

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 4, 1903.

Number 274.

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.

A prompt and strenuous house cleaning is one of the things the Chicago Municipal Voters' League owes to its present good name and its future good influence.

This organization has acquired national fame and respect for its excellent work in driving "gray wolves" out of the city council. But just as that enviable reputation begins to ripen, seven of its own approved candidates for the council scandalize it by coming into the open as "gray wolves" without even a pretense of disguise. Constituting a majority of the councilmanic committee on gas, oil and electric light, these councilmen have caused that committee to recommend to the council a telephone ordinance which has "monopolily plunder" writ large all over it.

It will not do for the league to pass over this matter in silence. Its managers cannot afford to ignore the treachery of these candidates they have endorsed, trusting that the ordinance will not be adopted by the council. So far as the league is concerned, the important question is not the fate of the vicious ordinance; it is the action of the majority of the committee—Bradley, Friested, Willeston, Race, Woodward, Moynihan, Ehemann, Sloan and O'Connell—whose candidacies it endorsed. Unless the League finds means immediately to rebuke these men, League endorsements will not have as much moral value at future elections as they have had in the past.

In whatever way the hideous

lynching in Delaware may be considered, there is no room for escape from one conclusion at least. At that time and in that place and on that occasion civil government broke down. It proved inadequate to the protection of a citizen whom it had imprisoned for the purpose of inquiring into his alleged guilt of crime. When civil government fails in this, it fails in one of its most important functions. Having deprived the man of his natural right of self-defense, its obligation to defend him was supreme. Nothing can be much more abhorrent than a government that stretches out the long arm and the strong arm of the law to entrap an individual accused of crime, for the alleged purpose of giving him a fair trial, but only to yield him up, unconvicted and untried, to a fiendish mob.

It is true that the breaking down of civil government at one time, in one place, and on one occasion, does not necessarily imply a general failure. One mob does not make general anarchy any more than one swallow makes a summer. But the Delaware instance is not isolated. Hardly does a week go by, seldom even a day, without its report of a lynching. North and South, East and West, all quarters contribute their testimony to the impressive volume of evidence of this breaking down of civil government.

Yet, how little thought is given to the cause of that tendency to collapse. We are told that there is no such tendency; that we are only in the throes of a race question. But if civil government cannot preserve peace in the face of a race question, that fact itself adds testimony to the inherent weakness of the governmental system. It is explained, too,

that these mobs exemplify a reversion of power from the government to the people. But this is only another way of confessing governmental collapse. Many there are, moreover—and their numbers grow,—who admit the collapsing tendency, but with the reservation that it applies only to popular government. They hold that a strong government suffers from no such weakness. We forego the temptation to call to their attention the Kishineff massacre within the jurisdiction of the strongest government in the civilized world, and content ourselves with the observation that if the surrender of all individual rights is necessary for the preservation of civil government the cost is quite out of proportion to the value of the product. Still, we are unwilling to admit that there is any reason in the true principles of popular civil government for its collapse.

If popular civil government is breaking down, the reason is that as it exists it is unscientifically constructed. It is invasive where it has no legitimate functions, and correspondingly inadequate in its legitimate sphere. Power out of place seems best to describe it. Properly charged with the regulation of land tenures, for instance, so as to secure to each his equal natural rights to the land upon which and out of which he must live if he lives at all, it has divested itself of that prerogative. And there is the root of the race problem, with all the evils it engenders. Whether Negroes shall associate with whites is a matter of personal congeniality, entirely unrelated to government. Whether you would "like your daughter to marry a nigger," is a question for you alone, except as it is for her and the "nigger." It is no question for government.

Negroes have no right to associate with white men who object to them. They have no right to marry white girls who reject them. They have no social rights whatever except the right to share equally with every citizen in the common benefits that attach to their native soil. But this right they have; and the civil government that denies it to them signs its own death warrant, and begins from that moment to break down. Now civil government in the United States does deny that right to the Negro. By its perversion of the governmental functions of regulating land tenures, he is born landless. It is because the Negro race is landless and not because it is black, that there is a race question. Were the whites the landless race the race question would shift from white over black to black over white. Were neither race landless, but all were protected by civil government in their natural rights as land animals, there would be no race question. If, then, popular civil government is breaking down, it is because it has surrendered to a few that birthright of all with the conservation of which, if it has any functions, it is most sacredly charged.

One of the arguments in support of Negro peonage that comes from the South, urged by "the best citizens," is that the Negro won't work unless he is whipped, and therefore that he must be whipped. The same spirit finds abundant expression at the North, also among "the best citizens," with reference to white workingmen who go on strike. It is a very common notion everywhere, indeed, that if the "mudsills" of society won't work they must be made to work. But this notion is as false as false can be. No one, white or black, rich or poor, is under any obligation, in the absence of free contract, to work for anybody else. We often hear that the world owes no one a living, and that is true. All it owes him is free and unobstructed opportunities to earn his living. It

is just as true that no man owes the world work. In fact the second proposition is a corollary of the first. Obligations are always mutual. Consequently if the world owes no man a living it follows that no man owes the world work.

We have examined the Iowa platform of the Democratic party (p. 182) with considerable care to discover if possible some substantial basis for the jubilation of the remorganizers over what they assume to regard as a sharp slap in the face administered to their black beast which they call "Bryanism." Thus far we have met with no success. There may be a remorganization joker in the platform, but if so it is well concealed. True enough 57 per cent. of the delegates did refuse to refer in the preamble to "the last national platform;" and if that act stood alone it might be significant. But quite aside from the fact that the majority on this question was so narrow, the body of the platform is, on national questions, sufficiently radical to warrant the guess that part of this majority may have been contributed to by adherents of the general principles of the platform, who cared more for its principles than for its name. And this guess is encouraged by the great speech of the temporary chairman, Mr. Quick, who called for the spirit of the Kansas City platform and not for its letter. At any rate the Iowa platform, with which the remorganizers profess to be so greatly pleased, follows the Kansas City platform in denouncing government by injunction, in demanding the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, in opposing imperialism, and in assailing trusts. While it ignores bimetallism it does not ignore the money question, but takes ground against money monopoly in harmony with the principles of the national platform. On the tariff it is even more radical, for it takes ground distinctly in favor of a tariff for revenue only. The same is true of its attitude toward trusts, which

it traces to "monopoly of original sources of supply of natural products." Its action on railroad monopoly was, indeed, vague enough; but there is encouraging significance in its demand that "the design of nature in making provision for the wants of man" shall "not be perverted into means for his oppression." If this platform is truly a remorganization triumph, how sadly have the remorganizers been misunderstood. We suspect, however, that the remorganizers did not make the Iowa platform and do not approve it. They are up to one of their old tricks of misrepresentation.

Above the hue and cry over the corruption of walking delegates, District Attorney Jerome's voice is heard in New York with a suggestion that deserves consideration. "The principal trouble, after all," says Mr. Jerome, as reported in the New York Times of the 18th, "is the underhand methods resorted to by building concerns who go out and look for walking delegates who are ready to sell out. If there were no bribing builders there would be no blackmailing walking delegates. The labor men learned their lesson of corruption from the employers."

When the American ambassador to Germany informed the Emperor that American law would not permit sailors in the American navy to accept a royal present, he was mistaken. The Constitution does not absolutely prohibit presents from foreign kings. It gives Congress power to consent; and in this case Congress doubtless would have consented. Still, it is well enough. The Emperor wished to give to two corporals and a private of marines medals or watches for having stood behind his chair at breakfast on board the American battleship Kearsarge at Kiel. Owing to the advice of the ambassador he was obliged to content himself with an intimation of his good natured intention. The marines may not have been as well sat-