

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 10, 1903.

Number 249.

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.

A "knocker" is one who condemns the bad things that you approve.

Suggestion for a Republican toast: "Here's to a full dinner pail and an empty coal bin. Let the so-called trusts alone and stand pat, stand pat!"

There is something pathetically serio-comic about the lantern hunt that is being made for a conspiracy of local coal dealers to shut off the coal supply. There are no longer any local coal dealers who are independent of the great coal trust. For two years this trust has been freezing out local coal dealers, until now even the largest firms are only its clerks.

Attorney General Knox strikes a true note on the trust question when in his letter to the House judiciary committee he writes: "In my judgment a monopoly in any industry would be impossible in this country . . . if competition were assured in a fair and open field. . ." Let the administration follow that clue wherever it leads, and the credit of forever settling the trust question would be Mr. Roosevelt's. But the clue leads straight to the ownership of coal fields, highway rights and terminal sites. Mr. Roosevelt would again get "cold feet" when that goal came into view.

In view of the revelations Maj. Glenn is making at his trial in Manila for murdering Filipino prisoners of war, revelations that trace to high military authority full responsibility

for the atrocities committed by American soldiers in the Philippines, it is no wonder that American sentiment in Manila was opposed, as the Chicago Inter Ocean dispatch of December 6 announced, "to the reopening of the case and again exposing the troubles in the army." It was thought, so the Inter Ocean correspondent then cabled, that "the less said about these matters the better." And so it turns out. The great crime appears to be coming home to the guilty in high places.

President Roosevelt's appointment of a Negro to the post of collector of customs at Charleston and his suspension of a Mississippi post office because the Negro postmistress was forced by local intimidation to resign, are in themselves laudable acts as indications of a democratic spirit. But they lose all their moral value when it is considered that the President confines his manifestations of race democracy to the South. He appoints no Negroes to local Federal office in States that are dominated by his own party. Mr. Roosevelt should consider that political equality of the Negro is not a medicine to be administered to the South; it is a principle for universal application.

Dr. John Bascom, whose remarks about Rockefeller's contributions we commented upon favorably last week (p. 610), has come in, as might be expected, for an avalanche of abuse from newspapers and "leading citizens," for proclaiming the foulness of John D. Rockefeller's money and denouncing the educational and religious institutions that accept his gifts. As Dr. Bascom is professor of sociology in a college that gets none of Rockefeller's loot, it is easy to surmise with reasonable accuracy from the experience he is undergoing for

plain speaking, what might happen to professors of sociology, political economy, and moral philosophy, in colleges that do accept Rockefellerian plunder, if those professors were to speak with similar candor. Even professors of history in such institutions would be brave men if they brought Ida Tarbell's story of the Standard oil trust to the attention of their classes, or invited their students to examine Lloyd's "Wealth Against Commonwealth." It is encouraging to find Dr. Bascom standing courageously by his guns. He replies vigorously to his critics. And he does so with the same faculty of acute distinction that he showed in discriminating between unearned fortunes legally obtained (that is, given by the public) and unearned fortunes lawlessly obtained (that is, stolen from the public). Asked if all charitable gifts from Rockefeller should be rejected, he replied with scathing irony:

Well, I should say that if a beggar came up to Mr. Rockefeller and asked for a dollar and then discovered where the dollar was coming from, if he were a beggar who discriminated between one dollar and another, he would promptly refuse the money of the Standard Oil magnate.

It is refreshing to read outspoken condemnations by judges, even if not in their judicial capacity, of the tendency of police authorities to violate fundamental law in their efforts to detect comparatively minor offenses. Such a condemnation is that of Judge Gaynor, a Supreme Court justice of New York, in a paper he contributes to the North American Review for January. The following quotation from Judge Gaynor ought to be pasted in the hat of every police official, from country constable to city superintendent:

It is often of little consequence, and seldom of great consequence,