

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1904.

Number 304.

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 suggestion of Gen. Nelson A. Miles as the Democratic candidate for President, a suggestion which is now echoed from many sources with more or less distinctness, is very far from being the worst that might be made. In fact, it seems at first blush to be among the best, if indeed it is not the very best.

Since William J. Bryan is politically dead, buried, epitaphed and forgotten, there is something puzzling about the consternation his declaration of political policy has created among the plutocratic politicians and newspapers of both parties who have killed, buried, epitaphed and forgotten him. The fact of the consternation is indisputable. The plutocratic papers ring with evidences of it. Just as the hungry Democratic politicians and the grasping captains of industry were reorganizing the Democratic masses and classes for another grand bunko fight for the Presidency, commiseriated with Wall street money duly bargained for, Bryan "kicks up a rumpus" by demanding the re-adoption of the essential principles of the Kansas City platform. Now, how can a dead man kick up a rumpus? Has Bryan's ghost done it, as the ghost of Hamlet's father did, by exposing the Denmarkian rottenness of the reorganization? Or is Bryan, after all, not dead, buried, epitaphed and forgotten, but still a great power with the common people? Either hypothesis would explain the rumpus Bryan has made. But could anything else?

The report of the trustees of

the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, of which Booker T. Washington is the head and personification, declares that the chief need of the Negroes of the South is "for teachers or leaders who will not only teach in the ordinary manner, but who will emphasize the dignity of labor," etc. But nothing is said of the need of emphasizing the fundamental rights of laborers, namely their right to natural opportunities and their right to the full value of their productions. Dignity of labor and exploitation of laborers are incompatible things. So long as our institutions allow laborers to be exploited, just so long shall we have to plead for a recognition of the dignity of labor, and plead in vain. The very classes that are most insistent verbally upon the dignity of labor are least insistent practically upon getting their share of this dignity. Give them the products of labor and they care not who has its dignity. So long as this is so, the Negroes of the South cannot be truly impressed with the dignity of labor. While they observe that it is not the man who labors, but the one who lives in luxury upon the labor of others, who is respected and honored—and the greater his unearned income the greater the respect and honor—how can they really believe that there is dignity in labor? With their native courtesy they may reply, "Das so! I reckon das so!" but in their hearts they must feel like exclaiming, "G'way, chile! G'way!"

Most of the talk about "the dignity of labor" is mere mockery. It is like that other phrase, now so common in plutocratic circles, about "liberty to work." In truth, labor is dignified, in the nature of things; but it is not dignified in the estimation of society. That

society does dignify it is the untruth to which our plutocracy tries to give currency as truth. They want a contented menial class upon whose labor they may luxuriously live, and this is one of the little confidence games they play upon the unsophisticated. In truth, also, liberty to work is an inherent right. But that is not what the plutocrats and their parasites, clerical and lay, mean when they talk of "liberty to work." All they mean is that trade union rules must not be allowed to obstruct liberty to work; they do not object to the obstructions of monopolistic laws. It is simply a case of whose ox is gored. If it is "my ox," then "liberty to work" is an obvious right; but if it is "your ox," then the principle of liberty to work raises very complex questions which, though they may be solved some ages hence, "through much pain and suffering," are only academic now!

The verdict of the coroner's jury on the Iroquois theater disaster (p. 660) is remarkable both for its findings and its failures to find. It holds several city officials responsible for the disaster, and includes Mayor Harrison because "he has shown a lamentable lack of force in his efforts to shirk responsibility," and "following this weak course has given Chicago inefficient service, which makes such calamities as the Iroquois theater horror a menace until the public service is purified of incompetents." Accordingly the jury recommends that Mayor Harrison "be held to the grand jury until discharged by due course of law." The Mayor was arrested and held in \$5,000 bail; but, very properly as it seems upon the face of the matter, has been exonerated by Judge Tuthill in habeas corpus proceedings. Others recommended for grand jury action and