

# The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse  
Nov. 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1900.

Number 118.

**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.

Always have an open mind, but don't keep it open at both ends.

Some irreverent punster, impressed with the efforts of the Outlook to sanctify imperialism, compares it with Outing, which he says makes religion of sport, while the Outlook makes sport of religion.

A peculiarly ignorant criticism of the American declaration of independence is the one now so often heard in plutocratic quarters, that it falsely asserts that all men are created equal. This is false—so the criticism runs—because men are not created equal in stature, nor in weight, nor in mental or physical ability, nor in health, and so on. The criticism would be beneath notice if it were not so common. But it is common, and the thoughtless are often fooled by it. In considering it, it should be observed at the very outset that the declaration of independence is not a treatise on physiology. Its declaration of equality cannot, therefore, be assumed to relate to physical proportions or strength. Neither is it a treatise on mental philosophy. Consequently the equality assertion cannot be assumed to refer to mental qualities. The document is altogether political; that is, it deals exclusively with rights. It is to be assumed, therefore, that in asserting the equality of men the declaration refers to equality of rights. In other words, that it means that men are created equal politically. Nor does this eminently sane construction rest wholly upon assumption. The assertion of human equality is made not only in

a distinctly political document, but specifically in a paragraph, and even in a sentence, in which "rights" is both the dominant idea and the dominant word. What the declaration means is that men are created with equal rights with reference to each other. If this assertion is false, its falsity must be proved by something more worthy of the human reasoning faculty than trifling references to differences in height, strength, mental qualities, weight, and so on. It must be shown that some men have a title by birth to rule over their fellows. Otherwise the assertion of the declaration of independence holds good.

Some of the magazines are renewing discussions of the theory that according to the religion of Christ in its purity only the poor can be saved. Naturally enough, objections to this theory are abundant. We see too much individual evil among those whom we call the poor, and too much individual good among those we account rich, to like the idea of salvation for the one class and indiscriminate damnation for the other. But does it follow that Christ's condemnation of riches was without religious basis? Must we soften the rigor of his words into allegory, or repudiate them altogether? To us it seems not. There is an explanation which, without doing violence to any really good impulse of the human soul, accords with Christ's merciless condemnation of riches. This explanation requires in the first place that we consider salvation and damnation not as judgments pronounced by some heavenly police court, but as the natural and necessary spiritual results of certain kinds of spiritual life. In the next place it requires a recognition, such as Henry George made in his posthumous book, of a scientific distinction between riches and poverty.

Mr. George distinguished riches as the power a man may have to get more than he earns, which in its last analysis is a power to extort unrequited labor from others. In that view of riches it is not very difficult to believe that the rich cannot be saved. The man whose income is unearned, be it great or small, and who likes that kind of income so well as to demand the perpetuation of the social conditions that make it possible and to use his influence to that end, is a rich man in the Christian sense—in the sense in which riches are condemned. Such a man cannot love his fellow man. Insisting as he does upon social institutions that rob them, he must be regarded not as loving but as hating his brother. How, then, can he possibly enter into the so-called heavenly life, which, if it means anything, means above all things else a life of brotherly love? There is a profound rational truth in the idea that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.

Chinese news does not yet afford a basis for fair judgment as to either the merits of the difficulties or the duty of foreign governments. That foreigners have been murdered, and that foreign representatives are among the victims, are reasonably well-assured facts; but it is by no means clear that the Chinese government has participated in any outrages, or encouraged them, or been indifferent to them. On the contrary, all the news from the Chinese side which reaches us, and some from the other side, indicate that it has tried to perform its foreign obligations faithfully. There is no evidence thus far of any assault upon foreigners by Chinese soldiers or officials, or of any concert of action between Chinese soldiers and the mob, except in defense

of the country against military invaders.

That the foreign naval authorities in the Gulf of Pechili undertook to order the Chinese commander at Taku with reference to his military movements, threatening him with bombardment if he should fail to comply within a prescribed period, has been conceded by the foreign powers from the beginning, though it was at first explained that he opened fire upon the foreign ships before the ultimatum had expired; and now there appears to be no doubt that the foreign fleet not only issued this ultimatum but began the firing. To the honor of the United States, be it said, Admiral Kempff refused to be a party to that assault upon the Chinese. If, after this attack upon the Chinese government, the Chinese military resisted the advance of Admiral Seymour upon the capital of their country with a foreign military force, it cannot fairly be said that the government was guilty of a breach of any obligation to foreign powers.

What we of this country must consider with reference to the situation in China is that the government there cannot protect foreigners against anti-foreign mobs if foreign governments insist upon stirring up native prejudices against foreigners. Our government could not do it in this country. Imagine a great Know-nothing excitement here, which, like the Boxer uprising in China, was carried to the extent of mobbing foreigners. What chance would our government have of putting down these mobs if foreign governments undertook to help by bombarding our coast forts and sending troops through the country to our capital? Instead of contributing to quelling the Know-nothing mobs, wouldn't that turn every American into a Know-nothing to the death? And why should we expect the Chinese people to be more docile under similar circumstances? A little reflection upon this point will convince any fair-minded American that the require-

ments made of foreigners by the viceroys in southern China, namely, that they shall avoid displays calculated to excite native prejudices, are wise. If the powers do not acquiesce, it will be apparent that what the powers are trying to do is not so much to suppress Boxer riots and protect foreigners in China as to make excuses to invade the empire and carve it up among themselves.

At the annual meeting of the Peace society in London last week the burden of the speeches was a denunciation of the American war in the Philippines and the British war in South Africa as "twin specimens of national hypocrisy." That is a true characterization. In each country the jingo, with a wave of his country's flag and a prayer to his nation's God, pretends that he is bent upon a career of civilization, when in truth his heart's desire is simply to make the God a universal boss and the flag a valuable commercial asset. Hypocrisy! Hypocrisy to the core! From lords and commons and chancel, from white house and senate and pulpit—the whole thing is hypocritical; except with men like Rhodes and Hanna, with whom it is barefaced deviltry. Thus it is on either side of the Atlantic. "Twin specimens of national hypocrisy" accurately describes the two jingo governments of these two recreant nations.

In seconding McKinley's nomination, Roosevelt revealed a phase of his own character which has hitherto not been prominent. He said of the democrats of the nation that—

they have raved, they have foamed at the mouth, in denunciation of trusts, and now in my own state their foremost party leaders, including the man before whom the others bow with bowed head and trembling knee, have been discovered in a trust which really is of infamous and perhaps criminal character—a trust in which these apostles of democracy, these prophets of the new dispensation, have sought to wring fortunes from the dire need of their poorer brethren.

It is not to the reckless language about raving and foaming at the mouth that we allude when we say that an unfa-

miliar phase of Roosevelt's character is here revealed. In that respect he is hardly up, or down, to his normal level. Neither do we allude to his uncandid insinuation that Tammany Hall is in sympathy with democratic principles, nor to his equally uncandid concealment of the fact that the New York ice trust was exposed and prosecuted not by republicans but by democrats. In these respects, also, he plays in familiar role. What we do allude to is the fact that in a public speech he should have thus mentioned a case which was at that moment pending before him in a judicial capacity. For at the time of his speech Roosevelt had under consideration, as governor of New York, the question of removing Mayor Van Wyck from office upon charges which required him to pass judicially upon the acts and one of the men that he thus stigmatized as infamous and perhaps criminal.

The New York ice trust, which Roosevelt has characterized as infamous and perhaps criminal, was not exclusively a democratic affair. Among other prominent republicans who were in it was Gov. Roosevelt's republican predecessor as governor of New York. That fact is, indeed, of no importance with reference to the guilt of the democrats; but it is of great importance in that it exposes the low partisanship of Roosevelt's speech. But even if there had been no republicans in this ice trust, Roosevelt could not blow away the trust issue by exclaiming at the fact that certain Tammany Hall leaders have been caught in a trust. It makes no difference who profits by trust management. That is not the question. The question is, who makes trust management possible? And the answer to that question is, the party of McKinley and Roosevelt. Their party has been delivered over, tied hand and foot, to the great combination of trusts. How childish, then, to meet the trust issue with the retort, "You're another!" It is comical to hear the vice presiden-