

The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse
Nov 2-01 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1901.

Number 151.

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.

Dr. E. A. Spitzka, the New York alienist, appeals to the noted successful men of the country to leave their brains by will to scientists for post-mortem examination. Why not make the same request of noted unsuccessful men? The brains of both will be needed for comparison before valid conclusions can be drawn. But suppose that such comparisons reveal no differences—what then?

About the remark of Prof. Robinson, of the McCormick Theological seminary, that such a democratic process is going on that when he walks the streets his pupils whom he meets do not look upon him as any better than they are themselves, the important thing is his saying it. These sentiments are common with men of his class and cloth, but he has had either the courage or the dullness to give them unguarded expression. Such candor is welcome. Democracy always fights best in the open.

Our Cuban proteges have been treated to an exhibition of the good old English writ of habeas corpus, which we as Americans have been taught to believe is one of the safeguards of liberty. A judge in Havana issued it for a prisoner in the custody of Gov. Gen. Wood. But Gov. Gen. Wood treated it with the indifference that the English exemplars of divine right used to. He ignored the writ, and shipped his prisoner to the United States. Another valuable lesson for the Cubans in the science of self-government.

In an article in the Commoner on gambling, respectable and otherwise,

Mr. Bryan lays, incidentally, the only firm foundation for human society, namely, "that each person shall make to society a contribution equal in value to the benefits which he receives." In that simple but pregnant sentence is embodied all economic truth. To depart from the principles of that declaration is to mire in the quicksands; to build upon them and by them is to establish economic justice.

Mr. H. O. Nourse's crusade against the large packing companies of Chicago for stealing water from the city mains has resulted in one conviction, that of the superintendent of one of the companies. He is convicted of petit larceny. The unfortunate thing about matters of this kind is that the real criminals cannot be got at. They are sheltered behind the impersonality of a corporation charter, and the criminal law finds no one to expend its force upon but some hired man to whom such crimes are all in the day's work.

Ten years ago a railroad laborer, who afterward became a freight brakeman, lent \$170 to a friend, taking as collateral an old watch and a new mortgage, the latter on 40 acres of land in Kern county, Cal. As the loan was not repaid, our Arizona workman foreclosed. But the land was valueless. No one had yet discovered how useful it could be made. Recently, however, it was found to be rich oil land, whereupon the lucky workman becomes a millionaire. Not quite so obviously, but none the less truly, all great fortunes are like this quondam workman's—a private appropriation of what by natural law and in justice is common property.

A New York judge has come to his senses, partly at least, on the subject of expert testimony in handwriting.

This "fake" of "fakes" has hypnotized the courts for a generation. Not content with admitting such testimony when the authority of a document is itself the main issue of the trial, the courts have allowed side issues, bearing upon questions of life and death, to furnish material for controversies between handwriting experts. To this practice Judge Fursman has put a stop. In the interest of justice it is to be hoped not only that the higher courts will sustain him, but that some other judge will go a step further and rule handwriting experts off the stand altogether.

To realize that the much-talked-of tariff war with Russia is not a war between this country and that, but is at bottom a quarrel over spoils between privileged classes in both countries, it is necessary only to consider the simple facts. If Russia pays sugar producers a bounty on the sugar they export, what is the real nature of the thing? Merely this, that she taxes her people in order to help along the private business of Russian sugar exporters. When our own government imposes extra duties upon Russian sugar imported into this country under bounty stimulation, what is the real nature of that thing? Merely this, that it compels our people to pay in taxes upon Russian sugar enough to make it just a little cheaper for them to buy sugar trust sugar. And when Russia retaliates by putting heavy import taxes upon American steel products, what is the real nature of that? Nothing more nor less than an arbitrary order that her people must go without these products, or pay exorbitant prices for them. Reduced to its last elements, this tariff war is merely a lifting of the lid, so that any intelligent man may see, if he takes the pains to look, what a villainous

robbery of the people for the benefit of privileged cliques and classes the whole protective system is.

As an international question, this tariff war with Russia is one in which our country is in the right, if there can be any right to what is fundamentally wrong. What we mean is that countervailing duties must be imposed by us upon bounty stimulated exports of sugar from Russia if our wretched tariff system is to be kept up at all. The American sugar trust might be completely circumvented, be wholly deprived of its tariff profits, if bounty-fed foreign sugar were admitted into this country without an extra import duty large enough to offset the advantage of the foreign bounty. And if we impose such duties upon sugar from one bounty paying country, we must impose them on sugar from all. Otherwise delicate international difficulties, promoted by "business" interests in the countries discriminated against, would assuredly arise. That is what makes it necessary to discourage the bounty-fed sugar exports of Russia with a countervailing duty. We impose countervailing duties upon the bounty-fed sugar exports of Germany, of Austria, of France, of Belgium; and consequently must be ready to do the same regarding Russia. So we must either continue to provoke Russia's retaliatory duties upon our steel trust interests, or consign our sugar trust interests to the free list. If we could turn the whole collection of tariff schedules into a free list, it would be a blessed thing for everybody—our trusts alone excepted. It is only justice to Russia, however, to acknowledge that her indirect method of giving a bounty on sugar exports—by merely remitting from the exports the internal taxes she imposes upon sugar consumed at home—is a concession to sugar exports of what ought to be conceded to all products. She allows her sugar manufactures to go into the markets of the world free from tax burdens. Would that our

protected masters would allow us to do the same, only more of it.

Apropos of the rumored consolidation of the steel trusts, the core of the trust question is touched by an editorial in a conservative newspaper, which declares that for the present— it may be said that as long as the raw materials of industry are not monopolized, there can be no monopoly of long duration in the finished products.

That is perfectly true, provided highways are regarded—as economically they must be—as raw materials of industry. What the paper in question overlooks, and in common with most other superficial students of the subject of trusts, is the fact that in the steel industry the raw materials are now monopolized. Not that all ore mines are in the trust. They are not. But all the rich mines are; and as these are amply sufficient to satisfy demand, competition by means of other mines is impossible. Besides that, the monopoly of highways has to be reckoned with.

When treasury looters fall out, the public may get some of its dues. And treasury looters in congress have fallen out over the river and harbor plunder and the ship subsidy plunder. Mr. Hanna himself became so angered at the difficulties he had encountered in his efforts to pay campaign debts with ship subsidies and thus make himself solid, "an honest man who stays bought," with the "business interests" for the next campaign, that in his speech in the senate on the 15th he suddenly exclaimed, in a loud voice:

How about the river and harbor bill? What does that contain? I make no charges against anybody, but there are things in that bill which make the ship subsidy bill pale by comparison. I say this most emphatically.

For once Mr. Hanna is right. The river and harbor steal does make the ship subsidy steal pale by comparison. But once the river and harbor steal also was a smaller steal. With time, patience, cheek and McKinleyism, it has expanded to such magnificent

proportions that Mr. Hanna notices its predatory qualities. Give the ship subsidy steal but half a chance and it will soon play a good second to the river and harbor bill in every congress.

Large employers of dependent labor are often guilty of impertinences which not unnaturally irritate and anger their tongue-tied objects. An instance was offered recently by Marshall Field & Co., of Chicago. Into the pay envelope of their employes this firm thrust a printed slip containing advice "on saving" from the pen of Russell Sage. That Russell Sage is competent to give advice on saving methods, no one doubts who knows of his mania for accumulation. But he is the last person to whom young men should be referred for advice as to the morality of saving or of anything else. And even if his example as man and citizen were worthy of emulation, it would still be an impertinence on the part of employers to thrust his advice unasked upon their adult employes. To appreciate acts like these it must be observed that they are not acts of friendship between equals. They are condescending efforts to regulate the lives of underlings, who tolerate it only because they dare not risk losing their jobs. The circumstances are such that Marshall Field & Co. virtually command their employes to read the sordid preachments of the most notorious miser of the modern kind. It is this assumption of a right to intrude upon the privacy of their employes, and not so much Sage's platitudinous, and in one respect abhorrent, advice for success in life, that offends. Mr. Field might proffer the Sage tract to a friend without offense. The friend, if sensible, would laugh at the tract, and might joke Mr. Field about his augmenting years. An employe has no such liberty. He is as helpless as when the firm orders him out on parade for political effect.

The possibilities of slavery in the guise of freedom have lately been ex-