

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 2-01 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1901.

Number 153.

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 column of last page.

The trustees of the New Brunswick, N. J., free library have honored themselves and their city by refusing to join the procession of municipal beggars to whom Andrew Carnegie is doling out library buildings. The mayor had appeared before these New Brunswick library trustees with a resolution inviting Mr. Carnegie to erect a library building in that city. But the trustees voted the resolution down. They protested that when New Brunswick needed a new library building its own citizens could and ought to furnish the funds for building it. Self-respect in cities has fallen so low, under the influence of such offers as Carnegie's, that this instance of worthy pride deserves especial notice.

With the closing session of the Fifty-seventh congress, one senator returned to private life whose services the country can ill afford to lose. This was Richard F. Pettigrew. Mr. Pettigrew went to the senate from South Dakota, a republican. But he was one of those republicans who were of that party because they were democrats. Such were the men that originally composed the republican party. Fallen under the dominion of the slave power, the democratic party afforded them no political refuge, and they made one, calling their new party "republican" because that was the name of Jefferson's democratic party. But victories and time have brought this party under the dominion of an element in comparison with which the old slave oligarchs were incarnations of the spirit of liberty. Democratic ideals are no longer its ideals. Its saints are no longer Jefferson

and Lincoln. Jefferson has given place to Hamilton, and Hanna has thrown Lincoln from his pedestal. It was Senator Pettigrew's fortune to be in the senate as a republican when the most spectacular part of this transformation occurred, and he rebelled. He has no love for fighting. A typical man of peace, nothing could have been more uninviting. But the call came and he responded. The story of his industry in this conflict is written in the record of the debates. The full measure of his courage can never be quite appreciated. But he has left upon the history of the country a mark that will endure. When this period of mad intoxication shall have passed, Pettigrew's name will stand out in the list of heroic patriots who, if they could not stay the tide of imperialism, lessened its dangers by their warnings.

Mayor Van Wyck has given notice that he will not encourage the use of troops to put down strikes in New York. When a national guard general asked an appropriation for a rifle range, explaining that soldiers who can't shoot are of no use, the mayor answered: "They don't need to shoot in this city; with our excellent police force there is no use for militia." Then the animus of the militia general came out. "There have been strikes," he said, "when the services of the guard were called for." But Mayor Van Wyck's reply was ready. "Not since I have been mayor of New York," he retorted, adding: "The police force is capable of handling any and all disturbances and there will be no shooting." It is reassuring to find a chief executive of a metropolitan city who is not hot for bloodletting at the mention of a strike.

The democratic democrats of Chicago have little room for choice in the

coming mayoralty election. On the one hand is Mayor Harrison, who wears the label of democracy, but is the mere puppet of a ring. He professes to favor public ownership of public monopolies, but pursues a policy which is calculated to postpone such ownership in Chicago indefinitely. On the other hand is Judge Hanecy, a republican boss, who is understood to be the willing servant of the monopoly corporations. There is no third choice. One or the other of these men will be the next mayor of Chicago. Had Harlan been nominated by the republicans, democrats who distrust Harrison could vote for him with satisfaction. But the corporations headed off the nomination that seemed certainly to be going to him. What democrats should do under these circumstances, in order to vote effectively, is a puzzle. Hanecy represents everything they are opposed to. Harrison represents faithfully nothing that they believe in. Many will probably solve the puzzle by voting for Hanecy, upon the theory that the most important thing in the interest of democracy in Chicago at the present time is to unload the Harrison ring. So long as that ring is entrenched in the city hall, with all the patronage of the city at its command, democratic sentiment will be unable to get expression at democratic primaries, and democratic nominees not satisfactory to the ring will be slaughtered by the democratic bosses at the polls. This is not a bad solution.

President McKinley's inaugural address furnished stimulating reading for ex-President Cleveland, to whose administration Mr. McKinley paid his respects in the opening paragraph. Referring to the time when he succeeded Cleveland, Mr. McKinley said: "Then our treasury receipts

were inadequate to meet the current obligations of the government; now they are sufficient for all public needs, and we have a surplus instead of a deficit." Proceeding in this strain, he told how he, immediately after Cleveland's retirement, had been compelled to call an extra session of congress "to devise revenues to pay the ordinary expenses of the government," and by way of contrast boasted of his ability now to announce that "the congress just closed has reduced taxation in the sum of forty millions of dollars." Were the man in Mars to read that paragraph he might suppose that whereas Mr. Cleveland administered the government with so much extravagance as to create a deficit, Mr. McKinley brought such skill to the task as to make possible a reduction of forty millions in taxation. From nothing that Mr. McKinley said could it be inferred that the forty million reduction was not calculated upon the basis of ordinary revenues. No hint gave he that it was a reduction not of ordinary revenues, but of war revenues, and only a partial reduction at that. Far, indeed, was he from explaining that after this reduction a vast burden not only of extra taxation but also of an extra war debt remains. It would be harsh to accuse Mr. McKinley of deceit. But how are we to account for his misleading comparison? The most charitable explanation is that which an acquaintance of his has made regarding similar variations between expression and substance in his writings and speeches, namely, that in English composition Mr. McKinley's feeling is strong for sound and weak for sense.

That comparison of treasury finances was not the only instance, in the inaugural address, of a sacrifice of sense for sound. Another was the reference to the "loyal millions" in the Philippine islands, whose destiny is not to be left to the "disloyal thousands who are in rebellion against the United States." Here is an implication that the Filipinos who resist

American invasion are comparatively few, whereas the fact has been demonstrated over and over again that the people who have resisted us comprise the whole civilized population of the islands. It is implied, moreover, that these people—"the loyal millions" equally with the "disloyal thousands"—owe allegiance to our government. Unless he maintains that they do, what does Mr. McKinley mean when he speaks of "loyalty" and "disloyalty" and of "rebellion against the United States?" Those only can be rebels who owe allegiance. But upon what in this case does the obligation of allegiance rest? Other countries may claim the allegiance of subjects; but the only basis of allegiance recognized by the American principle of government is citizenship. Yet Mr. McKinley's policy denies citizenship to those people. If they were citizens of the United States, any of them who came to this country would be entitled, after a short residence and without naturalization, to vote in any state in the union. That right is denied them. They are treated as aliens. Their allegiance, then, does not rest upon citizenship. But as this country acknowledges no other basis of allegiance than citizenship, Mr. McKinley's charge that the Filipinos are in rebellion is an instance of sound without sense. This is true also of his sapient allusion to the "disloyal" Filipinos, when he says that "force will not be needed or used when those who make war against us shall make it no more." Spain could have said that four years ago, when her soldiers instead of ours were engaged in slaughtering those people. She doubtless would have said it had she been called to account. In fact, she did say it of the Cubans. George III. said it of our own forefathers a century and a quarter ago, and the tory ministry of Great Britain say it to-day of the Boers.

But Mr. McKinley's penchant for sound at the expense of sense is best exhibited, in his inaugural address, by his stirring appeal to the people

to keep up with the imperial procession. This is an "onward movement," he tells them, and he describes it as a continuation of the onward movement our revolutionary fathers began. It would have been awkward to describe it as a backward movement. Though that would have improved the sense, it would have spoiled the sound. While one may heartily agree with Mr. McKinley that the country is moving, one must differ as to the direction. For the sound of it, Mr. McKinley tells us it is moving onward. But how does that compare with the idea that the advance is to the place of a world power? or that we are assigning to ourselves an equal rank, as Mr. McKinley puts it, "in the family of nations"? If this movement toward a partnership in the world policy of the grabbing nations is an onward movement, then those nations must heretofore have been in advance of ours. That is the test. When astronomers would determine the direction of a planet's movement, they calculate its relations to other heavenly bodies. So if we would determine the direction of a nation's movement, we must compare it with other nations. Tried by this test, in which direction has Mr. McKinley's policy carried us? Are we more like Russia and Germany, or less? Have we become imitative of the British Tories or not? Are French Chauvinism and British jingoism more or less in harmony with our new aspirations? Our ambition to be a world power answers these questions. We are moving toward the ideals of European imperialism which our fathers rejected. Either they turned backward then, or we are turning backward now.

Since outward display is important only as it may be actually significant, there is no reason for condemning it when it is merely an exhibition of vanity. A gaudily dressed woman, for instance, is only an object of mirth. She is vain, and that is all. But if her dress betokened arbitrary power, it would be different. So when a con-

stitutional monarch parades with the left-over trappings of a time when kings ruled by divine right, we look on with an amusement that would turn to consternation if we realized that the display of these symbols was significant of a resumption of the prerogatives they once proclaimed. Precisely so with the unprecedented pomp at the McKinley inaugural ceremonies. Were it possible to dissociate this pageant from the presidential policy of absolutism which but a few hours before had been rushed through congress, one might smile at the vanity of it all. But the two things are inseparable. At a time when the president is invested with absolute and irresponsible power over 10,000,000 people, and so invested with it that it cannot be taken from him against his will except by a two-thirds vote of each house of congress, the extraordinary inaugural display described by the press as "distinctly a military pageant" and by McKinley partisans such as Senator Dolliver as characterized by "a pomp and ceremony never before witnessed on such an occasion," is not without baleful significance. So manifest is this, even to Senator Dolliver, that he sends to a Chicago paper a column apology for the display.

Mr. McKinley's policy of absolutism received the sanction of the lower house on the 1st. As in the senate, so also in the house, it was rushed through under the political lash. Filibustering might have been resorted to in the senate to defeat the measure at the session just closed, but the house rules admit of no filibustering. The majority, which in the last analysis is the speaker, makes its own rule for each emergency. In this case of the army appropriation bill, to which the senate had attached several amendments, including those on the Philippines and Cuba which we described last week and which appear this week in our abstract of the Congressional Record, a stringent rule was introduced. It provided that the bill should be taken up forthwith, on

a motion to agree to all the senate amendments in gross, and that after two hours' debate, one for each side, the motion should be put to vote. This rule was adopted and rigidly enforced. In two hours, therefore, the house conferred upon the president absolute authority over the Philippines—legislative, judicial, and executive—without limitation or restriction of any kind.

In justification of this elevation of an American president to the power of an Asiatic despot, it is pleaded that the amendment provided for is the same in substance and almost the same in terms as the act adopted early in the last century, for the temporary government of the Louisiana territory. If that were true, it would be no justification. It would only go to show the danger of doing things that are wrong in principle, even when the application of the principle is unimportant. It is the unimportant cases that make bad precedents. But the Philippine act is in fact radically different from that which was adopted for Louisiana a century ago. Without considering the wide differences in circumstances, there is one difference in the language of the acts themselves which alone refutes the pretense of identity. The Louisiana act gave power to the president only until the expiration of the then session of congress. That act was to expire at an early day by its own limitation. It was a temporary make-shift. Not so the Philippine amendment to the army appropriation law. That is as permanent as any other act of congress. It is to remain in force until congress amends or repeals it. But as congress cannot amend or repeal any law without the president's consent, or a two-thirds vote to overcome his veto, the Philippine law makes the president an absolute dictator in the Philippines for such time as he himself may elect to retain the power, or until two-thirds of each house can agree to divest him of it.

Criticisms have been made of the

opposition senators for not having defeated the Cuban and Philippine amendments by refusing to allow the senate to come to a vote. There are suspicions, also, that they were induced to permit a vote by that species of bribery which consists in giving to localities in their states slices of appropriation-bill "pork." It is true that a vote in the senate could have been prevented. The previous question is not recognized in that body. Senators may hold the floor, therefore, as long as they can bear the strain. In this way Senator Carter, of Montana, did defeat the river and harbor appropriation. He spoke 13 hours on the morning of the 4th, holding the floor until adjournment, for the unconcealed purpose of preventing a vote. To have done this with the Cuban and Philippine amendments would have necessitated continuous speaking, night as well as day, for a week. The physical strain alone would have been enormous, even if several senators had engaged in this test of endurance, for the republicans would have left the floor entirely to the opposition, lying back confidently upon their majority of at least a score. And if this filibustering had succeeded, the victory would have been of the briefest. Congress would have been called together at once in extra session to pass necessary appropriation bills, which the filibustering would have swamped, and the blame for this costly necessity would have been cast upon the filibustering opposition. And when the extra session had convened the Cuban and Philippine measures would have been passed. Whether it was worth the while of opposition senators to bear the physical strain and submit to the odium of being stigmatized as filibusters, without the slightest possibility of defeating the amendments in the end, was a fair question for them to decide. Since they did oppose the amendment, with speeches as far as reasonable debate demanded, and at every roll call with their votes, they did all that the country has any right

to demand. Even if they were deterred from doing more by threats of having their states slighted in river and harbor appropriations, some allowance must be made for the exigencies of political life. So long as the people themselves solicit these appropriations, politicians cannot be lightly blamed for trying to get them. But what to us seems more important than anything else in this connection, is the duty of placing the responsibility for the Cuban and Philippine amendments where it belongs. It belongs with the president and the majority. To criticise the minority, even justly, for not outmaneuvering the majority is to lighten the burden of responsibility which the president and his supporters ought to bear.

As the Philippine amendment has brought more clearly to light the fact that the McKinley policy is one of imperial absolutism, so a little colloquy in the lower house exposed some of the sordid motives for it. Congressman Hull, of Iowa, chairman of the military committee, made upon the floor what would be called a confession had it not been presented in a boastful spirit of defiance. He said (we quote from page 3641 of the Congressional Record of March 1):

I am the same man that is connected with the Philippine Lumber company. . . . I have something invested in that enterprise. . . . I have not, nor has that company, ever asked a favor of the government of the United States; and we do not propose to do so. Our dealings there are with men who have titles in fee simple of long standing. The business is entirely legitimate. . . . Whenever the time comes that I am not permitted to invest in a legitimate enterprise, I would prefer to leave congress to being a drone, dependent only on politics for my living. . . . While the campaign was on, the company with which I am attached called a halt in their enterprise and notified every one of the stockholders that if Bryan should be elected, not one dollar would we invest in the Philippines, but if McKinley should be elected we would invest all the money that we pleased, believing it would have a favorable return by the restoration of order and good government in the Philippines. Bry-

an's election would mean disorder and anarchy in the islands. McKinley's election would mean order and thrift. Under the one I would not be willing to invest in any legitimate enterprise; under the other the ax and the sawmill would be encouraged, labor benefited and civilization advanced. Now, why? Because the one man was trying to run the country on wind, and the other believed in legitimate enterprise.

The buncombe in that speech but thinly conceals the malfeasance which Hull confesses. It little becomes him to sneer at making a living in politics. What else is he doing, and in the worst sense, when he invests and becomes the leading spirit in a business enterprise which his political influence as chairman of the military committee would enable him to make or mar? It is a painful sign of moral deterioration, that a man in his public position can publicly boast of such an investment. His speech is one of the most brazen declarations since that of Tweed. It implies that the people themselves are corrupt, or else that he is in a position to ask what they are going to do about it. Mr. Lentz was right in challenging Mr. Hull's vote on the Philippine amendment to the army bill, on the ground that he was pecuniarily interested in it, and the speaker was shrewdly kind to Mr. Hull when he dodged the challenge.

RECURRENCE OF THE TRUST QUESTION.

The organization of the steel trust, following close upon the consolidation of the railroad and coal interests, recalls a startling public assurance of a national party leader at the height of the presidential campaign. He asserted that there were no trusts. This assurance even then seemed to challenge obvious facts and familiar knowledge. Yet in a narrow verbal sense Senator Hanna was right in making it, and would be right if he repeated it, as we shall try to explain.

The term "trust" comes from the method of organizing trusts originally. The owners of stock in different corporations intending to consolidate would deposit it with trustees, whom they invested with absolute power

over it, subject to the reservations of the trust agreement. In that manner competing corporations concentrated in these trustees' complete control over their business, and the consolidation was consequently called a trust. But this method of making industrial combinations proved by experience to be crude and open to legal objections, and from time to time improvements were adopted until the trust in its original form disappeared. Senator Hanna was right, therefore, in a narrow verbal sense. He was right, that is to say, in the same sense in which the punster is right who tells you that "a door is not a door when it is ajar."

It was only in that sense, however, that he was right, for the name and the trusts have persisted, though the method of which the name was originally descriptive has long since given place to methods more effective. Trusts are more numerous and powerful than ever. But they are no longer in the hands of trustees. They are formed now by selling out competing corporations to corporations especially organized for the purpose of buying their interests and consolidating their power.

That is the method adopted by the gigantic steel trust. A syndicate has been organized, with which the stock of all the steel corporations of the country is to be deposited; and at the proper time this stock is to be turned over in exchange at certain ratios for the stock of the United States Steel corporation, recently organized for that purpose under the laws of New Jersey. Thus the United States Steel corporation, though nominally nothing but a chartered company, like thousands upon thousands of others that have been spawned by our incorporation laws, is in fact an enormous trust. It will monopolize the steel industry of America and reach out for the monopoly of that of the world.

This stupendous consolidation has again stirred public feeling. Not so boisterously as it has been stirred heretofore by disclosures of monopolizing tendencies, but more profoundly. Where is all this concentration of power to end? is a question which if not upon every tongue is making almost every heart throb with anxiety. All our people are not like the