violate the Monroe doctrine or any other principle enunciated by America's distinguished statesmen in the past. They never contemplated tying this nation up so as to make it impossible in all time to come to strike a blow at tyrants in behalf of an oppressed race, or to prevent the collection of a just and equitable war indemnity, which in the present case, it seems, must be paid in land, Spain having no other visible resources. Nor can there be anything in the Monroe doctrine to prevent the American nation from remembering the Maine and the martyred heroes of that ship. If there were, it would speedily be declared a dangerous heresy. There is a good deal more common sense in the popular interpretation of that often mentioned doctrine than there is in the timid comments on it by some professed statesmen.

PRIVATE DIPLOMACY UNLAWFUL.

A correspondent of the "News," writing from Boston under date of July 20, is of the opinion that the war could easily have been avoided had the United States in time sent a woman to Madrid to appeal "in the name of the enfranchised women of America" to Spanish "generosity and chivalry." Such an appeal would have resulted, he thinks, in Spain sending commissioners to Havana to pacify the island and arrange for the voluntary withdrawal of the Spanish troops, for the distribution of food and clothing and for the establishment of a provisional government. There would, then, have been no war, no wounded, no dead.

A certain Miss Schley must have had a similar fantastic idea when on her own accord and on the strength of her being a woman and a member of a peace society, she proceeded to Madrid in order to work in the interest of peace. But if she went to the Spanish capital with some such notions, she soon was awakened to a realization of her mistake. Neither the queen regent nor any other responsible person would consent to receive her; much less to listen to an appeal from her to the "generosity and chivalry" of Spain.

It was perhaps well for Miss Schley that her proposed interference with the affairs of state did not result in anything, for there is, it seems, a law in this country that forbids all citizens from entering, directly or indirectly, into any verbal or written correspondence or engaging in intercourse with any foreign government, or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of such foreign government in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the government of the United States. Such persons may be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 and by imprisonment of not less than a term of six months or more than six years.

Speaking of this law, the *Chicago Times-Herald* says it dates back to 1798, when the United States was on the verge of war with France. In that year, after the first peace negotiations between President Adams and the French directory had failed, Dr. George Logan, a Philadelphia Quaker, at his own cost