

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1903.

Number 284.

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.

Since the Ohio Democratic convention, the editorial page of the New York Times—a Wall street product—has been in a state of delirium bordering on insanity. "Loose writing" is what one might call it were it not so much like "tight writing."

Horrible as are the reported atrocities of the Turks in Macedonia, the United States is in no position to protest. Nowhere are the Turks reported to have been more atrocious in their conduct than American Christians are proved to have been in the Philippines. No Turkish general has yet been charged with issuing an order to his troops, as Gen. Smith did in Samar, instructing them to "kill all over ten."

When the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph insists with some show of violence that—

the law says that every man shall have the right in this country to earn an honest living, and that he shall exercise that right; there is no need for loafers or room for loungers; the law condemns them, and says they shall go to work, if not freely then forcibly—it must be understood as referring only to impecunious loafers who have no privileges, and not to rich loafers who are allowed to own the earth.

One of the New York papers of the current month, the Press we believe, reported a suggestive incident at one of the New York police courts. Eight men had been arrested for walking between the tracks on the Vanderbilt highway to Buffalo. Seven of the prisoners expressed contrition. They re-

pented and were discharged. But one of the eight insisted that he had a right to walk on the tracks. The magistrate asserted the contrary. "Oh, yes, I have," said the prisoner; "but as things are going now I suppose a man won't be let walk along the roads." The response of the magistrate was a sentence of three months' imprisonment. Now, why is that man imprisoned? Is it because he walked along a railroad track? Or because he didn't repent of walking along the railroad track? Or because he said he had a right to walk along the railroad track? Or because he expressed the fairly sagacious opinion that "a man won't be let walk along the roads" after awhile? Or because the magistrate is an unfit person to sit upon the bench of a court of justice?

Charles Francis Adams is reported to have testified thus regarding municipal ownership of transportation:

I can only say that, as the result of careful official examination on my part, I have never yet found in Europe anywhere a case of municipal or public transportation worthy of an instant's consideration as compared with our own. We here in America do things in the transportation line which in Europe they do not even dream of, and wherever the government lays its hands on a line it becomes, compared with our system, paralyzed at once.

But that is not the point. How does public transportation there compare with private transportation there? Is Glasgow better off or worse off than under the private system? Or, if Glasgow has had public ownership too long to admit of such a comparison, fairly, how does the public system in Liverpool compare with the recent private system there, and how do both compare with European systems where private operation still prevails? Those are the true tests. An expert witness should

leave less wool on the edges of his testimony.

A Southerner writing to the New Orleans Harlequin, of John Temple Graves's recent anarchistic utterances on the Negro question, suggests this important comparison:

There is not very far from our shores an English colony called Jamaica. The Negroes outnumber the whites in that colony far more than they outnumber the whites in any section of this country. And yet assault on white women in that colony by Negroes is absolutely unknown. It is unknown because the Negro in Jamaica knows that in an English colony the law is supreme, and that he will be inevitably pursued and punished for his crime. We of the South have tried lynching and the Island of Jamaica has tried the reign of law, and the record is there for any one to read who desires to be informed.

Expressions like that help to prove, what the fact is, that Southern sentiment is not altogether dominated by law defying mobs and their law-ignoring defenders in the press and upon the rostrum. It is to be regretted that the Harlequin found it necessary to disclaim "all sympathy" with its correspondent's views, without even an attempt to dispute the convincing facts he advanced in support of his views.

A case of white peonage has now come to light in Alabama to supplement the practice of black peonage (p. 264) which has prevailed in that and neighboring States. From black to white is an easy transition. Poor whites, North as well as South, who join in the hue and cry against the Negro race, little suspect the tendency of what they do. Let the Negro be deprived of natural rights on account of his black skin, and poor whites will soon be driven into the same procession on account of their empty pockets. In illustration of this ten-