

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1904.

Number 308.

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.

"Why don't you endow a chair in economics at our university?" This identical question was asked a few years ago by a distinguished educator, a man of national fame in his vocation, of a millionaire who had disclosed to him a profound interest in economic subjects.

As the story is true and at the present time instructively significant, it may be worth the telling. To appreciate its value, however, one must understand that the millionaire actor in it was in principle that very rare bird in the millionaire life of America, a democrat of the Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln type.

"Why don't I endow a chair of economics at your university?" returned the millionaire. "Well, I suppose it might be because I haven't much respect for the kind of economics the universities are teaching." But this reply did not divert the "touch" of the educator. "Oh," said he, "that could be easily arranged to suit you!"

Here was a plain intimation to the millionaire that if he would endow a chair in economics he might have any kind of economics taught from it that he preferred. The question of right or wrong, of truth or falsity, of science or bunco, cut no figure. Only the endowment cut any figure. In this instance the endowment was withheld, because the subject of the "touch" had no more respect for that kind of college administration than he had for the regular brand of college economics. But

it is a common thing now-a-days for millionaires who are not democratic to respond with fabulous gifts to the "touches" of pushing educators; and one cannot but wonder whether these gifts may not be made upon some such tacit understanding as the educator of our story proposed. Do these educators assure these donors that in consideration of their gifts the teaching of the favored college will be arranged to suit them?

It is the suspicion that this may be so, which gives to the dismissal of Oscar Lovell Triggs from the faculty of the Rockefeller-Harper university at Chicago its public importance. So far as the public knows, Mr. Triggs may be incompetent. His popularity among the students and his long connection with the university tend to discredit that assumption: yet questions of competency must be determined by trustees—the public cannot decide them. So far as the public knows, the pronounced democratic spirit of the man may have had nothing to do with his dismissal. It may be that all of us would approve the action of the trustees were we apprised of the facts which the trustees withhold. And whether we would or no, we should all be inclined to say that the responsibility is upon the trustees, and so long as they are worthy of confidence we must accept their conclusions not only as necessarily final but as presumably just. But there's the rub!—that question of confidence. How can the public be confident that Mr. Triggs has been dropped for legitimate educational reasons? How can the public be confident that he has not been dropped in pursuance of some understanding that the teaching force and spirit of the Chicago university shall be "arranged to suit" Mr. Rockefeller?

It is because they reasonably excite suspicions like these that lavish gifts to colleges from the millionaire beneficiaries of rich and rare legal privileges are peculiarly dangerous to the educational interests of a democracy. Such gifts tend to undermine public confidence in the management of the educational institutions upon which they are bestowed. The Chicago university is an example. Notwithstanding the value of the work that this university has done and is doing; notwithstanding the attitude of bold and intelligent defiance to plutocracy which some of its professors maintain as citizens, and the democratic spirit of their teaching; yet there is a well-defined and entirely excusable feeling abroad that when one of these manly professors is dropped from the faculty, the reason is more likely traceable to some arrangement with Mr. Rockefeller than to sound and sincere educational considerations. And so would it be with the University of Nebraska should President Andrews succeed in his arrangements for "touching" Mr. Rockefeller in its behalf. This whole regime of plutocratic paternalism is bringing the administration of American educational tendencies into scandalous discredit.

There is no mistaking the signs of a revival of the movement to force Grover Cleveland's nomination (pp 549, 553) upon the Democratic party. Mr. Cleveland's friend and adviser "Dan," whose surname is Lamont, is reported to be firm in his demand for Cleveland and nobody but Cleveland. Tammany Hall, now under the control of the Rockefeller financial interests, has virtually declared for Cleveland. Strong Republican influences, financial in character, have long had the Cleveland trend; and now that Hanna is

dead they are setting in stronger and swifter than ever in that direction. They have a much more sensitive affinity for Cleveland than for Roosevelt. The most significant of all these pro-Cleveland signs, however, is Cleveland's own undisguised bid for the nomination. His article on "Democracy's Opportunity," is so understood on all hands, except among the innocents of his own worshipful flock; and, indeed, no one possessed of the slightest political sophistication can draw any other principal inference from it.

Mr. Cleveland advocates some good things in this article of his. But he advocates nothing that he couldn't dump, were he President again, as easily as he dumped the anti-protection policy on which he was elected twelve years ago. Nor does he utter a word that would interfere with his serving his good friend, J. Pierpont Morgan, as he served him in 1893 when he abandoned the tariff issue on which his party was united and he had been elected, to substitute for it the money issue on which his party was divided and he had not been elected. He again weakly tries to shift responsibility for Democratic disaster in 1896 to Bryan; but that it was really due to his own treachery is too plainly written in the election returns of 1894, when the party went to pieces under Cleveland, and in those of 1896 when it began to revive under Bryan.

Cleveland has something to say against "obsolete issues and questions no longer challenging popular interest." Yet he demands "tariff reform," a semi-protection issue which is as obsolete as the cautious words themselves are devoid of inspiration. Tariff for revenue only is the mildest form in which the tariff question can ever again excite popular enthusiasm, and for this Mr. Cleveland has no praise. He objects to "redundancy" and "dreariness" in campaign declarations, yet fills his own article with redundancies and worse than redundancies, to

the end that he may seem to say much that is democratic on principle without committing himself to anything. He demands that "the people of the Philippine Islands should be aided in the establishment of a government of their own." Yet when they had a government of their own, and the paramount issue before the American people in a Presidential election was whether the heavy hand of American imperialism should be lifted from that struggling government, Mr. Cleveland remained in his cloister, because he didn't like the anti-imperialist candidate personally and disagreed with him on questions which were not only subordinate but which Mr. Cleveland himself regarded as obsolete. Isn't it rather late in the day for Mr. Cleveland to propose that the Democratic party undo our Philippine wickedness, against the doing of which it protested and resisted at the critical moment but without aid or encouragement from him?

The truth seems to be that Mr. Cleveland foresees possibilities of victory in the coming campaign; and, backed by Lamont, Tammany Hall and the conspirators of Wall street who are Republicans with Republican grafters and Democrats with Democratic grafters but grand-boodlers always, he is reaching out for the plum leaf. Success is really the key note of his article. And what manner of success would it be? There is nothing to base expectations of Democratic success upon except the preference of Wall street—nothing whatever. Roosevelt is popular with the Republican masses, but an object of hatred to Wall street manipulators. Cleveland is unpopular with the Democratic masses, but an object of love, for manifest reasons, to Wall street manipulators and their parasites and dupes. If a genuine democrat were nominated by the Democratic party, he would almost certainly be defeated at the polls; for against him there would be the Republican masses, the Wall street manipu-

lators, and the Cleveland grafters in the Democratic party itself. Cleveland sees this; and so do his whole faction. That is the reason they say the Democratic party can win if it nominates "the right man." They think that Wall street could shift the ballast. By "the right man," they mean one whom the Wall street manipulators would prefer to Roosevelt; and preeminently Cleveland is that man. There, therefore, is Cleveland's opportunity; this alliance with Wall street is the "Democratic opportunity" to which he alludes. It is hardly conceivable, however, that the Democracy of the country, anxious as its politicians are to get up to the public crib, would consummate the deal. Roosevelt and his jingoism are very objectionable, but in contrast with Cleveland and his Wall street partnership, should there be no other alternative, Roosevelt with all his faults would be angelic. Let every democrat pray that this alternative may not arise. Better far another defeat under a Williams, a Garvin, a Johnson, a Bryan—anyone, so only that he be a worthy man and a sincere democrat—than a hope of victory, or even victory itself, under the leadership of a stalking horse for the most corrupt plutocracy the world has ever known.

Some of the Grover Cleveland organs, notably the Chicago Chronicle, which is the property of John R. Walsh (a Chicago banker who was once and is again an aspirant for secretary of the treasury under Cleveland), advocate the repeal of the two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions. This demand is meritorious. Both the two-thirds rule and the unit rule are tools in the hands of political manipulators for subverting the will of the majority. Let both be bundled into one resolution of repeal and wiped out together.

Beginning with repudiating the sentiments of Abraham Lincoln and suppressing the Declaration of Independence, the plutocrats

who control the Republican party have finally placed Washington's farewell address upon their index expurgatorious. When a motion was made in the lower House of Congress on the 22d to recognize the birthday of the Father of his Country, by reading his farewell address, these recreant Republicans, these imperialistic Americans, voted the motion down.

In his address at the Union League Club's Washington birthday celebration on the 22d Elihu Root undertook to give the history of what will be described hereafter as the Panama episode. That this address was intended as a campaign document in justification of the attitude of the party was quite evident from the internal evidence. But what shall be thought of the moral status of a people who can solemnly approve theft when only thinly disguised by the doctrine of "qualified sovereignty." This would justify every act of aggression which may be committed by one interest upon the rights of any other. Such a principle denies natural rights and erects a rule of conduct based upon power animated by desire. It conceives of right and wrong as merely conventional. It is another expression of the doctrine that any act which is legalized, thereby becomes moralized. When imperious desire is supported by power it has always been the practice to legalize spoliation and then despoil. It has sometimes happened that the necessities of the situation demand immediate spoliation without waiting to be pre-legalized; but this difficulty is overcome by retroactive decrees legalizing whatever has been done. Mr. Root's doctrine of the "world's easement" is new, but it also affords considerable scope for thought. It is the doctrine of the "decadent nation" theory of Lord Salisbury. The "rights" of which Mr. Root spoke as being "necessary to make this easement effective" is a feeble imitation of the "implied powers" of constitutional interpretation. If one were able to extirpate that unconscious exercise of the reasoning faculty

which links separate and distinct incidents by the fiber of their principle, it might be a simple matter to silence the questioning raised by Mr. Root's address. But that is unfortunately impossible. One unconsciously strives to distinguish between "qualified sovereignty" of a nation over territory and the "qualified sovereignty" of individuals over personal property upon which porch climbers and sandbaggers cast an envious eye. Under this theory the fact that the owner of a gold watch was a small man and the sandbagger a very large and burly individual (and one who "needed the money" besides), would seem to make it highly improper to question the sandbagger's "easement" or his "right" to make use of any means necessary to make this "easement" effective. "Qualified sovereignty" is the euphemistic phrase under which international petit larceny is justified and our Republic transformed into a "fence."

In describing last week the petition for the repeal of the opinion-penalizing act of Congress under which John Turner, the English labor organizer, is held at Ellis Island for deportation (p. 723), we accidentally omitted the name of Philip Stein, a judicial associate of Judges Tuley, Dunne, Windes and Brown, who were among the signers of the petition. Judge Stein also had signed it.

Without shame, how is it possible for any loyal American to read the reports from Porto Rico, that the Federal party there is vainly demanding either Statehood or independence? Porto Rico welcomed the American army as her deliverer from Spanish bondage. But now she learns that America has placed her in a bondage more humiliating. Under Spain she sent six members to the Spanish parliament. But under the United States she has no representation in the American Congress, her one solitary delegate to Congress having no vote on any question and no right to speak even on Porto Rican affairs save by courtesy of

the House. Under Spain her natives were natural born citizens of Spain, and therefore capable of becoming naturalized citizens of any other country, including the United States. But under the United States they are not natural born citizens of any country, and are therefore incapable of becoming naturalized citizens anywhere—even of the United States. Truly the Porto Ricans have achieved humiliating distinction as wards of our Republic.

In his funeral oration over Senator Hanna's body, the chaplain of the Senate (the venerable Edward Everett Hale), referred to labor arbitration as mediation "between the men who provide the tools and the workmen who handle them." As a quotation from a Senate chaplain this superficiality might pass for an example in rhetoric. But Mr. Hale is something besides a chaplain. He is an economic thinker. One might like to know, therefore, who Mr. Hale's men are that furnish tools to workmen, if they are not workmen themselves. All artificial tools must be made by workmen. Does Mr. Hale allude, however, to natural tools—to such things, for example, as mineral deposits? Truly no human workmen provide these. But what makes it necessary for any men to provide such tools? Nature provides them abundantly.

Gov. La Follette, of Wisconsin, has demanded of the Wisconsin railroad companies that they furnish a list of all the public officials they are bribing with annual passes. It is to be hoped that Mr. La Follette will be able under the laws of his State to enforce his demand. Giving passes is one of the insidious modes of corruptly influencing legislation, administration and adjudication. No man who holds a public office—be he legislator, executive or judge—can be trusted to deal honestly between railroad interests and the public interests if he holds railroad passes. Not that corrupt officials can be so cheaply bribed, but that this petty bribery breaks