

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1901.

Number 189.

**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 Democratic party is, indeed, in a sorry plight, if it has no better presidential possibilities to choose from than the Republicans and the coadjutor Republicans offer it.

First in this list—not because his chances are best, but because, his record as a public man being of such high flavor that only strenuous political sportsmen can stomach him, he may be dismissed most briefly—is Arthur Pue Gorman. Mr. Gorman's Democracy is of the "copperhead" type. The only sign of democracy about it is the label. In Maryland his highest ideal of statesmanship is disfranchisement of the Negroes. In the United States senate, he was a faithful representative of predatory financial interests. In national politics he plays the game with the calculating coolness and moral obliquity of a professional gambler. These are his principal political characteristics. Such a man does not measure up to the politico-ethical standards which Bryan has set for the Democratic party, and which it cannot repudiate without committing suicide. Mr. Gorman is a presidential impossibility.

Next in the list is David Bennett Hill. He, like Mr. Gorman, is assigned to this high position in the list, not because his chances are good, but because he is a close second to Mr. Gorman as an available impossibility. Yet Mr. Hill is not altogether impossible. As well as may be foreseen three years in advance, he might capture the Democratic nomination. Shepard's defeat for mayor of New York makes this barely possible. And, if political conditions were unpropri-

tious for the Republicans, he might, if nominated, win at the election. But his nomination and election would be the greatest possible satire upon American Democracy.

Mr. Hill is truly what the Cleveland faction dubbed him ten years or more ago, a "peanut politician." Possessed of many personal virtues of the negative sort—he does not steal, nor swear, nor drink, nor smoke, nor carouse—he is yet wholly without political virtues. A political principle, moral or traditional, is something in which he takes no interest and with which he appears to have no acquaintance. He calls himself "a democrat," but no one else would call him one, and no one would ever have suspected him of being one but for his own assertion.

Mr. Hill's most recent disclosure of his ignorance of or indifference to democratic principle, is made in a newspaper article in which he unfolds and strenuously advocates a scheme for suppressing anarchy. For its avowed purpose nothing could be more obviously futile; for defiance of democratic principle and Democratic tradition in the United States nothing could be more pronounced.

His scheme consists in excluding alien anarchists from the country. He would not admit those who were known to be anarchists, and he would remove those who were discovered to be such after admission. How futile for its avowed purpose such a law would be is evident. It would be operative only upon foreign and not upon native anarchists. Yet the only distinctly anarchist crime ever committed in this country—the assassination of President McKinley—was committed by a native American. Is it said in reply that foreign anar-

chists would be prevented by Hill's law from corrupting Americans with anarchistic ideas? The answer is simple and complete. They could do that quite as effectively with their books and papers as by personal contact; and Mr. Hill does not propose a censorship of anarchistic publications, but only a censorship of anarchistic persons. As a measure against anarchists this extraordinary law which Mr. Hill so gravely fathers would be absurdly ineffective.

It would be worse than ineffective. Mr. Hill proposes that the law shall not define anarchy. He would leave the interpretation of that most important word in the law to the dictationaries and the courts. On this point he says:

The word anarchist is sufficiently defined by every dictionary in the land. It means a person who is opposed to any government whatsoever. Mere opposition by a person to monarchical government or some particular form of government does not render that person an anarchist, but the opposition must be to every form of government.

So Mr. Hill would have congress enact a law discriminating against persons who oppose government—not those merely who attack governments or government officials, but those also who believe and teach that the principle of government is morally and politically bad. He would condemn men whose only offense is that the philosophy they believe and teach goes to the extreme of what Jefferson taught; men who argue, democratic fashion, that if "that government is best which governs least" then the best of all governments must be one which does not govern at all.

This pretentious Democrat, this "peanut politician," would draw no line against monarchists. The emperor of Germany, the tsar of Rus-

sia, the sultan of Turkey, the ameer of Afghanistan, the king of the Cannibal islands, might send proselyters to our country to teach that all systems of government are bad but their own, and Mr. Hill's law would admit them; for they would be advocates of "some particular form of government." But the gentle Tolstoy, who opposes all forms of government, arguing that non-resistance is a Christian principle which would produce universal peace, and that the principle of government is hostile to the principle of non-resistance—he would be turned back from our shores by the "democratic" Mr. Hill.

Though Mr. Hill appears to be unaware of it, it is the fact that his law, while keeping out non-resistant anarchists like Tolstoy, would leave the door wide open to the kind it is especially designed to exclude. For physical-force anarchists are as a rule communist-anarchists, and communist-anarchists believe in government. Though they do not believe in coercive government, they do believe in voluntary, non-invasive industrial government. This is certainly "some particular form of government;" and, according to Mr. Hill's own construction of his law, would exempt its advocates from exclusion.

But more important than any other consideration, with reference, at any rate, to Mr. Hill's ambition to be the Democratic candidate for president, is the fact that in addition to its absurd puerility his proposed law would be distinctly un-democratic. It would be un-democratic in principle, because democracy demands that no one, native or alien, be discriminated against by law for opinion's sake. Free thought and free discussion, these are democratic landmarks; and no man is a democrat on principle who repudiates them. David B. Hill does repudiate them. His proposed law would be un-Democratic also by tradition. It is essentially the same law as the old alien act, which empowered the president

to exclude immigrant Frenchmen (they being then regarded as holding opinions inimical to our government) and to remove those already here. That law and one other—the infamous "alien and sedition laws,"—having been enacted by the Federalist party, caused its ruin. The Democratic party came into power, with Jefferson at its head, upon the wave of democratic indignation at this legislation against opinions. It stood opposed to the condemnation of opinions by law; and no one can be a Democrat by tradition who deserts that stand. David B. Hill has deserted it. No matter, therefore, how often nor how vociferously he proclaims, "I am a Democrat," he would make a sorry figure as presidential candidate of the Democratic party.

The third and last in the list of Democratic candidates is Grover Cleveland. We omit Bryan's name, because we are considering only men whom the Republican newspapers, both within and without the Democratic party—those newspapers which either openly or treacherously opposed Bryan's election in 1896 and his nomination and election in 1900—regard as available. Cleveland is really the more likely candidate in the list for the nomination, for he has political convictions and his candidacy would consolidate the anti-Bryan sentiment of the party. But Cleveland's convictions are not democratic, and his associations are decidedly plutocratic. Upon no fundamental political principle could he be distinguished from a thoughtful Republican, unless by the fact that the thoughtful Republican was the more democratic. His consolidation, therefore, of the anti-Bryan sentiment of the party in his favor would have the less encouraging effect of consolidating the Bryan sentiment against him. This fact militates very greatly against his availability.

Mr. Cleveland gave indications once of being a genuine democrat. Though at his first election he stood

before the people only as a man who had made an ideal mayor from the "good government" point of view, and an excellent governor from the corporation point of view, and a "winner in a walk" from the politicians' point of view (he having polled a phenomenally large majority for governor in a phenomenally small vote), yet he grew in democracy, in the presidential chair, up to the point of writing his famous free trade message. But Mr. Cleveland's democracy died early. Two campaigns were fought upon his democratic message, and he won the second brilliantly, only to fritter away its fruits after his inauguration.

If ever a president was elected with a specific mandate from the people, that president was Mr. Cleveland. He was elected, and a Democratic congress with him, under express orders to abolish the protective tariff. The new congress could not meet for 13 months. But Mr. Cleveland could have called it together in special session, to execute the popular mandate, in less than five months. Had he done so, a tariff measure would have been passed, under the impulse of the popular command, which would have been an honor to his administration and a relief to the people. The trusts would then have been powerless to turn the Democratic tariff into a joke, as they were afterwards able to do. Had he followed this obvious course, the subsequent political campaigns would have been fought progressively for free trade, with the protectionists on the defensive. The Democratic party would have been united; and free trade Republicans, assured at last of Democratic sincerity, would have joined it. Defeat would in those circumstances have been impossible. In that case there would have been no Spanish war, yet Cuba would be free. For a Democratic president would have accepted Spain's concessions, instead of suppressing and misrepresenting them in order to make war, as was done. There would consequently

have been no Philippine question, no imperialism, no militarism, no "world-power" humbug, but a steady progression along democratic lines toward a democratic republic. Mr. Cleveland neglected this opportunity, and the deplorable result is a black page in our history.

Nor can his mistake be attributed to error of judgment. This charitable verdict might be rendered had he refused to call congress together in special session for any purpose. But he did call it together, and for what purpose? To execute the popular mandate? By no means. He called it together to create a new issue, and in that he was entirely successful. His four years of nominal law practice in the purlieus of Wall street, had brought him new friends, who brought him a handsome fortune, and from whom he imbibed new ideas. In consequence, when he went back to the White House, the idea of reforming the tariff was not uppermost in his mind as it had been when he left the White House after his first term. The burning question with him now was finance. Out in the West, in the silver producing regions and in the neighboring agricultural states, there was apparently an almost universal demand for silver coinage. But the question was not a national issue and the silver men could not have made it one. Mr. Cleveland did that. Although he would not assemble congress in special session to do what the voters who elected him had commanded, he did assemble it to do what they had not commanded. He turned from an issue upon which the party was united, to one upon which it was divided. By that act he created the silver issue, and produced party demoralization.

When at last congress did act upon the tariff question, free traders had been disheartened, tariff reformers of the West had felt the diverting and disintegrating effects of the money issue, and the protectionists of both parties, as well as their clients, the

trusts, had regained confidence and courage. The Democratic tariff measure consequently came out of congress in a condition to justify all the ribaldry of the scoffers. Both the precipitation of the money issue and the debasement of the tariff question were the work of Mr. Cleveland. Instead of growing in democracy he had turned toward plutocracy, instead of sitting at the feet of Jefferson and Jackson he had taken counsel of J. Pierpont Morgan. It was not the fault of the Democratic party that Mr. Cleveland made a fool of it in 1892-96. It would be its fault were he to do so in 1904.

That Mr. Cleveland's democracy, such as he has, is of the rule-of-thumb variety, is evident from what he said last week in a speech in Pittsburgh, in celebration of founder's day at the Carnegie institute. On the whole, it was one of those ponderous speeches which seem profound until you dig into them to find a thought. But at one point the speaker did try to say something. For purposes of examination we quote it.

No American citizen was ever yet doomed by birth to a life of labor or poverty, and fortunes are the products of industry and intelligent endeavor. It is somewhat puzzling to know what Mr. Cleveland could have meant by this, if, indeed, he meant anything. No one doomed to "a life of labor"? Pray how shall every one escape labor? Is not continuous labor the condition of existence? Would not men be like rats in a trap if labor ceased for even a brief time? How is it possible then for every one to escape labor? If any escape, must it not be on condition that others do their work for them? But if this be so, many must be doomed to labor; for there are those who do not labor, yet live in luxury. What Mr. Cleveland probably had in mind was the old Democratic notion that everybody can get ahead in this democratic country of ours if he is industrious and intelligent. This inference is confirmed by his remark that "fortunes are the products of industry

and intelligent endeavor." That is a delusion which nobody believes in any more, except lucky and self-satisfied old men and inexperienced and ambitious young ones.

But what makes the above quotation repulsive to the democratic conscience is its manifest implication. The point that Mr. Cleveland evidently wished to impress, but which he did not put into words, was that "industry and intelligent endeavor" are the only conditions of fortune making, and that upon these terms all can be rich. But the fact is that, other conditions are necessary, and any observer whose instincts are democratic knows it. Millions in this country who are both industrious and intelligent have no fortunes. Those who have fortunes have either inherited them or have acquired them through legislation which is predatory in its character. The rich man does not exist who has earned his fortune. He may have won it by industry; but highwaymen are industrious. He may have won it by intelligent endeavor; but counterfeiters are intelligent in their endeavor. We do not mean, of course, to say that rich men are on the moral plane of highwaymen and counterfeiters, or that all fortunes are tainted with personal dishonor. What we do mean is that such terms as "industry," "intelligent endeavor" and the like are moral neuters. They indicate nothing as to the moral conditions which are necessary to make industry and intelligence succeed. Though fortunes be acquired by "industry" and "intelligent endeavor," it does not follow that they are earned. They may have been "industriously" and "intelligently" diverted from those who did earn them; and with most if not all fortunes that is true. Had Mr. Cleveland said that fortunes are the products of industry, intelligent endeavor, and monopoly laws, he would have been right as to all but inherited fortunes, which rest almost entirely upon monopoly. But his ignoring of the third condition indicates that he

either has no convictions regarding the equitable distribution of wealth, or that his convictions are plutocratic. In either case he lacks the essential quality of an available Democratic candidate for the presidency at a time when democratic principle is needed to solve industrial problems.

During the New York mayoralty campaign we endeavored to explain the real causes of Tammanyism, insisting that they lie deeper down than dilletante "good government" politicians like to admit. In concluding that explanation we said that Tammanyism can be uprooted only by one or the other of two things: Either the ballot must be taken from the poor, which would enable the comfortable classes to realize their own ideal government; or poverty must be abolished, by destroying privilege, which would lift the poor to higher planes of citizenship.

Commenting sympathetically and intelligently upon this conclusion, the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald draws attention to the remarkable declaration of Abraham S. Hewitt (a Democrat!), made in behalf of Mayor Low's candidacy, in these refreshingly candid terms:

If Shepard thinks that universal suffrage is the best form of government for large aggregations of men he differs with most statesmen and the best thinkers of the day. They all agree that municipal government is a matter of business, and not of general politics. They think that ignorance should be excluded from control, and that the city business should be carried on by trained experts selected upon some other principle than popular suffrage. In this view I concur.

The Telegraph-Herald's suggestive, thoughtful and democratic comment is as follows:

Abram S. Hewitt, ex-congressman and ex-mayor, agrees with The Public's conclusions, and as he is opposed to elevating the poor by destruction of privilege and incidental abolition of poverty, he holds that city officials ought to be chosen by some other method than a popular vote. He would prevent the poor from voting at municipal elections by disfranchising them. In time, the concentration of wealth continuing, this may be done. Whenever and wherever organized and

combined privilege finds itself unable to dictate the votes of the poor by the methods so successfully employed in the national campaign of 1896, it will favor use of the methods in vogue in the South against the Negro. But with control of the transportation lines and of the productive industries rapidly concentrating in fewer and fewer hands, open, wholesale disfranchisement will hardly be necessary. The concentration of wealth and of power over future wealth is steadily rendering the masses of men less and less independent and more and more dependent, and a consequence of this process of degradation must be subjection of the votes of the dependent to the will of the industrial masters.

It is gratifying to learn from the Platt papers that popular suffrage is a success. Mayor-elect Low also calls it a success. That is because it defeated Shepard. Had Shepard been elected, then, according to the amiable ex-Mayor Hewitt and democrats of his particular brand, popular suffrage would have been proved a failure. Some classes of people are so well satisfied with themselves and their manifold and manifest virtues that they test everything by its effect upon their own class. If it serves them, it is successful; otherwise it is a failure.

Constitutional lawyers of Great Britain, as well as believers in British liberty everywhere, are shocked by a decision of the judicial committee of the king's privy council. This committee has apparently decided that the British courts are not open for the protection of individual liberties, when the protection of those liberties might endanger, in the opinion of the courts, the interests of the empire.

The case passed upon came up from South Africa. A British subject of the name of Marais had been arrested in Cape Colony, and is now in prison. He had no connection with the British army, but was arrested and is confined solely by military authority. No charge has been made against him, and he is ignorant of the reason for his arrest. Early in September he appealed to the supreme court of Cape Colony on habeas corpus proceedings,

on the ground that as a civilian he was subject to the process only of civil tribunals, and could not be lawfully imprisoned by military authority. That court dismissed the writ, refusing to interfere. Had the case involved money in large sums, instead of personal liberty, Marais could have appealed to the home courts as a matter of right. But as it did not involve money, but only the liberty of a man, he had no right of appeal. He could only ask leave to do so. It was upon this application for leave that the judicial committee of the privy council is understood to have made the decision in question.

In the course of the argument the lord chancellor frequently interrupted Marais's lawyer with hostile comment. At one point, when the lawyer was arguing that in the absence of express statutory authority civilians cannot be tried by court-martial while the ordinary courts are open, the lord chancellor interjected the statement, as reported by the press dispatches, that "the courts are not open, if access to them would endanger the interests of the state." One member of the privy council, Lord Davey, protested emphatically against this revolutionary doctrine; but he was outvoted, and the leave to appeal was denied. The reason for the decision is assumed to be in substance that expressed by the lord chancellor during the argument and quoted above. Should this prove to be the case, the liberties of British subjects may be regarded as hanging hereafter by a slender thread. The British courts, whenever they choose to regard the interests of the empire as in danger, may close their doors to applicants for writs of habeas corpus; and civilians will be as much at the mercy of military law as soldiers enrolled in the army. Imperialism comes at a high price.

It is said that the Chicago traction companies are about to apply to the federal courts for an injunction prohibiting the Illinois board of tax equalization from obeying the proc-