

# 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

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Connecticut  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
MISS GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York  
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1912.

No. 719

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:	
From Mack to Folk.....	25
Governor Wilson.....	25
Ey and For Bankers.....	27
Roosevelt and Harriman.....	27
Our Criminal Chancery Courts.....	27
Three-cent Fares in Cleveland.....	27
Art and the People (James H. Dillard).....	28
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:	
Democracy at the Seat of Harvard (Lewis J. Johnson).....	29
The Singletax in South Africa (George C. Mosses).....	31
INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:	
Los Angeles and the McNamaras (Chas. H. Shinn).....	32
Dynamite vs. Reason (G. W. Avery).....	32
"Without Any Very Great Conscious Moral Turpitude" (Celia B. Whitehead).....	33
Cleveland Traction (F. J. Miller).....	33
NEWS NARRATIVE:	
Senator La Follette's Speaking Tour.....	33
Progressive Republicanism of Illinois.....	34
Presidential Preparations by the Democratic Party.....	34
Progressive Democracy in Ohio.....	35
Governor Foss to the Massachusetts Legislature.....	35
The Arbitration Treaties.....	35
Report of the Monetary Commission.....	35
The Beef-trust Trial.....	36
Echoes of the McNamara Case.....	36
Joseph Fels in Boston.....	37
Russian Reprisals in Persia.....	37
The Republican Struggle in China.....	37
News Notes.....	38
Press Opinions.....	39
RELATED THINGS:	
America, 1912 (Miriam Allen de Ford).....	40
True Little Tales of Minor Reformers—II (Chas. H. Shinn).....	40
BOOKS:	
The Boys' Book of Conservation.....	41
Glimpses at Life.....	41
Books Received.....	42
Pamphlets.....	42
Periodicals.....	42

## EDITORIAL

### From Mack to Folk.

"I think," said Norman E. Mack, chairman of the Democratic committee, in his speech at the Jackson Day banquet in Washington, "it is time we Democrats stopped fighting one another and began a unanimous attack on the common enemy." But who is the common enemy? Is La Follette the type, or Lorimer? And who are the Democrats that must stop fighting one another? Are they Bryan, for instance, and Guffey? Mr. Mack added: "The country is ready to turn its affairs over to the Democratic party if we behave ourselves." But what does this behavior consist in? Must Democrats like Bryan, Wilson, Folk and that class, harmonize with Guffey, Sullivan, Harmon, Underwood and that class, for the purpose of fighting Republicans like La Follette and his class? Is this the good behavior for which the country is ready to turn its affairs over to the Democratic party? We doubt it. Governor Folk's speech at the same banquet struck a better keynote than Mr. Mack's. Governor Folk said: "The present rising tide of democracy is not for the Democratic party, no matter how controlled, but in favor of real democratic principles."



### Governor Wilson.

Over the publication of a letter of Governor Wilson's, written before he saw the cross of demo-

cratic Democracy in the political sky—a letter in which he wished for “something at once dignified and effective to knock Mr. Bryan once and for all into a cocked hat,”—there should be rejoicing in the Wilson camp of President-makers. The plutocratic origin and motive of that exposure of a mistake of Governor Wilson’s before his conversion, go far to prove that *the Interests believe his conversion to be genuine.*



Naturally enough the language of the letter is not soothing to Bryan’s friends. But those who are truly his friends are too robust in their politics to cry for soothing syrup. We shall be surprised if Mr. Bryan himself takes the matter to heart, unless it leads him to better reasons for doubting Governor Wilson’s sincerity than the letter itself. He must realize that the unearthing of this letter by his own unrelenting plutocratic enemies is but part of their warfare upon what he himself represents in American politics. Standing by itself, the publication of that letter is clearly an attempt to obstruct the progressive movement in the Democratic party by discrediting one of its new and effective leaders. As Bryan has been discredited all these years by the Interests, so now the Interests would discredit Wilson. Isn’t that plain upon the face of it?



If discrediting Governor Wilson in public opinion were not the purpose of the publication of that letter, the Interests would be supporting Wilson on the faith of it. They wouldn’t lose such a fine chance to put a man of their own into the White House if they thought him really their own. The letter is of a kind to make friends for Governor Wilson among the very Interests that have dug it up. But manifestly that is neither the effect nor the object of its publication. The object is to arouse enmity against Governor Wilson among Bryan’s friends, and thereby to remove him from the list of Presidential possibilities: the effect is to please the friends of the Interests with Wilson’s discomfiture. What, then, is the inference? What is the inevitable inference when the Interests make themselves so solicitous for Bryan and his friends, that they uncover an old anti-Bryan letter of Wilson’s written when the Interests thought him a friend of theirs—as very likely he was, for he didn’t understand practical politics then,—what in those circumstances is the inevitable inference? Surely no one supposes that this exposure of Wilson’s old letter is to guard Bryan and his friends from a wolf in sheep’s clothing? A disguised wolf

or two in the Bryan sheepfold is precisely what the Interests would like.



It is not in support of Governor Wilson for the Presidential nomination that we discuss the publication of his old letter in this temper. We are not supporting him. Although we have regarded him as in the list of desirables, and as at present heading the list in point of availability, there are other desirables who may become more available than he, a contingency that time and circumstances alone can decide. Meanwhile, it is for the friends of all Democratic candidates of the democratic species to bring them as close to the front as possible; provided, of course, that there be no *confusion of which the Interests may take advantage.* But right at that point is the danger of the publication of the Wilson letter, as it is also its purpose.



There is like danger and purpose in the digging up of Wilson’s scholastic writings, published before his eyes opened to the significance of political alignments. In considering any such basis for discrediting Governor Wilson’s conversion, it must be borne in mind, not only in fairness to him but also in prudence with reference to the period of political turmoil upon which we are entering, that as a leader of men in the open political field this man has lived a whole lifetime in hardly more than a year or two. Prior to that, he was a leader of boys, a moulder of immature minds in scholarly cloister. He kept democratic principles in his study and enjoyed them in his books as he might have kept and enjoyed canary birds—as pets in a cage. But even there he experienced a shock. His first effort at Princeton to let his democratic principles out of their cages, though only in college politics, brought on a chorus of anathemas from the region of the Interests. He fought it out with them, however, and the Interests fought him out. But all this was still scholastic, like a moot court to a law student. It was an affair between a pedagogue on one side and rich young boys at college backed by rich old boys of the alumni on the other. So no doubt it seemed to Big Business and the political partners of Big Business in New Jersey. At all events Big Business picked him up for Governor of New Jersey—their Governor. As a democratic gramophone in a plutocratic caravan, he was moving along finely with them some fifteen months ago, until George L. Record, a democratic Republican, asked him nineteen crucial questions. Then the gramophone came to life. Those ques-

tions forced Wilson to think in terms of progressive practical politics, and his democratic principles forced him to think straight. He was "up against the real thing," as St. Paul was; and like Paul he appears to have yielded himself wholly. Ever since that time, at any rate, Governor Wilson has given the signs of a genuine and vital conversion to fundamental democracy in boots. Nor have such signs come from him alone. The Interests themselves have been giving signs. They have given many, but none more convincing of the genuineness of Governor Wilson's conversion than their resurrection of that old anti-Bryan letter. In judging Wilson's sincerity, the friends his conversion has attracted ought not to be indifferent to the kind of enemies he has thereby made.



### By and For Bankers.

Riddle: When is a bank not a bank? Answer by the Aldrich Monetary Commission: When it is a "cooperative union of all the banks."



### Roosevelt and Harriman.

Much is made of the recent contention in behalf of Mr. Roosevelt regarding his relations with the late Mr. Harriman in connection with the latter's raising of a Republican slush fund for the campaign of 1904,—of the contention that this fund was for the State campaign and not for the national campaign. On the one hand, as the argument runs, the fund could not have helped Mr. Roosevelt, who was the national and not the State candidate; on the other hand, it is to the effect that the fund was really for national purposes, since the national committee had previously borrowed from the State committee about the amount of the Harriman fund. But what difference does it make whether the fund was spent for the candidate for Governor of New York or for the candidate for President—if President Roosevelt used his influence to have Mr. Harriman raise the fund? Isn't the latter the real question?



### Our Criminal Chancery Courts.

A man has been arrested in connection with the railroad strike in Illinois and without criminal procedure sentenced to imprisonment as a criminal in the work house at Peoria. His name is Harry Andrews. The crime charged is intimidating employes of the railroad. He was not indicted by a grand jury, he was not convicted by a petit

jury, he was not tried in any court having jurisdiction of such crimes. So far as due process of law is concerned, no one knows whether he committed the crime or not. Nominally, he is not convicted of crime. Yet he is in the work house under sentence of having committed one; so what's the use of splitting hairs? This is a case of "government by injunction." The judge was Humphrey, of a Federal court. He issued a Chancery order at the request of railroad lawyers, forbidding the crime of intimidating railroad employes. He then issued an order for the arrest of Andrews, upon an affidavit that Andrews had intimidated such employes; and thereupon, without a trial for the crime, without jurisdiction to try anyone for such a crime, without any of the safeguards of criminal trial for the protection of the innocent, Judge Humphrey "convicted" his man and sentenced him to penal servitude. This is one case in thousands of similar judicial usurpations. There is no law for it. The only color of law is a bare pretense. In the name of a Chancery proceeding, judges make criminal statutes and punish as criminals whomsoever they see fit to charge with their violation—punish without law and without trial. Shall this usurpation continue?



### Three-Cent Fares in Cleveland.

The New York Times, in its issue of October 25th of last year, stated that Cleveland street car fares would soon be raised from three cents, and indulged in misrepresentations to make its prophecy appear reasonable. A similar statement had been made in the Philadelphia Bulletin of October 11th. Evidently both papers were deceived by some Big Business publicity bureau. We commented upon these misrepresentations at the time, explaining the true situation\* and showing the improbability of any greater increase than from 3 cents (plus 1 cent for transfers but repayable upon use) to 3 cents (plus 1 cent for transfers and not repayable). But not even this increase has come at the expected time. Nor is it likely to come. The Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 17, 1911, reported that—

November earnings of the Cleveland Railway Co., made public yesterday, give 3-cent fare, with penny back for transfer, a lease of life well into next year, even if no additional economies are made effective when Street Railroad Commissioner Witt gets into harness. The company yesterday reported that it spent \$18,683 more during November than the Taylor grant allowance contemplated. . . . During November the average fare paid by paying passengers was \$.03158, the amount above 3 cents being con-

\*See The Public, vol. xiv, pp. 1002, 1114.