

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1893.

Number 24.

**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 column of last page.

In his official letter of condolence to the Emperor of Austria, whose wife had been murdered by a lunatic, President McKinley correctly phrased American sentiment. He conveyed the sympathy of his countrymen to the head of a friendly nation overwhelmed with personal grief, without implying that his grief was essentially more important than that of the humblest man or woman in the empire. President McKinley thus exhibited an unusual sensitiveness to the spirit of democracy, which does after all animate American sentiment in spite of the external snobbery that has of late years become so common.

With the Austrian emperor in his sorrow we all sympathize, deeply and sincerely. A man like the rest of us, his grief is in degree our own. Whoever believes in the universal brotherhood of man, must feel for the emperor somewhat of the thrill of sorrow one would feel if his own nearest neighbor suffered a similar affliction. This seems to be the sentiment of President McKinley's letter, and his expression of that sentiment all American democrats will cordially approve.

Some newspapers, however, as well as some public men, have not been so thoughtful as the president. They voice the sentiment of American snobs, those despicable creatures who look upon monarchs as something above men. These creatures profess on an occasion like that of the assassination of the Empress of Austria, the utmost regard for the sanctity of life. But it is not life that they look

upon as sacred; it is only some lives. Common human life has to them no sanctity comparable to property rights. Here is a woman, a good woman according to report, but neither better nor worse than millions of other women. She had a husband who loved her, but not more than millions of other husbands love their wives. In the prime of life she is assailed by a madman and stabbed to the heart. It is indeed a sorrowful event and utterly unjustifiable. But not more so than the tragic death of any other of the millions of good wives might be; not so much so as the deaths, and the misery culminating in death, which at this moment afflict thousands of less prominent but not less virtuous wives even in the very empire over which her bereaved husband presides—death and misery caused by hunger produced by the laws. Yet upon her death these American snobs shed crocodile tears, while they are indifferent or worse to the hourly hunger tragedies that afflict this world of plenty. Is it because her death was sensational, or because they regard her as superior to her sisters, and her life as more sacred? Be it either way, they are contemptible all the same. If they would be credited with sincerity in their professions of regard for the sanctity of life, let them supplement their sorrow and indignation at the murder of the Empress of Austria, with some approach to sorrow and indignation over that multitude of hunger murders, in comparison with which her assassination was like sinking into peaceful sleep. Our emotions in connection with the assassination of the Empress of Austria should be the same as would be excited by the assassination of any other woman, neither less sorrowful and indignant nor more.

It is said that the murderer of the Empress of Austria is not a lunatic but an anarchist. This cry of William of Germany is echoed throughout the courts of Europe and repeated here. Its motive is to arouse a wild passion which can be utilized in the name of law to put down men and movements that, though they neither assassinate nor encourage assassination nor look to assassination as a method of revolution, are infinitely more dangerous to the greedy beneficiaries of hunger-murder, crowned and uncrowned, than have been all the assassins since the days of Cain. In response to that cry, it is seriously proposed to make an international compact that would outlaw such peers in the society of the promoters of the world's peaceful advance, as Prince Krapotkin and Elisee Reclus. Even the gentle Tolstoi would come under its ban. William himself proposes if possible to make the event an excuse for suppressing the socialist party of Germany.

These passion provokers know full well that the murderer of the Empress of Austria is probably a lunatic. That his lunacy should have taken the form of a mania against royalty is not remarkable in a country where royalty personifies the oppression which drives men crazy. But if he were in fact what for evil purposes he is asserted to be, an anarchistic conspirator against crowned heads, what folly it would be to attempt to put down his co-conspirators by international outlawry or any other kind of force. Force is futile against men who have no fear of death. This man admits his act. He makes no effort to escape punishment. He even offers to go from Switzerland where he can be only imprisoned, to Austria where he would be beheaded. And through it all he sings as if he

were a youth on his way to his wedding. If in fact, then, this man is not a lunatic but a murderous conspirator, one of a band like himself sworn to assassinate royal personages, what protection could there possibly be in international outlawry, or in killing off "anarchists," unless the decree were as sweeping and indiscriminating as Herod's against the innocents? If not a lunatic, that man is affected with the kind of fanaticism that leads men joyfully to death in pursuit of their objects; and if there be in truth a society of such, neither outlawry nor fear of death will suppress them. If there be a society of such men, which we do not believe any more than we believe in the ogres of fairy lore, they will make it more dangerous to wear a crown than to go to battle; and the more they are "suppressed," the more dangerous they will become.

But be there such a society or not, be the assassination of the Empress of Austria the work of an "anarchist" or of a lunatic, the remedy is not the international outlawry of people accused of being "anarchists." Besides being futile, that would itself be anarchy; and it would degenerate into something akin to the old witchcraft persecutions. The remedy is to remove the cause of anarchy; it is, in the language of one astute American editor, to "stamp out the ignorance, stupidity, idleness, and moral obliquity from which modern anarchy is hatched." This ignorance, stupidity, idleness and moral obliquity, however, is not located where the astute editor supposes. It is the "ignorance" and "stupidity" of the titled fools who imagine that they can stop progress toward liberty by taking advantage of maniacal crimes to persecute political adversaries; it is the "idleness" of those who though they toil not, live in luxury upon the earnings of such as do; it is the "moral obliquity" of those who think of the world as their oyster and of their fellow men as menials designed by a plutocratic God to open it for them.

Stamp out these base things, and anarchy would indeed disappear. There would be then no more lunatics driven by what they see of undeserved hunger to insanely murder people whom they see revelling in unearned luxury.

The principal specification of the charge that the Cubans are incapable of self-government was to the effect that they fired upon Cervera and his surviving officers and men after they had surrendered. This was the especial ground of complaint of that industrious journal of plutocratic civilization, Harper's Weekly, which denounced the act as placing the Cuban republic "outside of the pale of civilization." It seemed to us at the time that this indicated a sad lack of real grounds of complaint against the Cubans, and implied that the plutocrats of this country were willing to seize upon the flimsiest kind of excuses to justify their purpose of wresting the Island of Cuba from its people. We were unable to see that this act charged against a few Cubans as putting the whole Cuban people outside the pale of civilization, was a whit worse than that of the Spanish sharpshooters who fired upon our wounded, our Red Cross and our surgeons, deliberately picking them off, a barbaric act which nobody thought of imputing to the whole Spanish nation. Moreover, there was no good reason for believing that the Cubans knew Cervera had surrendered. He appeared to be running away, and we could see as a matter of civilization no difference between the act of Cubans in firing upon him as he ran away, and the action of our own troops in firing upon Spanish soldiers at San Juan as they ran away. The indignation of our plutocrats impressed us as similar to that of the wolf when the lamb muddied the stream. And so it appears to have been. For now, and from Spanish sources at that, it is shown not only that Cervera had not surrendered but was running away to escape capture, when the Cubans fired upon him, but

also that as soon as he did surrender—and it was to the Cubans, mind you, that he surrendered—they treated him with civilized consideration and turned him over to the Americans. It begins to look as if proof of the incapacity of the Cubans for self-government would be at a premium at Washington before Mr. McKinley succeeds in "pacifying" their island sufficiently for the civilizing purposes of the American-Indies Company.

These are distracting times for Mark Hanna's White house protege. The management of the war was like a holiday to him in comparison with the troubles which its mismanagement has brought upon his administration. At first he was determined to ignore the universal complaints, to regard them as scandalous emanations from yellow journals; but his complacency was rudely disturbed by the election returns from Vermont. This green mountain state always goes republican, but the rise and fall of the republican majority there is as invariably an indication of the condition of the political weather elsewhere. So when Mr. McKinley heard that while the democrats of Vermont had polled as large a vote last Tuesday as they polled at the presidential election two years ago, the republican vote had fallen off 25 per cent., he hurried to set on foot the army investigation which the people had urgently demanded, but which until then he had regarded as quite unnecessary.

This investigation was requested by the secretary of war, it is true, but that detracts nothing from the inference that it was really set on foot by the president. It must be remembered that the secretary of war plumply opposed any investigation. He was proud of his department. The charges of ill-treatment of soldiers he denounced as silly. There had been but one complaint, he said, and that was without foundation. The truth was, so he asseverated, that the soldiers had had too much to eat, too much of fruit and harmful food;