

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 7, 1904.

Number 318.

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.

It is reported from the South that overtures from New York are being made there looking to a plan for stampeding the Democratic convention for McClellan or Cleveland, Parker's boom having hopelessly flattened out and Hearst's having visibly expanded.

McClellan would at one time have been acceptable to democratic-Democrats, but he himself has raised an insuperable barrier by lending the authority and power of his office as mayor to the promotion of a plutocratic scheme of huge proportions and shameless character. We refer to his official approval of a law creating an eternal monopoly of the New York gas supply. His excuse that the law be sanctioned only confirmed an existing law coming down from Tweed's day, is worse than no excuse at all. If the existing law was valid, it needed no confirmation; if invalid, McClellan has conferred vitality upon it. His act identifies him with the plutocratic interests which already control the Republican party and are seeking control of the Democratic party. That is enough to stop the proposed stampede for him. Hungry Democratic office seekers know that they cannot get to the public crib on the shoulders of any tool of the plutocracy. One might like to see them feed there, for their stomachs' sake, but the price would be too high.

If there is to be a stampede for either of these two men, let it be for Cleveland. His devotion to the plutocratic interests has been

demonstrated in so many ways that no specifications are necessary. At any rate, his sell-out of his party and his office to J. Pierpont Morgan's gang of freebooters in 1893-94, is enough for a reminder. He would more completely than anyone else split the party by a clear-cut line, with most of its genuine democrats on one side and most of its plutocrats on the other. And who can say that in the long run this would be undesirable? Mr. Cleveland stands out in bold relief as the national leader of the plutocratic Democracy. His nomination would fool nobody. That is in itself the best of reasons for nominating him, if the party really decides to compete with the Republicans for plutocratic favor.

That Mr. Cleveland is receptive is no longer questionable. His extravagant protests regarding the presence of Negroes at social functions in the White House during his administration (protests so extravagant in form and phrase as to make it quite impossible to apply to them Mr. Cleveland's curiously favorite adjective of "sober") could hardly have had any other purpose than to repair his political fences at the South; his significant mention of his delight at finding in Parker a man whose candidacy might relieve himself of the unwelcome necessity of being a candidate; and now his Princeton lecture on his relations to the Debs strike, breaking a profound silence of nearly ten years after Gov. Altgeld had publicly challenged his good faith, and two years after Altgeld's death,—all these things point unerringly to Mr. Cleveland's receptivity. His Princeton lecture is probably his most direct intimation that the plutocratic Democrats need not worry over the collapse of the Parker boom so long as Grover Cleveland lives.

It is addressed to the aggressive plutocratic sentiment in particular, but in general to that wider and stronger and really good sentiment for law and order upon the ignorance of which the plutocrats play as a musician upon a stringed instrument. Mr. Cleveland has chosen shrewdly. With Dan Lamont's plutocratic cavalry, supported by infantry battalions recruited from the unsophisticated among the masses of order-loving people, he may not unlikely control a majority of the office-hungry delegates at St. Louis. He may also make great inroads into Roosevelt's ranks, should he be nominated. Certain it is that Roosevelt's Wall street followers would desert to Cleveland, and that all whom they could coerce or influence would fall in line meekly behind this trusted leader of American plutocracy. At all events Cleveland would frankly represent the plutocracy of the country; and next to its nominating as frank a representative of democracy, that is the thing most to be desired at this crisis.

Mr. Cleveland's lecture on the Debs strike is heartily welcome. If it serves no other purpose it will set thousands of college youth to investigating the facts of the controversy between Cleveland and Altgeld relative to the former's uncalled for, unnecessary and arbitrary use of Federal troops. The result of this investigation will not redound to the glory of Mr. Cleveland's statesmanship nor tend to establish confidence in his candor or veracity; but it will redound to the great credit of John P. Altgeld, as a democrat, as a believer in orderly law and order, as a faithful executive, and as a courageous statesman. Others besides college students will also make this investigation. Men afflicted with groverclevelanditis

will not do it, of course; their investigation will begin and end with a reading of Mr. Cleveland's lecture. But all admirers of Cleveland are not afflicted with grover-clevelanditis, and these will at least look into the matter impartially, including Altgeld's telegrams, and the evidence upon which they were based and which Cleveland ignores with a sneer. When the facts about this episode are sifted to the bottom, Mr. Cleveland's connection with the matter does not appear enviable.

His action regarding that strike was taken at the request of the managing committee of the railroad combine. This is the kernel fact of the whole affair. Nor does this fact lose any of its sinister significance because the request was made through a special counsel of the United States; for the special counsel of the United States for that occasion was also a counsel of the railroad combine, and his relations in that particular were known by the Cleveland administration at the time it selected him for special counsel of the United States. A plain partnership for plutocratic misrule and official disorder, between the combined railroads centering at Chicago and the Cleveland administration, is revealed by the documentary history of that railroad strike and of Cleveland's participation therein. Persons wishing to compare Mr. Cleveland's side of this story with Gov. Altgeld's, will be edified and instructed, after reading Cleveland's lecture, to read Altgeld's speech at Cooper Union, October 17, 1896, in which all the pertinent documents are quoted.

Mr. Cleveland makes a second bid this week for plutocratic support for the Presidency. It is in the form of a tract on his bond deal with J. Pierpont Morgan, and appears in the Saturday Evening Post of Philadelphia. In this tract Mr. Cleveland boasts of his arrangements with Morgan, whereby, he says, "the credit and fair fame of our nation were saved." This patriotic

boast is much like the pious ejaculation of the Eastern noodle who, upon seeing a reflection of the moon in the water at the bottom of a well and thinking it the moon itself, undertook to lift it back to the sky. In his strenuous efforts he was thrown sprawling upon the ground, which caused him much pain; but as he lay groaning there his upturned eyes observed the moon sailing through the heavens, and with becoming piety he exclaimed: "Allah be thanked! Though I suffer for my pains, I have restored the moon to her place."

Mr. Cleveland's Western organ, the Chicago Chronicle, owned and edited by John R. Walsh, the millionaire banker of Chicago, who expects to be secretary of the treasury in Mr. Cleveland's next cabinet, is entitled to full credit for openly advising the "reorganizers" to bolt wherever they lose in a party contest. It does so very frankly in the leading editorial of its issue of April 30. This is excellent advice. Bolting is one of the most wholesome exercises in the politics of a self-governing people. It means death to the boss, death to the caucus, death to the manipulator of conventions, and life to sound politics. Nor can any faction have a monopoly of it. Others as well as Cleveland's backers can bolt. And now that those who distrust Cleveland are so well advised, not only by Cleveland's bolt in 1896 and 1900 but also by the frank intimations of his principal Western organ, that his faction will bolt again if it loses at St. Louis, they need have no political scruples as to their course if it wins at St. Louis. This outlook is reassuring because it is in the nature of a prophecy that after the St. Louis convention the Democratic party will be either democratic or plutocratic without mixture.

In the soundness of its democratic principles the Nation, of New York, is without a superior in periodical literature. Take this, for example, on the labor

question in politics, quoted from the issue of April 21:

The real friend of labor, then, is not the forerunner of prosperity nor the vendor of social patent medicines, but simply the man who will stand for equal laws and the abolishment of special privileges. . . . The candidate who promises labor anything more than an even chance is not its friend, but its beguiler.

Those sentiments are as refreshing to the democratic soul as a new Declaration of Independence; they are so true, so direct, so fundamental. If the Nation could see its way clear to guiding its political policy in the concrete by these abstract principles, what a power for sound democracy it might be. But the trouble with the Nation is that it is too expert in compounding for the special privileges it "is inclined to by damning those it has no mind to."

The Emma Goldman (p. 55) and John Turner (p. 41) episodes ought to warn the over-officious Fouche's of our police to stop making asses of themselves and fools of their communities by their lawless interference with anarchist lecturers. Unless they want to propagate anarchist doctrines they will hereafter keep hands off. The absurd arrest of Turner, for merely thinking out of harmony with jacks-in-office, and the wanton suppression of Miss Goldman's Philadelphia meeting, have done more to advertise and propagate anarchist doctrines than ten thousand undisturbed lectures could have done; for these attempts to deport a thinker and to suppress a meeting have aroused to some extent the traditional believers in free speech in America, and that in turn has directed attention to the fact that anarchist lecturers do not preach violence but do preach education and peace.

Another incident confirms our contention that the feeling of hostility to Negroes is not confined to the South, but is as bitter and lawless at the North. This is no sectional question, not even superficially. It is a race question superficially, and a democratic