

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1903.

Number 257.

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.

President Roosevelt's recourse to a personal letter in explanation and justification of his policy regarding the appointment of Negroes to office, is an encouraging sign. It recalls his dignified manifestation of the true American spirit when he refused a body guard upon his accession to the presidency.

He might have stood upon the false dignity of his office and pursued his Negro policy in silence, as an official too exalted to be questioned; or he might have reserved his explanation for a ponderous state document—a speech from the throne, as it were. Either course would have been conventional and monarchical. But he preferred the democratic method of a personal letter addressed to a private citizen, for general and ordinary publication in a provincial newspaper.

Shocking as this doubtless is to some sensibilities it implies a recognition of the American principle that officials are not rulers but servants, which is peculiarly refreshing at a time when the current is running swift and strong in the other direction. Instead of calling for criticism, the President's adoption of a simple, man-to-man method of apprising the people of his purposes and motives demands a cordial acknowledgment. It conveys a lesson that should not be forgotten, and affords an example which we trust may not be ignored.

The tone of the letter itself is fully in keeping with the democratic spir-

it that seems to have prompted it. It is simple, frank and direct, and singularly free from even a touch of bombast; and it lays down as his rule of conduct regarding official appointments a principle so truly democratic that no one claiming to be a Democrat should be capable of contesting its righteousness without blushing with shame to the roots of his hair. "I certainly cannot treat mere color," he writes, "as a permanent bar to holding office, any more than I could so treat creed or birthplace—always provided that in other respects the applicant or incumbent is a worthy and well behaved American citizen." And to that he adds this proper correlative: "Just as little will I treat it as conferring a right to hold office." The man who denies the soundness of that policy is not a democrat, no matter what political label he may wear.

True, the man who utters it may not be a democrat, either. He may be talking for effect. And it must be confessed that Mr. Roosevelt's fine sentiment would be more acceptable to genuine democrats the country over if he were as devoted to it in his appointments in the North as he appears to be in those he makes at the South. He is right—or, at any rate, he is not wrong—in appointing a Negro to the collectorship of the port at Charleston. But why does he appoint no Negro to important Federal office at the North? It is certainly not because the Negro population is small. Take away the Negro vote of Ohio, for instance, and that State would be permanently and hopelessly Democratic. And even though the Negro population is small in the North in comparison with the South, that difference loses all importance when it is considered that a race prejudice exists at the South, which is naturally intensified when it

seems that enforcement of the principle of equality is for the South alone.

Neither is the neglect to appoint Negroes to high public office at the North explained by lack of competent men. Able Negroes are numerous at the North. Some of them have been appointed upon missions to "inferior" peoples over seas. But none have been appointed to responsible office at home. This could hardly be so if President Roosevelt were wholly devoted to the principle he professes with reference to appointments. It is not probable that he has been as indifferent to color in his Northern appointments as in those he has made in the South or as he has been to creed and birthplace in both sections. Would it be ungenerous, then, to suspect that he may have been influenced by the fact that the North is as intolerant of the Negro race as is the South, and that a prominent Negro appointment in the North would expose this anti-Negro feeling in the President's own party? We do not charge Mr. Roosevelt with such hypocrisy, but the facts need an explanation which nothing short of an appointment of at least one competent Negro to important Federal office at the North can adequately give. Senator Tillman's suggestion that Booker T. Washington be appointed to a place in the cabinet would, if adopted, be the best possible kind of assurance that political equality is a genuine principle with Mr. Roosevelt's administration and not a mere whiplash for one section of our people.

But it is unhappily true that a generation has come upon the stage in the Republican party which "knows not Joseph." The noble spirit that Lincoln infused into that party in its

youth has departed. The splendid work in the direction of equal political rights and duties which it accomplished under the leadership of democratic-Republicans in the epochal days that followed the civil war, has just been declared by a member of President Roosevelt's cabinet, one of his closest personal and political friends, if not his very closest, to have been a failure and a mistake. The change in Northern feeling is too obtrusive to be ignored. Mr. Roosevelt may conjure with sentiments that once thrilled the North, but there is no vitality in them. They are good for nothing but conjuring. Those were sentiments which couldn't hold their strength through the era of Manifest Destiny into which McKinley inveigled us and of which Roosevelt has boasted for us. Like "Good-deeds" in the mediæval play of "Every-man" they are beautiful to look upon, but too weak to walk alone. Equal rights for the Negro are now flauntingly denied, not only at the South, where the old prejudice against his race could not be expected to die out so soon, but also at the North, where he had reason to regard them as secure. Senator Tillman's latest speech in New York has fared differently from his previous speeches in the North. Where once he would have been denounced, he is now applauded. It is only a question of time—and no long time either, if the impulse of Anglo-Saxon domination which rose like a dark wave with our wretchedly fatalistic war upon the Filipinos does not subside—when the American Negro will be even more completely without a country than the Filipino or the Porto Rican. And it will be part of the irony of fate to have forced upon him the reflection that he himself has hurried the climax. When with amazing fatuity he cast his ballot as a citizen and enthusiastically used his rifle as a soldier to shoot down the little brown "niggers" of the Philippines, he helped to vitalize the undemocratic sentiment that now makes his own race at home its victim.

Nor will the Negro be alone in his dilemma and his reflections. The same impulse that is carrying him down will carry white men with him. White Americans as well as black ones will some day awake to the reflection that they are without a country, and that they owe their plight partly if not altogether to their share in degrading their black brother. The wave of hostile sentiment that is rolling over "inferior" peoples is spoken of as a wave of Anglo-Saxon domination, but in truth this is not a race movement. That manifestation is only superficial. In perfect accord with our new doctrines that there are "inferior" peoples in the islands of the sea whom it is our destiny to govern, the South has always believed that the Negroes are an inferior race whose voice in a common government with white men must not be tolerated. And now Northern sentiment accepts that political heresy. How soon will it be before this notion of "inferior" races will reach out to "inferior" classes?

Already we hear from such men of "light and leading" as the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology that "the ballot—the right of franchise—has been given all too freely." He was speaking expressly with reference to the Negro, and his utterance was in harmony with what may now be heard on every side regarding Negro suffrage. But he did not confine the application of his remark to any race. He carried it to its logical climax, to the result that will be inevitable if the process of disfranchisement once gains popular sanction. "In my opinion," he added, still referring to the franchise, "it is out of place in the ranks of the ignorant no matter what complexion the man may be." An elastic word is "ignorant"—as elastic at least as "nigger." It is so elastic as to be meaningless in fixing the limits of disfranchisement. If his idea were adopted the whole question would come to be one of power. And the power to disfranchise, weak as it ordinarily is, would gain in strength with its exercise. The American Ne-

gro without a country is ominous of American white men without a country. The sooner "inferior" white men realize this, the better will it be for all concerned. They can't promote the disfranchising process up to a certain point agreeable to themselves, and then stop it. It is as impossible, to quote Wendell Phillips, as to "jump part way over Niagara Falls."

But is there no higher ground of appeal for the integrity of manhood suffrage in America than that which may be addressed to the self interest of voters or classes of voters? Is all sense of duty dead? Surely there is a deeper reason for defending Negro suffrage than the certain menace its abrogation would be to the suffrage rights of everybody who might be classed as "inferior" in race, or education or property, or religion, to a strenuous majority. There is a duty involved which no one can shirk without degrading his own civic standards and moral character. It is the very first duty of citizenship to defend all rights of citizenship—not one's own rights alone, but those of his fellow citizens as well. And the less able any class of citizens may be to defend their own rights, the more pressing is it the duty of others to help defend them.

It will not do to say that the Negro has no rights of suffrage which may not be revoked. We would not say this of our own rights of suffrage. Then we cannot in good conscience say it of his. The man who does say it is deceiving his intelligence and trifling with his conscience. To the extent that suffrage is limited, to that extent the government rests upon might and not upon right. It is nothing but an expression of physical force, and what man of moral purpose would argue in the forum of his own conscience that physical force is a synonym for right. The man without a voice in the affairs of his country is truly a man without a country; and who can help to expatriate men with natural rights equal to his own, upon some fanciful theory of their in-

feriority, yet feel in his conscience that he has done his duty?

When our country is assailed we are told that it is our duty to defend it with our lives. When a countryman, however humble, is wronged in another land, we are told that it is our duty to pour out blood and treasure to the fullest extent necessary for his vindication. Have we then no duty to defend (at home, with our influence and vote) the principles of political equality upon which our national fabric rests? Have we no duty to defend the rights of even the humblest of our countrymen as valiantly against domestic aggression as against wrongs abroad? If there is no such duty, then let us stop prating of morality and religion and the civic conscience, and candidly live out the brute life that belongs to creatures with no duties to perform nor rights to enjoy. But if there is such a duty, let those who are conscious of it realize that this advancing movement for the disfranchisement and subjugation of the Negro race in America furnishes the occasion for devotedly performing it. Wholly regardless of the evils which neglect of that manifest duty will bring upon ourselves, let us stem the tide of this wave of unrighteousness.

Nor let us be deterred by fear of sectionalism. The Negro question is no longer a sectional question. North as well as South is now heaving with hostile sentiment. A vicious hatred of the Negro as a Negro is sweeping over the entire land. By common consent he is to be put down. In the country of his birth he and his children are to be outcasts forever. In a land of equal political rights he is to have none that white men need respect. What the Jews were in Europe in the middle ages (save their skill in finance) such the Negroes are to be made in the United States in the twentieth century. And this is to be done by a "superior" race. God save the adjective! Where is the courage, where the chivalry, where the sense of duty of white men who stand

silently by while this second great stultification of our national ideals moves on to its shameful consummation?

City and State, of Philadelphia, has published as a supplement Senator Carmack's telling speech in the Senate in exposure of the strenuous efforts of the administration and its senatorial supporters to suppress the facts regarding army atrocities in the Philippines. This speech should be a familiar document in every village in the country—not that the shame of the nation should be exploited wantonly, but that her shame should be made widely known to the end that it may be duly atoned for.

The St. Louis scandals are paralleled by Fort Wayne. Some forty arrests were made last week, under seventy odd indictments found in connection with the corruption of the city council by franchise seekers. Corruption of this kind speaks eloquently of the impropriety of granting franchises for the performance of public functions. It points directly to the difference between public business and private business. A grocery store, for illustration, is a private business. Whoever would engage in this business does not need to procure the consent of a city council. But the street car business is a public business. No one can engage in that without the consent of the city council. This difference distinguishes the two businesses, not accidentally but in their very nature. And it explains why corruption characterizes the conduct of the one kind and not that of the other. Since the consent of the city council must be obtained in order to carry on a street car business, corruption is almost inevitable. If the councilmen do not insist upon being corrupted, franchise seekers tempt them. But the important lesson of the whole matter is this, that when a business is such that in its nature it cannot be carried on without public consent, it is a public business and ought to be publicly managed. There might be some corruption in public

management, but it could not compare with the corruption that is bred by private management.

During the coal strike last Fall, the Pennsylvania militia was called out to protect non-union miners from assaults by strikers. The non-union miners were anxious to work, so it was represented, but were prevented from doing so by the wicked strikers. Thereupon a great sigh of sympathy went forth over the land—sympathy for those industrious miners who really wanted to work for their good employers but dared not because the naughty strikers threatened them with personal injury. Now for the sequel. News dispatches of last week from New York tell of lawsuits begun by 22 Italian laborers against the Pennsylvania Coal company and the Erie Railroad company in which the plaintiffs assert that they were forcibly transported from New York city to the mines and there imprisoned in the mines and forced to work in the places of the strikers. They further assert that when they were taken into the mines they were not allowed to leave, but were compelled to work in the pockets against their will, and that their protests were not listened to when they demanded to be set free. It would seem that the militia was used to protect non-union men against the wrong persons.

It is gratifying to be able to quote from so representative a Republican paper as the Chicago Inter-Ocean the following just criticism of the Federal injunctions in West Virginia which have provoked a bloody conflict in the mining regions of that State. After discreetly condemning the men who defied the injunctions to the death, the Inter-Ocean of the 27th says:

Yet in fairness it would seem that some blame for this deplorable conflict should rest upon the Federal judges granting the injunctions that these men were resisting. Their resistance was wholly unjustifiable, but was the intervention of the Federal courts justifiable? . . . Practically all the popular agitation against "government by injunction," so called—practically all the widespread feeling that the Federal courts are used to oppress labor—is aroused by Fed-