

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1902.

Number 231.

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.

The mock attack by a fleet of the American navy upon the coast of New England; a comical imitation by the one-vessel navy of Illinois, with the coast of Lincoln park at Chicago for its objective; and arrangements for a prize fight somewhere or other later this month, are among the principal sporting events of the week.

That the naval maneuvers off New England are regarded by those in authority as more in the nature of aristocratic sport than as serious preparation for defensive war, was demonstrated by the suspension of an important movement in order to accord a social reception on board the flagship to the American wife of an English duke. It is to the honor of several of the subordinate naval officers that they refused to be dragged into this snobbish performance. They, at any rate, take the naval maneuvers seriously. But they are mistaken. The principal object of this expensive aquatic sport is evidently to edify society folks at Newport.

Observing the ridiculous failure of the Civic Federation's tribunal, presided over by Mark Hanna, at the first test to which its possible usefulness has been put, certain distinguished gentlemen of New York, who are encouraged by Abram S. Hewitt, have set about organizing what they call the National Economic league, with the object not so much of settling as of avoiding "disputes between labor and capital." That is an excellent object. But what hope can there be of accomplishing it through men who confuse capital

with monopoly, as the organizers of this movement evidently do. Conflict between labor and capital can be prevented, but the conflict between labor and monopoly is irrepressible. It can neither be prevented nor settled, and can be ended only by the triumph of one of these forces over the other. Either monopoly must be abolished or labor must be subjugated.

That is a fact which benevolent labor-pacifiers, who would run with the hare while they hunt with the hounds, either do not see or will not acknowledge. So they bundle monopoly into the same category with capital, and in the name of the latter try to shield the privileges of the former. Whether they know it or not, they are quacks. In the coal strike now in progress, for instance, the quarrel is not between mining labor and mining capital. It is between mining labor on the one side, and mine and railroad monopoly on the other. Because mine and railroad monopoly are erroneously classified with mining machinery and railroad plants, under the common name of capital, and the essential difference thereby hidden, this conflict is mistakenly regarded as one between labor and capital. Let the difference between true capital and mere monopoly once be clearly distinguished, and there will be no excuse for the intervention of your Hannas and Hewitts, who call themselves capitalists, but who are in fact capitalists only in small degree. Their chief interests are in some form as land monopolists, and it is land monopoly that they are anxious to protect.

Out of all the Chicago church pastors who preached on the coal strike last Sunday, only one of those who were intelligibly reported appears to have said anything

worth while. This was Frederick E. Hopkins. He sensibly pointed out the futility of arbitration as a permanent remedy, and dwelt upon the necessity of removing the cause. Mr. Hopkins may not agree in all respects with most of us as to what the cause is; but it is always refreshing, nevertheless, to find a preacher who believes in removing the cause of an evil instead of indulging amiably in wise fooling with its effects. But whether he scents the true cause of labor conflicts or not, Mr. Hopkins does put his finger boldly upon one cause of the anthracite strike, for he said:

In the state of Pennsylvania an enormously valuable natural product has been allowed to pass into the hands of a few individuals. They own the coal, and upon such terms that they can say we will mine it and sell it as only ourselves see fit. Ought a state ever to have allowed such a condition to be created in respect to a product of nature? If not the remedy is to be found in Pennsylvania correcting its mistake.

Ohio Democracy, under the lead of Tom L. Johnson, has a better idea of harmony in the national party than that which seems to prevail among the "reorganizing harmonizers." Both Johnson's speech as temporary chairman of the Ohio convention, and the platform afterwards adopted, make it clear that harmony is not regarded by Ohio Democrats as the same thing as officially ignoring the last national platform and officially spitting in the face of the presidential candidate who stood upon it. According to this Ohio idea, it is not within the functions of a state convention called for state purposes to reverse national policies or remodel national platforms. Its duty, on the contrary, is simply to recognize the national platform last adopted, if it wishes to remain in affiliation with the national party; and to pay its tri-

bute of respect to the last national standard bearer unless it wishes to be deliberately insulting. In taking this stand, Mr. Johnson and the Ohio convention over which he presided have set an example that all Democrats who sincerely wish for harmony on democratic principles will be glad to follow. The criticism of those who use "harmony" as a catch-word to promote plutocratic schemes can be easily endured.

On state issues the Ohio platform is bold and explicit, as was Chairman Johnson's speech. There is no false note or timid tone about it. Only knaves can misinterpret it; only fools can doubt its sincerity. On all the subjects that interest the people, not of Ohio alone but of every state in the Union, it has the sonorous ring of radical democracy. Its principles are summed up in the phrase with which the distinguished chairman characterized the issues of the campaign—"Home rule and just taxation."

Of the candidate whose name leads the Ohio ticket, for the office of secretary of state, but little need be said in these columns. To our readers the name of Herbert S. Bigelow is a household word. It has been objected that he is one of "Tom Johnson's preachers." But that sneer has lost its sneeriness. When Johnson became mayor of Cleveland, he appointed a clergyman to a place in his cabinet as director of charities and correction; and now the people of Cleveland unite in saying that the Rev. Harris R. Cooley is the best director of charities and correction the city ever had. When Johnson had become the acknowledged leader of Democratic politics in Cleveland, he suggested for the director of schools a graduate in theology whom the opposition dubbed "reverend," though he had not served in a pulpit. Nevertheless, the Rev. Starr Cadwallader was elected; and the good people of Cleveland now acknowledge that he is the best director of schools the city ever had. It may not be wise, then,

for Republicans of Ohio to say too much about the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow as "one of Tom Johnson's preachers." The good people might all want to try him and see if he wouldn't make the best secretary of state Ohio ever had.

Mr. Bigelow, a graduate of Adelbert college and Lane theological seminary, is the pastor of the Vine street church of Cincinnati, which has an enviable record as one of the underground railway stations through which escaping slaves used to pass from Kentucky to Canada, and which cherishes and exemplifies, under Bigelow as its pastor, the spirit of liberty in which it was born. It is a church that knows no distinctions of color or class, and in which the golden rule is taught without apology or modification—a church of the common people. Of Bigelow it is enough now to say, as of Johnson himself, that he is an able, eloquent and devoted advocate of Henry George's concrete application of the golden rule.

Another follower of Henry George—not a preacher this time, but a journeyman blacksmith—whom Johnson is credited with enlisting in the great combat between democracy and plutocracy already thickening, is Edmund H. Vail, whom the congressional convention of the Twenty-first Ohio district has called directly from his anvil to make a contest for Congressman Burton's seat. Mr. Burton is a difficult man to defeat. Not because he has rendered exceptional service to the country as a national legislator. No one would make that claim. But because he has rendered faithful service to the water front proprietors of Cleveland in connection with the river and harbor appropriations. In spite, however, of water front and kindred interests, the district can be carried by the workingmen if they unite; and if they cannot unite upon Vail it is hopeless to expect them to unite upon any one. He has made his way through

life as a journeyman blacksmith; has made him a little home; has educated his children in the schools; has educated himself in public affairs; and has done it all in the sweat of his own face and not in the sweat of somebody else's face. In Congress, Vail would not only want to vote right on public questions, and dare to do it; but what is equally important, he would know how.

If the people of Ohio are at all alert, the Democratic candidates will be elected this year by overwhelming majorities, so bold have the Republican leaders become in disclosing their devotion to private in preference to public interests. With them public office is anything but a public trust. Both United States senators—Foraker and Hanna,—who between them manage the state administration, are deeply interested in street car monopolies. These interests evidently come first in their consideration, and Hanna is candid enough to say so. In a newspaper interview at Columbus last week he declared:

"My street railway is my savings' bank. If I cannot look after my street railway interests and politics, too, I'll quit politics and look after my business alone."

This was said in connection with the use he is making at Columbus of his influence as a Republican senator and leader of his party in framing the new municipal code. He wants it framed in the interests of his street railroad, regardless of the interests of the people of the state or even the interests of his party.

Senator Hanna has become either so arrogant or so fatuous that he openly demands perpetual charters for street cars. Not indeterminate charters that can be terminated at any time by the cities, be it observed; but indeterminate charters which the cities can never terminate if the companies perform their agreement, and which they would be powerless to alter except at intervals of 10 or 15 years, and then only with the consent of the companies or by making a case upon which the courts could act.