The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

Vol. XV. CHICAGO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1912. No. 757.

Published by Louis F. Post
Ellsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents **Yearly Subscription, One Dollar**
Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL

"Law and Order" Folk in Ulster.

It now appears that Orangemen were never opposed to lawlessness. They professed to be opposed to it when Irish agitators for home rule rebelled. But this turns out to have been only because the rebels were not on their own side. Now that the law is to favor home rule, Orangemen purpose lawless methods as enthusiastically as ever did an Irish peasant when shooting at a landlord from behind a hedge. Orangemen, also, are evidently human. Isn't it altogether human to be lawless or law abiding, according to whether the law is agreeable or not?

Roosevelt and His Party.

Had a new party sprung into the field in consequence of reactionary nominations by both the old parties, it would have been a party in reality and one greatly to have been desired. Roosevelt might have forced himself upon it, as he would certainly have tried to do, and, bitter as this pill would have been to its projectors, they might have been obliged to swallow him. But when the Democratic party was captured by its progressive elements, under Bryan's leadership and with such a candidate as Wilson, not only did all reasonable possibility of a genuine new party disappear, but so did all reasonable necessity for one. As events have shown, there was no revolt in both parties big enough and with a purpose sufficiently

identical to make that chemical union of elements without which no new party can be a real party. The Progressive Party is now, as it was from the beginning, nothing but a Republican "bolt." Instead of a nucleus for broad political alignments, it is essentially a Republican faction.

Not only is a new party in anything but name unwarranted by the circumstances, but the Republican faction which, so regarding itself, has taken the name of Progressive Party, is under a heavy handicap of leadership in its creator and chief candidate; and, paradoxical though it may sound, this handicap is its only political asset. Take Roosevelt out of the Progressive Party, and it would evaporate. No reflection at all is this upon the good intentions of the mass of its membership. It is simply a pointed indication of the fact that there is no Progressive party—not a *party*—but for the most part only a personal following. Analyze its elements and see if this is not so. There are the representatives of Mr. Roosevelt's "good trusts." They would drop the party without ceremony if Roosevelt dropped it, unless they could themselves control it. Then there are the good people of many kinds, each with his own variety of social reform duly planked in a platform obviously intended by the leader "to run on rather than to stand on." These good people would drop the party without ceremony rather than consciously allow Mr. Roosevelt's "good trusts" to control it. But what other elements are there in the Progressive party? None but a few crooked political bosses to whom Mr. Roosevelt has given absolution, the genuine Republican progressives of California who are back of Governor Johnson, the genuine Republican progressives of Kansas whom William Allen White and the populists before him have taught politics to, and the shouters for "Teddy"—just "Teddy."

And what does this man really stand for? We are not asking what his platform specifies. If it does not specify every particular thing in the public thought of the moment—except unpopular things—the reason must be that Mr. Roosevelt, who hewed all its planks with his own hatchet, didn't have his attention called to the omission in time. We mean to ask what Mr. Roosevelt's party —for his very own it truly is—stands for in its essentials. It stands for private monopoly. One of the ablest among the faithful progressives of the Republic has so characterized it, especially with reference to Labor, and the circumstances bear him out. We are not alluding now to Senator La Follette. We mean Louis D. Brandeis, a man who has done more as a private citizen for the protection of Labor from monopoly than Mr. Roosevelt in all his career, public and private.

In his address before the Massachusetts branch of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Brandeis said of Mr. Roosevelt's platform:

> Note not only what it contains, but what it omits; and consider what the natural results will be of the policies which it advocates. And when you make that examination you will find that there is a significant omission; and that this skilfully devised platform takes from Labor more than it gives. The new party, in this platform, pledges itself to social and industrial justice, and specifically to "work unceasingly for effective legislation looking to the prevention of occupational diseases, overwork, involuntary unemployment, and other injurious effects incident to modern industry," and it proceeds to set forth fourteen definite and distinct measures to that end. But nowhere in that long and comprehensive platform, neither in its nobly phrased statement of principles, nor in its general recommendations, nor in its enumeration of specific measures, can there be found any pledge to secure the right of Labor to organize, without which all other grants and concessions for improvement of the condition of the workingman are futile. It contains merely a friendly approval of the practice. The platform promises social and industrial justice, but it does not promise industrial democracy. The justice which it offers is that which the benevolent and wise corporation is prone to administer through its welfare department. There is no promise of that justice which free American workingmen are striving to secure for themselves, through organization. Indeed, the industrial policy advocated by the new party would result in the denial of Labor's right to organize. The new party stands for the perpetuation and extension of private monopoly in industry—that private monopoly from which the few have ever profited at the expense of the many, and for the dethronement of which the people have, in the past, fought so many valiant battles. That cursed product of despotism the new party proposes to domesticate in our Republic, proclaiming: "We do not fear commercial power." Certainly organized labor has had experience with the great trusts which should teach all men that commercial power may be so great, that it is the part of wisdom to fear it. Great trusts—the Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Beef Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Smelter Trust—and a whole troop of lesser trusts have made the extermination of organized labor from their factories the very foundation stone of their labor policy. . . . As John Fitch, who testified before the Stanley Committee, says: "The fact is the steel workers do not dare openly to express their convictions. They do not dare assemble and talk over affairs pertaining to their welfare as mill hands. They feel that they are living always in the presence of a hostile critic. They are a generous, openhearted set of men upon the whole. The skilled men are intelligent and are able and glad to talk

upon a variety of subjects. But let the conversation be shifted to the steel works and they immediately become reticent. It is safe to talk with a stranger about local option, the price of groceries, or the prospect of war with Japan, but it is not regarded as safe to talk about conditions in the steel industry." Again he says: "One man of long experience as a steel worker who gave me a better insight into mill conditions than any other one person, remarked: 'I used to write for labor papers a great deal, and sometimes I fairly burn to do it now—to declare before the world, over my own signature, the facts about working conditions in the steel industry. But I can't. It wouldn't be safe.'" That is free America—not despotic Russia. Espionage and discharge as a trust method of subjugating Labor is supplemented by the subtler and gentler device of "welfare work." The Steel Corporation has done much work of this character highly to be commended. Stung by the whip and scorn of publicity, this sensitive corporation has for several years made great strides in introducing safety appliances; and during the last year has gone far in reducing the seven-day week; and it has provided compensation for accidents and established a pension system. But its compensation and pension schemes are so devised as to rob the detached workman of an all-powerful corporation of what glimmer of freedom and independence remained. They create a new form of peonage. . . . Many of the new party leaders admit such hardship to labor and such injustice as I have described. They grieve over it and want to put an end to such practices. They say it is because of these abuses that they advocate the policy of legalizing private monopoly and regulating it; or, in other words, domesticating industrial monsters and taming them. They propose to secure relief by legislation and an Interstate Trade Commission. I, also, want legislation and an Interstate Trade Commission to help enforce the laws, but I don't think the community ought to be forced or bribed into legalizing private monopoly in order to get the legislation and the commission. And it seems to me very unwise, particularly for Labor, to surrender industrial liberty and to rely wholly upon legislation and a commission. Legislation and commissions help only "him who helps himself"; and a social program which accepts these things as a substitute for industrial liberty, instead of using them as means of securing industrial liberty, is fundamentally unsound.

La Follette and Roosevelt.

Peculiarly Rooseveltian is the pretense that Mr. Roosevelt was supporting the La Follette fight for progressivism until Mr. La Follette's illness necessitated new leadership, and that then Mr. Roosevelt came reluctantly to the front. Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the work of La Follette, when the latter was fighting the Interests alone in the Senate and the former was fighting for them and not alone in the White House, testify with great force against Mr. Roosevelt's present pretensions. But some leopards are allowed to change their spots to suit the seasons, and maybe Mr. Roosevelt is such a leopard. More directly to the precise point, it may be, however, is the conduct of Roosevelt toward La Follette when Roosevelt skilfully managed to speak in Wisconsin just after the primaries instead of just before. Why did he make that side-step? And when he did speak in Wisconsin after La Follette had carried the primaries, why was he so eloquently silent about La Follette? This bit of political history is not consistent with the present theory that Roosevelt was supporting the movement which he now assumes to lead in La Follette's place.*

Edward Keating.

One of the candidates for Congressman-at-Large from Colorado is Edward Keating, the president of the Colorado State Land Board. Mr. Keating was nominated at direct primaries in spite of the fact that he declared unequivocally for free sugar, although the beet-sugar industry in Colorado is supposed to be under the fostering care of the tariff, and in spite of the further fact that he is well known as a thorough-going Singletaxer. He has frequently presided at Henry George celebrations in Denver. His nomination was, we say, in *spite* of those facts; but ought we not to say that it may have been in some degree *because* of them? Free sugar isn't so unpopular as it used to be, and neither is the Singletax. Familiarity with both doctrines is fast breeding the reverse of contempt. At any rate, Mr. Keating has been nominated, and it seems to be more than likely that he will be elected. This probability should be made a certainty by the Freetraders and Singletaxers of Colorado. Able, brilliant and popular, but no time server, Mr. Keating would be a valuable accession to the Singletax group in the national capital—Congressmen George, Lewis, Buchanan and the rest in the House, and Owen, at least, in the Senate.

An Echo from "the Dunne Board."

The "Dunne Board," as Mayor Edward F. Dunne's progressive appointees to the Chicago School Board were sneeringly called by corrupt politicians and grafty newspapers less than five years ago, are vindicated now in another of the policies which in their official day won for them the complimentary enmity of all the crooks in Chicago politics. Of the policies for which they fought and lost and which have since been adopted, the latest is the use of school buildings out of

*See The Public of September 16, 1910, page 866.