

# The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 1903.

Number 279.

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 a Democrat says, 'Let's run Grover again!' all the other Democrats," observes the witty Life, "know whom he is talking about." True, very true. But then it adds: "That's an advantage." Not at all. It's a handicap.

A dispatch from New York gives the refreshing information that—

Judge Andrew Kirkpatrick, of the United States court of New Jersey, occupies the unique and delicate position of dispensing patronage from the bench to a trust company of which he is president. . . . Judge Kirkpatrick says he sees no impropriety in designating his own company.

Why should he see any impropriety in it? The day is past in the United States when judges are expected to see any impropriety in judicial "graft."

Some labor men, including the president of the local miners' union, have been driven out of Idaho Springs, Col., by a mob headed by the mayor and the president of the local national bank, who is also manager of a local mine, of a local tunnel company, of the local electric company, etc. The labor men were in jail upon an unproved charge, which they denied, of having dynamited the buildings of a local mine. This outbreak of mob law would be of no more general importance than any other instance of frontier lawlessness were it not approved with a few honorable exceptions, by the organs of "law and order" in the civilized parts of the country. Their approval raises a very serious question as to what they mean by "law and order." Are

we to understand that mobs and riots over labor disputes are lawful and orderly or not, according to whose ox gets gored?

"Government by injunction" flourishes in Manila under the American regime. The sentence to six months' imprisonment of a labor leader for contempt of court, for publishing a labor paper the publication of which had been suspended by order of the court, was the first newspaper news to come over the Pacific cable, just completed, between the Philippines and the imperial republic of which their inhabitants are restless subjects. Why "government by injunction" should have been adopted out there is not quite clear. More autocratic and summary methods are certainly available. Possibly, however, the American officials prefer forms of tyranny that have become familiar at home and are therefore less likely to shock the American goddess of Liberty.

A dispatch from Atchison, Kan., tells humorously of the disappointment of a New Yorker who responded to the Kansas call for farm hands, but quit when he found what farm-handing meant. Says the dispatch:

The New Yorker had never seen a farm before, except the kind on the stage, and his first disappointment was the farmer's daughter. He expected to find a pretty little thing in short milkmaid skirts, like the chorus girls in Pinafore, who went to her milking singing blithely with a pail swinging on her arm and a little Swiss apron on. There were no soda fountains on the farm, and one whole day he was without a cigaret. On the whole, he found every illusion too shattered to pick up when he started for home.

This New Yorker must have been one of those editorial pen-smiths of the metropolitan press, who "write up" the great opportunities which the boundless prairies

of the West offer to the industrious. If unsophisticated enough to believe in his own editorials, he might very easily, upon losing his editorial job, have undergone precisely such an experience of disappointment and discouragement as is described in the above-quoted Kansas dispatch.

There is an extensive crusade in the cities of the country against what is called the "end seat hog." The allusion is to people who, in summer trolley cars, take the outer end of the long transverse seats, and force later comers to the inconvenience of crowding past them in the narrow space between seats. This may be hoggish sometimes; but it is not always so. Suppose the first occupant intends to ride but a short distance. What difference would it make in that case whether he held his outside seat (thereby forcing later comers to crowd past him when they get on), or moved up (thereby subjecting them to the equal discomfort of his crowding past them when he gets off)? The "end seat hog" is not found on cars with a longitudinal aisle. Nor does he inconvenience fellow passengers on cars with roomy spaces between seats. He is a natural product of parsimonious street car management.

Henry Rochefort, the Paris journalist, has gathered the horrible facts about Negro lynchings in the United States and published them in France in comparison with the horrible facts about the massacre of Jews in Kishineff. He does this as a suitable commentary upon the American protests to the Czar. The humiliating thing about it is the truth of what is suggested. With one accord the press of the United States has denounced the massacre of Jews in Russia, and

thousands of our people have joined in a petition about it to the Czar; yet with few exceptions the American people are silent when they do not applaud, and the American press is dumb when it does not approve, the savage outrages upon Negroes at home. It is futile to try to make distinctions between persecution of Jews and of Negroes. The distinctions lack that without which no distinction is valid—a difference to be distinguished. In one case as in the other, race antagonism is the cause of these crimes. In Russia the hated race is the Jew; in the United States it is the Negro; in both the animus is a common feeling that the persecuted race is inferior. Of all the morally wretched defenders of this American crime, therefore, the American Jew who defends Negro lynchings while denouncing Russian massacres—and some do—is most contemptible.

Mild surprise is expressed by the Commoner because the New York Evening Post declares its ignorance of the existence of Judge Walter Clark, of North Carolina, one of the ablest jurists and publicists of the country. The reflection, as the Commoner observes, is not upon Judge Clark for being unknown to the New York paper, but upon the New York paper for being ignorant of Judge Clark. In the same article the Commoner wonders because another New York paper of national reputation regards as "little unknowns from nowhere," such men as Stone, of Missouri, who has served with distinction in both houses of Congress and as governor of his State, and Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, who has served two terms in Congress, also with distinction, is Mayor of Cleveland twice elected on issues of national concern and interest, and has four times defeated Mark Hanna at elections in Hanna's own Republican city and county. If Mr. Bryan is really surprised at this sort of thing, it must be because he knows little of New York city and its journalism.

There is no more provincial place, nor any more provincial press, on the face of the earth. Not even the remotest village, outside of the actual backwoods, is so completely wrapped up in the contemplation of its own lilliputian local interests.

Cleveland's newspaper supporters are renewing their old charge against Bryan that he bolted the Democratic ticket in 1892. The object of this is to show, by the "you're another" process of reasoning, that Cleveland's bolts in 1896 and 1900 do not disqualify him for the regular party nomination for President in 1904, since Bryan, notwithstanding his bolt of 1892, was the regular candidate in 1896 and 1900. Mr. Cleveland's friends are proceeding upon the theory that you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time. It is matter of history that Mr. Bryan did not bolt in 1892. On the contrary, he did what Mr. Cleveland, through his manager, requested him to do. We have told this story and furnished proofs more than once (vol. v., '322). Mr. Bryan has recently told it with circumstantial detail in the Commoner. If anything further be required, it will be found in the Annals of the American Academy of Political Science for 1901, in a scholarly paper on "Present Political Tendencies," by Waldo Lincoln Cook, of Springfield, Mass. On the point in question, Mr. Cook writes:

In 1890 and 1892, American Populism displayed great political strength. Mr. Cleveland, although a conservative man of the most orthodox New York associations, profited by the Populist disaffection in his third campaign for the Presidency. His political manager, Mr. W. C. Whitney, who was able to carry New York only by a plurality of 45,000, and without a majority over all, made astute use of the Western Populists by arranging fusions with them wherever there seemed to be a prospect of diverting electoral votes from Gen. Harrison to Gen. Weaver.

As anyone with even the faintest knowledge of American political history knows, one of the States

in which that arrangement was made was Nebraska, and one of the men who responded to the Whitney-Cleveland request to make it was Mr. Bryan. Hence the Cleveland cry now that Bryan was a bolter then. To call Bryan a bolter for this is not ignorance, it is duplicity. As a bolter Cleveland remains solitary among candidatorial possibilities. He has been a notorious bolter in every Presidential campaign for 20 years in which he was not himself the candidate.

Had Congressman Baker expected to win laurel wreaths from the press by refusing the pass with which the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company endeavored to enlist his Congressional sympathies in its behalf (p. 263), he would have been disappointed. The plutocratic papers of both parties, most of those that have not been silent about it, have been jocular. The idea of a public official's refusing a corporation "courtesy" was just too funny for anything—not because it is unique, but because "there's no sense in it." Of such morality are these our ethical teachers made. One exception is especially worthy of note. The New York World editorially deprecates this licentious merriment, and admonishes those of the thoughtless public who may also think a bit of official honesty funny, that such high sense of official obligation as Congressman Baker's, had it been general before his innovation, would have prevented the post office and army glove scandals.

The comment upon Congressman Baker which exhibits moral obtuseness of the most painful kind is that of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. That paper calmly suggests that Baker "should have returned the pass and kept still about it." Truly, this would have been an excellent way of avoiding the pricks of private conscience without interfering with the pass-corrupting practice. But considering that