

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1903.

Number 286.

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.

To suppose that the disruption of the British cabinet forecasts the downfall of Chamberlain and Chamberlainism, is to ignore or misunderstand some of the most significant signs of the times.

While it is altogether probable that at the first general elections everything Chamberlainistic will go by the board, it is just as probable that the return wave will carry back Chamberlain and all he stands for upon its crest.

What is most involved in this ministerial crisis is a realignment of British parties and a readjustment of their issues. Free trade of a limited kind has for two generations been a traditional policy in Great Britain. Both parties have been compelled to adjust their economic differences with reference to free trade standards of the Manchester or British school, much as both parties in this country have been for nearly two generations compelled to adjust theirs with reference to protection standards. That necessity is about passing in England and Chamberlain has had the sagacity to see it.

British sentiment has for some years been ripening toward more radical economic issues. The free trade idea has been developed by radicalism to its logical end as Cobden saw it—the land question. Concurrently, special interests have been turning back upon free trade. A clash between radical free trade and Imperial protection is consequently not far off. This

clash will be felt, though only slightly, in the first elections.

In those elections the official Liberal leaders will stand for the old Manchester idea of free trade limited. They will have the advantage of the support of traditional opinion. The old free traders who are not acting with them will not be acting against them. But active opposition will come from Chamberlain, who will stand uncovered as a protectionist. There is no probability of his making more than a beginning now, but he will have won his place as opposition leader when the Liberals come into power.

The Liberal lease of power will be short. That party is more distracted by internal conflicts over the approaching new alignment of parties than is the Democratic party of the United States. What with Liberals who are inclined to protectionism, those who are traditional free traders, those who are free traders limited, and those who are radical free-and-equal-rights-to-land men, no Liberal ministry can long hold together, especially in the face of the growing protection sentiment among the people, which Chamberlain will lose no opportunity to propagate, and the growing sentiment for radical free trade which the spirit of opposition aided by purposeful agitation will undoubtedly foster. And when the Liberal party goes again to the country, broken and scattered, it will confront a powerful antagonist in the new spirit of protection under the leadership of Chamberlain.

Under these most favorable circumstances Chamberlain would probably come into power at the head of the Imperial protection party. The Liberal party—in fact

if not in name—would repeat the experience of the American Whig party of the early '50s. What form the opposition would take cannot be predicted. Possibly an era of protectionism unopposed would be in store for England, somewhat like that which the United States has experienced since the Civil War. But meanwhile Mr. Chamberlain, for the remainder of his life, would be British premier and practically king. Such, in the rough, is doubtless the outlook in British politics as Mr. Chamberlain views it.

The Ohio campaign (p. 376) is now in full swing, the Republicans having begun their meetings last week. The opening meeting of the Republicans at Chillicothe was an astonishing performance, when the objections of the Republican press and leaders to "Tom Johnson's sensationalism" are considered. Johnson's "sensationalism" consists in using a large tent and speaking to large audiences. He is attended by no bands, by no uniformed clubs, by no glee clubs, by no banners. But the opening meeting of the Republicans was distinguished by every sort of sensationalism known to the political showman. We quote from the Chicago Inter Ocean, a Republican paper:

The Blaine club of Cincinnati, with over 800 uniformed men, had a strong rival to-day in the Ross County Rough Riders, every township in that county being represented by delegations on horseback. The Tippecanoes from Cleveland, the Rail Splitters from Toledo, and the Buckeyes from Columbus ranked next. The Glee club from Columbus had over 100 voices. The decorations were as elaborate as at the recent Ohio centennial celebration at this place, the first capital of the State. The attendance included all the party leaders and officials, with special excursions from all parts of the State.

How does that compare for sensationalism with the quiet entry of Johnson and Clarke into Akron

(p. 370) at the formal opening of the Democratic campaign?—so quiet that the occasion was supposed to be “a frost” until 7,000 auditors packed the large tent and stood 10 deep around its edges to listen, not to platitudes and buncombe and billingsgate, but to a straightforward discussion of issues.

At the Republican meeting the gubernatorial candidate, Mr. Herrick, plunged into a subject which, for the peace of mind of the plutocratic classes whom his candidacy represents, he might better have avoided. We quote from the Associated Press report:

The only issue between the parties this year having reference to taxation is whether we shall discard all recognized proper methods of taxation and adopt the methods based upon the speculative theories of Henry George and his followers. It is fair to discuss single tax because the leader of the present Ohio Democracy has declared for it, and is supported on the stump by recognized exponents of the doctrine. I cannot resist calling attention in brief to the fact that such a tax is objectionable to all classes, because it abolishes all plans of established revenue service; it prevents the assessment of desirable excise; it cannot be equitably assessed; it threatens free institutions; it cuts off the possibility of taxing trusts and corporations; it is unjust and not universal; it puts the whole burden of revenue on the few, and not equally, makes the farmer and home owner overpay and the dangerous form of wealth escape; it would not remove a single hardship, it would not relieve the poor, would not reach the so-called monopolistic class, and above all has been a disastrous failure in the only instances of experience. Contemplating what we have, we can ill afford to sanction, even by the inference of indorsement, Ohio's commendation of such a peril.

As that is not argument but only bald assertion, and raises no issue in the campaign, no reply is demanded. But Mr. Johnson is anxious that the single tax should be the issue in Ohio, and is therefore not unlikely to push Mr. Herrick further and further along this line of controversy. He would be glad enough if it resulted in making Henry George's ideas the subject of discussion in Ohio this Fall from Lake Erie to the Ohio. That might indeed assure Her-

rick's election as governor (no great matter in a State in which his party has a recent record of 137,000 majority which it held up to 90,000 last year); but what about the future? The discussion so begun would not stop with the election. It would go on all through the Winter; and when another campaign came on, the people of Ohio, especially the farmers, would understand the single tax principle so well that they could not again be fooled by the clap-trap speeches of its enemies. If Johnson could get the people of Ohio to understand the single tax at the moderate expense of letting Herrick into the office of governor of their rock-ribbed Republican State this year, it would be for the people of Ohio one of the best of good bargains.

Judge Lore, of Delaware, has strengthened his title to public respect (p. 356) by advising the grand jury to set the machinery of the law in motion against the mob that lynched and burned a Negro accused of crime (p. 201) near Wilmington last Summer. In the course of his charge to that body on the 21st, Judge Lore said:

The crime of George White and his punishment are not before us. Upon his body human vengeance has done its work. If the matter concerned George White alone, there would be nothing left for our consideration. But for the first time the lawless and revolting crime of lynching has invaded this State. Lynching is a crime against the law of both God and man. Every willful participant in such an act is a murderer. No person has a right to commit that crime because he believes or fears that some other person who is entrusted with the execution of the law will fail or has failed in the performance of his duty. In obedience to the oath you have taken and to your duty to your State, we ask you to so act that the crime of lynching may be suppressed in this State, so far as by your action that end may be attained, and that the perpetrators of this crime, and the authors of the disgrace that has come upon us through their crime, shall be dealt with according to their just merits.

Another Southerner whose sensible words are contributing to the rescue of the Southern name from the mire into which barbarous mobs and their more barbar-

ous newspaper and lyceum-platform setters-on are trampling it, is Bishop Warren A. Candler, of the Methodist Church (South), a prominent Georgian. Bishop Candler was reported on the 8th from Atlanta as saying:

When a lynching occurs the law is more truly lynched than is the victim of the mob's fury. It is an outburst of anarchy and not an irruption of righteous indignation against an atrocious crime. In defense of lynching it is sometimes said ‘Stop the outrages that provoke lynching and the lynching will cease,’ but pray tell which outrage is meant. If reference to the horrible crime of assaulting women is intended it is enough to say in reply that it is not the cause of one-fourth the lynchings which occur in the United States. Two years ago, for example, the figures for a year showed only 16 cases of assault against 128 lynchings. This evil strikes at the very heart of our civil institutions. If unchecked it will increase and eventually become unendurable by the vicious even. Men will grow so weary of it that they will welcome any sort of strong hand which will undertake to put it down, even the hand of tyranny. The “Chautauqua season” is a very dangerous period of the year, especially during those years when the Congress of the United States is not in session and the thrifty statesman who is deficient in a sense of responsibility for his words is “out for the stuff” and when platform managers, who have an eye for gate receipts only, are out hunting for “drawing” sensationalists. What a pity that these men undertake to handle matters so serious and so complex—yea, what a peril. Adventurous sportsmen discharging firearms in a powder house would not be a greater menace to good order and security.

At its recent session in Washington the International Typographical Union received from the Washington delegation and referred to a standing committee, a set of resolutions regarding the local government of the city of Washington, which this union and every other organization with the slightest pretensions to democracy, whether within or without the circles of organized labor, should adopt. It may not be generally known that the District of Columbia, including the city of Washington, has for a quarter of a century been totally divested of local self-government. Yet that is the fact. The District and the city are governed by the Presi-