

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1903.

Number 251.

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.

When the Washington dispatches announced Senator Tillman's intention of addressing the Senate on the coal famine question, they added that no attention would be paid to his speech as the Senate does "not take Tillman seriously." But when Tillman spoke, he made the friends of the administration realize that it would be decidedly necessary to take him seriously. And they took him seriously indeed, as the subjoined dispatch to that rock-bound administration paper, the Chicago Inter-Ocean amply testifies:

Senator Tillman's speech created a sensation in the Senate and Senators Spooner and Beveridge continually entered objections to his remarks. Senator Spooner announced after the South Carolina Senator had concluded that several senators would reply to Mr. Tillman on Monday.

Floating through the press we find these words credited to Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the senators from Massachusetts:

When wealth realizes its responsibilities, when it is used to relieve suffering, to promote education, to bring works of art within the enjoyment of all, then it is a protection and a strength.

This is a good example of the unconscious disguising of a manifest falsity in figures of speech. What Mr. Lodge is thinking about is not wealth, but wealthy men; but had he written "wealthy men" instead of "wealth," the error in his sentiment would have been apparent. Let us translate it into those terms, thus:

When wealthy men realize their responsibilities, when they use their wealth to relieve suffering, to promote education, to bring works of

art within the enjoyment of all, then they are a protection and a strength.

It is now evident that this sentiment begs the whole social question, which is not a question of how wealthy men do or should spend their wealth, but of how they get it. If they get it at the expense of others, either legally or illegally, then, whether they use it benevolently or not, they are neither "a protection" nor "a strength," but a burden and a menace.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is reported from Johannesburg as announcing that "measures must be taken to train the natives to habits of industry," and "that if no other remedy can be found the blacks must be compelled to work by force." Truly, that suggestion smacks of a design to reestablish Negro slavery. It probably means, however, that the slavery is to be disguised in some such innocent form as a "hut tax," under the operation of which South African capitalists may secure an abundant supply of cheap native labor. Though "Britons never will be slaves" themselves, some of them, like some Americans, are not averse to making slaves of others. The "right to work" (other men) has struck its roots deep in Anglo Saxon philosophy.

New York dispatches of the 18th gave a lurid account of the behavior that day, on a Mount Vernon trolley car, of a dozen soldiers of the 16th U. S. infantry just home from the Philippines. They were returning to Fort Slocum to the garrison of which they belong; and their condition, if it be not unpatriotic to mention it, was what among civilians is known as "bestly drunk." When they used offensive language to a woman passenger, two men among the passengers resented their indecency, whereupon these valiant defenders of their

country's invading flag in the Philippines, assaulted the unpatriotic men with their fists, and with their revolvers riddled the car with bullet holes. A panic followed, in which the passengers leaped for their lives from the car. The excitement over, it was discovered that one passenger had been thrown bodily out of the window while the conductor had been seriously stabbed. In other ways, also, some of the processes of "benevolent assimilation" which these soldiers had learned to exercise in the Philippines were practiced upon the barbaric inhabitants of Mount Vernon. "The water cure," however, was not exemplified. We forbear comment. The "honor of the army" must be respected.

There is no mistaking the animus of the majority of the Chicago council in turning down the "Finn" municipal ownership bill by substituting the "Jackson" bill. Both provide for municipal ownership and both provide for referendums on the subject. But the "Finn" bill was prepared by a committee the majority of whom believe in municipal ownership, really as well as nominally; while the "Jackson" bill is virtually confessed by its sponsor to have been drawn by street car lawyers. The latter bill favors municipal ownership as the devil hates lying—in the abstract, not in the concrete.

It is in their referendum clauses that the difference between these two bills is most plainly visible. The "Finn" bill provides for an "initiative" as well as a "referendum;" the "Jackson" bill strikes out the "initiative." Note the difference. Under the "Finn" bill, ten per cent. of the registered voters could submit the question to popular vote, and a majority of those voting would de-