

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1903.

Number 250.

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.

The Republican prosperity which the coal trust is now enjoying, at the expense of keen suffering among the working classes, culminating in sickness and death, is likely to stimulate more fear than pride in the makers of this unique kind of prosperity. Most people must now begin to lose interest in a prosperity that can be enjoyed only by ear.

It is interesting to observe the growth of the army of "calamity howlers." James J. Hill has hardly enlisted when Charles T. Yerkes comes up for examination. Both believe that a panic is at hand, and Yerkes is especially hard upon the trusts, those erstwhile prosperity producers. He makes a fairly good "calamity howler" when he himself begins to feel the bruises of prosperity.

Judge Grosscup, of Chicago, a Federal jurist, has discovered a new remedy for the trusts, and so new that he has been at the pains of inventing a new word to describe it. He would "peopleize" them. To most persons his speech at the Hamilton club indicates that in "peopleizing" them, as he calls it, he would make it easy for the people to buy shares in trust stock. That, however, is more suggestive of enabling children to catch little birds by making it easy for them to put salt on the birds' tails, than of anything rational. Yet Judge Grosscup may mean, what in one part of his speech he seems to have said, that the trust question is to be solved by making the country's "opportunities open alike to all." That is the true solution. If he meant it,

however, he managed to mask his meaning with even more than judicial skill.

Professional economists and semi-socialistic pulpiteers who glibly proclaim the unwisdom of attempting to return to individualism, would do well to reflect a moment upon the fact that never within historical times have we had an era of individualism to return to. If we are ever to have individualism it must be after the plutocratic socialism of the past and present, and the possibly democratic socialism of the future, have spent their force. Periods of slavery, serfdom, and restricted competition in trade, are not individualistic periods; and calling them so does not make them so.

The Merchants' Association of New York has discovered that the traction companies are appropriating public property, a fact which was recently known only to "anarchists," "socialists," "calamity howlers," "commew-nists" and other wickedly envious folks. The vehicles of the elevated and surface roads, says this association through one of its committees in addresses to the public on the indecency of overcrowding, "are public property," and the companies "pay the city sums which are trivial in proportion to the value of the privileges enjoyed by them." Those observations are close to "populism," if the Merchants' Association did but know it.

A wholesome verdict by a Michigan jury at Jackson, on the 11th, rendered under the influence of sound legal instructions from the judge presiding at the trial, emphasizes an almost forgotten but vital right of American citizenship, the right, namely, of exemption from arbitrary arrest. The defendant had refused

submission to an arrest by officers without a warrant, and in defending himself against the lawless proceeding had shot and killed one of the arresting party. He was consequently indicted and tried for manslaughter. The judge charged the jury that the defendant had a right to use all necessary force to protect himself from the unwarranted arrest, and upon that explanation of the law the jury acquitted the prisoner. It is to be hoped that this just charge and righteous verdict may serve as a salutary lesson to disorderly policemen everywhere.

Were starving working people to make a raid upon bakeries and confiscate bread, they would be sent to jail if few in numbers, or shot down by the militia if an otherwise resistless mob. This is not a guess; it is a statement of historical fact. And preachers, lawyers, bankers, and other good people would commend the arrests, and while deploring the necessity would approve the slaughter. But when a mob led by preachers and bankers in want of coal makes a raid upon a train of coal cars and confiscates the cargo, the leading Republican paper of the West, the Chicago Tribune, heretofore an organ of "law and order," makes this mild comment:

When the leading men in a town—its bankers, merchants, lawyers and doctors—lay violent hands on coal which does not belong to them it is evident they are in sore need of coal. . . . The action of the good citizens of Arcola was clearly illegal. No one has a right to help himself to the property of another without obtaining the consent of the owner. But "self-preservation is the first law of nature." If the state of affairs at Arcola has been as bad as the dispatches report, it is not to be wondered at that the people should take advantage of the opportune breakdown of a coal train.

Which goes far to show that a stern enforcement of the law is not for

"bankers, merchants, lawyers and doctors" (nor even for preachers), who defy it when they are in "sore need of coal;" but only for the "lower classes," when they are in sore enough need to forget that even though "self-preservation is the first law of nature," "peace and order" is the first law of society."

There is a thing or two about this Arcola incident, however, that should be highly satisfactory to the much-abused anarchist. In the first place, a mob of respectable "archists," as anarchists would call them, have turned anarchists in the opprobrious sense of that term. That is, they have kicked over the laws of property just the same as if they drank beer for a living and carried dynamite bombs for amusement. In the second place, having set government aside, they have done precisely as professed anarchists say men would naturally do if there were no government. They proceeded, that is to say, in a perfectly orderly and honest manner to do the fairest thing under the circumstances. A committee was appointed for the emergency. The confiscated coal was fairly distributed among those who needed it. Accounts were kept, and a fund was voluntarily raised to indemnify the owners. On the whole, these Arcola anarchists show off to much better advantage than do the "law-abiding" Baers and Morgans who have produced the terrible coal famine from which the people of the country are suffering. The strongest indictment against them, perhaps, is not that they became anarchists, but that they somewhat hypocritically insisted all the time that they were law-abiding people.

It is altogether probable that the rebate of the tariff on coal, to continue a year, will have little or no effect upon prices. When importers must advance the duty before they can get the rebate, and know that the rebate will be allowed only for a few months, they are not likely to make great efforts to establish lines for

importing coal. The temporary nature of the relief is a menace to every business man who may think of importing foreign coal to compete with the trust.

And yet, this little measure of relief may be immense in its effects. The point of impact is often more important with a blow than its force. So a reduction of 67 cents a ton on the cost of getting foreign coal into the American market may break the extortionate prices of the trust. It is asked, for instance, how a tariff of only 67 cents can keep foreign bituminous coal out of the Chicago market, when, as now, domestic bituminous, usually worth about three dollars a ton, sells at six dollars or more. The answer is that such a tariff could not keep out the foreign product if the domestic high prices were more than a temporary spurt. By a 67 cent tariff regular shipments of foreign coal are shut out. Consequently, if the domestic article is cornered its price can be run up for a time far above the tariff difference. The conditions are not favorable to a quick increase in importations of foreign coal to compete, as they would be if there were no tariff to prevent the establishment of regular shipments. If the present high prices were to continue long enough to make it reasonably certain that they would not flatten out before foreign shipments could be brought here, an increasing stream of coal imports would set in and not abate until prices had been reduced to the point at which the 67-cent tariff becomes prohibitory. It should always be remembered that natural trade laws are laws of tendencies, and that a tariff which disturbs a trade tendency at all may disturb it out of all proportion to the amount of the tariff. As a pebble dropped in a favorable place may divert the course of what becomes a great river, so a small tariff put on or taken off at the advantageous point may change the direction of vast volumes of trade. It must not be forgotten, nevertheless, that the tariff on coal is a small matter as compared with the tariffs imposed for similar

reasons and in the same general pecuniary interests, by railroad combinations.

The message of the first single tax governor, Garvin, of Rhode Island, is attracting attention for the rational view of public affairs which it presents to the people of the State and indeed of the country. While conservative yet far-reaching methods for redressing grievances are proposed, the sentiment of the message is pitched in a radical key. When Gov. Garvin declares in this message, referring to popular discontent, that it is due to "privations which are artificial and unnecessary," the truth being that "the enormous amount of wealth produced is unequally distributed—unequally because of interference with the natural laws of distribution by unwise and unjust legislation," he recognizes a fact that most public officials prefer to blink, and leaves no room for mistaking either the nature of his convictions or his courage regarding them. Among the specific facts to which he invites the attention of the legislature is the importance of a constitutional initiative under which a reasonable number of voters may at any election propose constitutional amendments to be submitted directly to popular vote.

Rhode Island has a source of income resembling in principle that which advocates of the single tax insist is virtually the sole legitimate source for all incomes. It is the oyster planting rights in Narragansett bay. Land under the waters of this bay belongs to the State, and in 1864 the practice of ground renting it for oyster culture began. The ground rent for the year was \$61. But it has increased until in 1902 it amounted to \$35,000. As the expense of surveying, administration, etc., was only \$8,000, the net income from that source was, therefore, \$27,000. It is expected that in 1903 the net income will be as high as \$42,000. This land under water might be turned over to individuals as private