

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1903.

Number 251.

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.

When the Washington dispatches announced Senator Tillman's intention of addressing the Senate on the coal famine question, they added that no attention would be paid to his speech as the Senate does "not take Tillman seriously." But when Tillman spoke, he made the friends of the administration realize that it would be decidedly necessary to take him seriously. And they took him seriously indeed, as the subjoined dispatch to that rock-bound administration paper, the Chicago Inter-Ocean amply testifies:

Senator Tillman's speech created a sensation in the Senate and Senators Spooner and Beveridge continually entered objections to his remarks. Senator Spooner announced after the South Carolina Senator had concluded that several senators would reply to Mr. Tillman on Monday.

Floating through the press we find these words credited to Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the senators from Massachusetts:

When wealth realizes its responsibilities, when it is used to relieve suffering, to promote education, to bring works of art within the enjoyment of all, then it is a protection and a strength.

This is a good example of the unconscious disguising of a manifest falsity in figures of speech. What Mr. Lodge is thinking about is not wealth, but wealthy men; but had he written "wealthy men" instead of "wealth," the error in his sentiment would have been apparent. Let us translate it into those terms, thus:

When wealthy men realize their responsibilities, when they use their wealth to relieve suffering, to promote education, to bring works of

art within the enjoyment of all, then they are a protection and a strength.

It is now evident that this sentiment begs the whole social question, which is not a question of how wealthy men do or should spend their wealth, but of how they get it. If they get it at the expense of others, either legally or illegally, then, whether they use it benevolently or not, they are neither "a protection" nor "a strength," but a burden and a menace.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is reported from Johannesburg as announcing that "measures must be taken to train the natives to habits of industry," and "that if no other remedy can be found the blacks must be compelled to work by force." Truly, that suggestion smacks of a design to reestablish Negro slavery. It probably means, however, that the slavery is to be disguised in some such innocent form as a "hut tax," under the operation of which South African capitalists may secure an abundant supply of cheap native labor. Though "Britons never will be slaves" themselves, some of them, like some Americans, are not averse to making slaves of others. The "right to work" (other men) has struck its roots deep in Anglo Saxon philosophy.

New York dispatches of the 18th gave a lurid account of the behavior that day, on a Mount Vernon trolley car, of a dozen soldiers of the 16th U. S. infantry just home from the Philippines. They were returning to Fort Slocum to the garrison of which they belong; and their condition, if it be not unpatriotic to mention it, was what among civilians is known as "bestly drunk." When they used offensive language to a woman passenger, two men among the passengers resented their indecency, whereupon these valiant defenders of their

country's invading flag in the Philippines, assaulted the unpatriotic men with their fists, and with their revolvers riddled the car with bullet holes. A panic followed, in which the passengers leaped for their lives from the car. The excitement over, it was discovered that one passenger had been thrown bodily out of the window while the conductor had been seriously stabbed. In other ways, also, some of the processes of "benevolent assimilation" which these soldiers had learned to exercise in the Philippines were practiced upon the barbaric inhabitants of Mount Vernon. "The water cure," however, was not exemplified. We forbear comment. The "honor of the army" must be respected.

There is no mistaking the animus of the majority of the Chicago council in turning down the "Finn" municipal ownership bill by substituting the "Jackson" bill. Both provide for municipal ownership and both provide for referendums on the subject. But the "Finn" bill was prepared by a committee the majority of whom believe in municipal ownership, really as well as nominally; while the "Jackson" bill is virtually confessed by its sponsor to have been drawn by street car lawyers. The latter bill favors municipal ownership as the devil hates lying—in the abstract, not in the concrete.

It is in their referendum clauses that the difference between these two bills is most plainly visible. The "Finn" bill provides for an "initiative" as well as a "referendum;" the "Jackson" bill strikes out the "initiative." Note the difference. Under the "Finn" bill, ten per cent. of the registered voters could submit the question to popular vote, and a majority of those voting would de-

cide. But under the "Jackson" bill no submission to popular vote could be secured until a council, liable to be influenced the other way by bribery, had taken the initiative. There could be no direct popular demand for the measure. And if the council did submit the question, a majority of the registered voters would be required for an affirmative decision. Every registered voter who was too indifferent, or ignorant or lazy to look into the question and form a judgment, would be committed against the reform. Is it not very remarkable, not to say extremely significant, that while the "Jackson" bill would thus prohibit municipal ownership until a council could be induced to submit the question, and would make every non-vote a negative vote, it would allow franchises to be granted private companies without any popular action whatever? It may be that the majority of the Chicago council is honest in this matter; but with tempting boodle, suited to the demand and ready for takers, they must pardon those of us who suspect that such aldermanic votes as go in the direction of "boodle" interests are attracted by "boodle" magnetism.

Truman C. White, the judge who tried and passed sentence on Czolgoz, the assassin of McKinley, and who still occupies a seat upon the Supreme bench of the State of New York, recently delivered a lecture in Buffalo, the sentiment of which cannot be too highly praised. Referring to the spirit of lawlessness which animates so many public officers, from policemen to judges, shown, as he said, "in the readiness with which a conclusion is reached that a person charged with crime is guilty, and in the determination born of that conclusion and founded on an accusation in advance of proofs, to bring about a conviction and punishment if possible," Judge White led on to the mob spirit among "conservatives" which was aroused by the McKinley murder. He did not mention that instance, but his allu-

sion to "men of high order of intelligence who openly said that if they had the opportunity they would kill the prisoner," could not be misunderstood. And heavy, indeed, was his condemnation of such men. Said he:

The man who stands ready to commit a crime because another man has done so, is as bad, in my judgment, as the criminal upon whom he wishes to wreak revenge. I know this may be an unpopular view to take, but it is a solemn truth in my judgment. If you and I and all of us would from the beginning of raising a family inculcate in the minds of our children the evil of this spirit of lawlessness, there would, I believe, be a decided improvement in society.

That Judge White's wholesome sentiment was no passing whim, but was rooted deep down in immutable principle, is evident from his spontaneous replies to questions. We quote from the local newspaper report of his lecture:

A voice in the audience spoke up: "What about the Texas case where a Negro was burned at the stake for rape upon a little white girl?"

"What I have said applies to that case with equal force," answered Justice White.

"But suppose that child had been your own? Wouldn't you have felt like wreaking that vengeance?" persisted the questioner.

"I have thought of all that," said Justice White, calmly. "That doesn't change the situation. The better way is for citizens to uphold the authorities, and the law will better be vindicated."

That is good doctrine. But it has few adherents. Take them as they run, men are a pretty disorderly lot.

The special grand jury of Cook county, Ill., sitting in the coal conspiracy cases, has outdone the mountain that was delivered of a mouse. The mountain's mouse, with all its comparative littleness, was at any rate a real mouse and consistent with itself. But the deliverance of this Chicago grand jury is not only ridiculously out of proportion but indescribably absurd in itself. Some three dozen indictments have been found by it charging men and corporations

with a crime which the grand jury takes great pains, in a voluminous report, to prove has not been committed by anybody.

According to this truly remarkable report, the coal famine was caused by the anthracite strikers. By going upon strike for a paltry increase in their wretchedly low wages, they reduced the supply of coal. Those wicked, wicked strikers! And then the evil they produced was intensified by that ever-ready explanation of all our economic difficulties, our "great prosperity." A lessened supply of coal had come into collision with an augmented demand. The famine, therefore, was strictly a result of the natural operation of the laws of supply and demand. The operators did all they could to relieve the shortage. The railroads cooperated and did all they could. It wasn't much, maybe; but it was their little all. The shortage and high prices, consequently were "not owing to or appreciably influenced by any conspiracy or combination in restraint of trade, or any attempt to forestall the market." Yet this ingenious grand jury indicts some 30 or 40 individuals and corporations engaged in producing coal, for precisely that thing—conspiracies and combinations in restraint of trade. Altogether one might suppose that while the indictments were ordered by the grand jury, its report was dictated by some coal trust lawyer.

Sensational editorials in the press of this country, over the exposures of "municipal socialism" in England made through the London Times by that prince of statistical adventurers, Robert Porter (p. 484), no longer appear; but echoes from those that did appear a month or two ago may still be heard. A word, therefore, directly from Glasgow, where this "municipal socialism" originated and prevails with greatest intensity, will not come amiss even at this late day. We are quoting from John Paul, editor of