

# The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume VIII

Number 396

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOV. 4, 1905.

## CONTENTS.

### EDITORIAL:

Workingmen and savings banks.....	483
"Honest graft".....	483
Thinking workers and working thinkers.....	483
Roosevelt and public ownership.....	483
Pierpont Morgan and Chicago traction.....	483
Practicability of municipal ownership.....	484
Land values taxation in Great Britain.....	485
Woman suffrage in New York.....	485
Bernard Shaw's play.....	485
What is the Matter with the Church? (Putnam).....	486

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

Cleveland (Schilling).....	487
Australia (Bray).....	487

### NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Russian revolution.....	488
Revolt of Finland.....	489
Resistance to American domination in the Philippines.....	489
Next week's American elections.....	490
Chicago traction question.....	491
Railroad-rate regulation.....	491
News Notes.....	492
Press Opinions.....	492

### MISCELLANY:

Social Sonnets (Bengough).....	492
Wm. M. Ivins on Woman's Suffrage.....	492
Treason Towards Ideals.....	493
The Appeal from Tyranny.....	494
The Lion of Tula (verse).....	495

### BOOKS:

Joehrn Uhl (Dillard).....	496
Municipal Trading.....	496
Mayor Jones's Letters of Labor and Love.....	497
The Impending Crisis.....	497
Books Received.....	497
Pamphlets.....	497
Periodicals.....	499

CARTOON.—The Great Un-Worker (Bengough).....	498
--	-----

For terms and other particulars of publication see cartoon page

## EDITORIAL

### Workingmen and savings banks.

Savings bank statistics as evidence of the prosperity of workingmen gets another blow (p. 338) through revelations in the settlement of the estate of Col. Willard Glazier, the wealthy author and lecturer. Nearly all his fortune of \$135,000 was found deposited in the savings banks of more than 50 cities scattered over 15 States. In New York city alone he was a depositor in 18 savings banks. These deposits show up in warm colors through the savings bank statistics, as an indication of that improving condition of the working poor of which statistics are so full and the working poor so ignorant.

### "Honest graft."

"Honest graft" is the new

New York name for a kind of graft that is described by a New York expert in this wise:

My party is in power in the city, and it is going to undertake a lot of public improvements. I am tipped off on the place. I go to that place and buy all the land I can in the neighborhood. Then the board of this or that makes its plan public and there is a rush to get my land which nobody cared particularly for before. Ain't it perfectly honest to charge a good price and make a profit on my investment and foresight? Of course it is. Well, that is honest graft.

And what is the modus operandi of "honest graft" when "my party is in power" and is going to give away a lot of street franchises?

### Thinking workers and working thinkers.

The comment of the American League of Industrial Education, upon a quotation from an unnamed Negro writer, ought to penetrate the dull wits of those who are unconcerned while educational systems are formulating for the creation of a class of culture and a class for service. The criticized writer had said: "Teach the thinkers to think and the workers to work," adding: "It is silly to make a scholar a blacksmith, but sillier still to make a blacksmith a scholar." This was an incautious, perhaps unintended, expression of an idea that has taken root high up in educational circles. We quote the answer of the League, for it goes straight to the mark: "This ideal of 'teaching the thinkers to think,' and not to work, and the 'workers to work,' and not to think for their own protection, if carried to its ultimate, we are sure would again naturally and inevitably lead to just such a state of society as prepared the way for the ruin of the republics of old Greece and Rome, where a small coterie of well educated men 'taught to think' but not to work nor to respect the workers, thought out ways to reduce the 'workers who had been taught to work' but not to think for their own protection, to the most abject and pitiful poverty and slavery that has ever disgraced hu-

manity. And these 'thinkers who had been taught to think' but not to work, became the most arrogant tyrants and profligates in all the world's sad history. This baneful sentiment has always and always will tend to bring men to this condition to the end of time, if carried to its natural ultimate."

### Roosevelt and public ownership.

"I do not believe in government ownership of anything which can with propriety be left in private hands," said President Roosevelt in his Raleigh speech. And what can "with propriety" be left in private hands? Can we "with propriety" leave in private hands any public function at all? If we can, then why not all public functions? Or, if some public functions may be left "with propriety" in private hands, where shall the line be drawn between such as may be and such as may not? And why does President Roosevelt so particularly and "most strenuously object to government ownership of railroads"? Does he refer to plant and rolling stock as well as right of way? If he includes right of way in his objection to government ownership, why does he not object to government ownership of paved streets and dirt roads, which are clearly in the same category of public highways with railroad rights of way? Mr. Roosevelt says that dirt roads are not in the same category, because they are simple while railroads are complex. But so was the post office once simple whereas now it is complex. Could we therefore "with propriety" put the post office in private hands?

### Pierpont Morgan and Chicago traction.

There was an interesting concatenation of circumstances last week in connection with the Chicago traction (pp. 466, 472) matters.

Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan had come to Chicago. This aroused suspicions. To understand the

reasons for those suspicions two facts must be noted. One is the fact that the traction-extension ring were at a critical place last week in their desperate struggle with Mayor Dunne, who is fighting them with all the power at his command. They still controlled a majority of the Council, but it was a shaky and dwindling majority. The second is the fact, in verification of which we quote the Chicago Tribune, an organ of the traction extension ring, from its issue of Chicago 23, that—

despite the adverse street railway sentiment, J. P. Morgan and a few of his friends bought control of the City Railway company at \$200 a share, or approximately \$40 a share above the market, and at a time when the situation appeared the gloomiest. Mr. Morgan and other friends bought also the Union Traction company, the most hopelessly worthless street railroad proposition here, and bought also the North and West Chicago companies, even when the attitude of the city threatened their annihilation.

Upon his arrival in Chicago, Mr. Morgan indulged in the society of Mr. Marshall Field, and these two were in close communion. Naturally, for the two men are financially birds of a feather. But Morgan's visit to Field just at this time, when the Chicago aldermen were weakening on the ring's traction-extension policy, might be expected to suggest an explanation to the over-suspicious. And suspicion was not allayed when, in the issue of the Tribune of October 28, an interview with Mr. Morgan reported him as saying, with reference to Mr. Field:

We did not talk about the traction question. It is settled.

He was reported as adding: "We were not here on traction matters at all and our visit has no significance;" but it was hard to believe that Mr. Morgan had not come on traction matters when the stock for which he had paid "\$40 a share above the market," was in imminent danger of sinking to \$40 a share below the market. So the impression gained ground that, as the Tribune reported, Mr. Morgan had settled the traction question.

Thereupon Mayor Dunne very properly wrote a letter to Mr. Morgan in which he said:

If the traction question, which interests the citizens of Chicago to the extent of over \$100,000,000, has been settled, it has been settled without the knowledge of the Mayor of this city. If it has been settled, the settlement is a surprise to the 2,000,000 people of this community, who have been under the impression that the City Council and the Mayor are now seriously engaged in considering this great question. The news of the settlement is of great importance to the people of this great community, as well as to myself. Will you kindly inform me when and where the settlement was made; who represented the traction companies and who represented the city in this settlement; how was the settlement arrived at, and what methods were used to settle it without bringing the attention of the Executive of this city to the terms of the settlement? Will you also kindly inform me what are the terms and conditions of the settlement?

And now comes Mr. Morgan's response. Replying to Mayor Dunne, he wrote:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this date, and to say in reply that the statement to which you refer as attributed to me in a reported interview—i. e., that "the traction question is settled"—is absolutely without foundation. I need hardly add that I fully understand that there has been no settlement between the traction companies and the city.

Mr. Morgan's denial of the interview is explicit, and in view of the reckless methods of newspaper reporting in vogue in Chicago the presumption would be in his favor if he had stopped with his explicit denial. But what does he mean by adding that there has been no settlement "between the traction companies and the city"? Why this care to state what everyone knows, that no settlement has been made with the city? Was it a thoughtless addendum, unintentionally shifting the emphasis, or has there been a settlement—not between the traction companies and the city, but between the traction companies and the city's bosses? There may be no significance to the fact, but it is a

fact, that in less than a week after Mr. Morgan was reported as saying, "the traction question is settled," the traction-extension ring rallied enough aldermen to come within one vote of two-thirds of the Council on a test question.

#### Practicability of municipal ownership.

It will be remembered that Mr. Morgan's friend, Mr. Marshall Field, after a pleasure trip abroad, reported adversely (p. 449) on the practicability of municipal ownership in the United States. While Mr. Field's report was giving pleasure to his financial friends who are hanging on vigorously to their franchise flesh pots, its rhythm was seriously disturbed by Octavius C. Beale, president of the Associated Chamber of Manufacturers of Australia, who happened to be passing through Chicago. Mr. Beale appears to be blessed with a good deal more public spirit than Mr. Field manifests, and with reference to public affairs to have a higher degree of good sense. Note this observation:

If a thing in its nature must be or ought to be a monopoly, that monopoly ought to be with the people.

Discussing the subject generally, Mr. Beale said:

I did not come to America to champion the cause of municipal ownership; for, in the land from which I come and in some European states in which I have traveled, the successful results that have accrued to the people through the operation of that principle makes it appear to me as something extraordinary that, in a nation so progressive as the United States, there should be any question as to the expediency of the people controlling public service. . . . Any statement that municipal ownership abroad has not in practice met the expectations of its advocates proves that the maker of that statement has not carefully studied conditions or has his facts sadly mixed.

These statements were followed by Mr. Beale with citations of facts supporting them, drawn from the experience of Australia, Great Britain and Germany; and he touched the core of the munic-