

# The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1904.

Number 341.

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.

What kind of campaign management can that have been which sent Senator Tillman to Chicago to support Parker by appealing to the supposed animosity of the stockyards strikers toward Negroes because some Negroes were imported by the packers to take the strikers' places?

Until he touches upon the race question, Senator Tillman is one of the best democrats, in the fundamental sense of the word, to be found in American public life. But whenever and wherever he faces that question, he loses his democratic balance. It is the worst kind of bad policy, therefore, to assign him to campaign work in any place where the right of Negroes to vote is respected by public sentiment, yet where the relations of the races may become a subject of discussion. He is certain to solidify the Negro vote against his cause, and not unlikely to drive away no inconsiderable number of white voters besides.

But this incident suggests more than bad campaign management. It bears every indication of premeditated deviltry. Owing to the loss of their strike, the stockyards strikers were naturally bitter against the imported "scabs" who had caused their defeat. This feeling would have been the same had all the "scabs" been white men. The hatred was at bottom in no ordinary sense a race hatred. But as many of the imported "scabs" were Negroes, the feeling did take on an appearance of race animosity. The Negroes were hated, not because they were Negroes,

but because they were "scabs;" but their distinguishing color involved their race in that hatred, just as it would have involved whites of distinctive national appearance not represented among the strikers. It was to fan this spark of possible race hatred into flame, that Tillman, whose anti-Negro sentiment is known to be strong and uncontrollable, was sent into the stockyards district of Chicago. The purpose was as cruel as the policy was suicidal.

Parker's managers are not the only unwise ones in this campaign. Watson's chances of polling a vote significantly large are endangered by the recklessness of Populist papers in denouncing Bryan. It would doubtless have been gratifying to Populist leaders had Bryan made the inexcusable mistake last summer of bolting his party, though no more so than it would have been to the plutocrats and wire-pullers who have acquired temporary control of its organization; but their disappointment serves them badly when it excites them to the point of denouncing Bryan as a traitor to the cause of genuine democracy.

Among Bryan's friends are some who, while recognizing the propriety of his course as a leader within the Democratic party, have felt that their confidence in him and their approval of his course would not necessitate their following his advice when they come to vote at the approaching Presidential election. As these men are human, nothing could better serve to divert them from "scratching" for Watson than the unnecessary and unjust attacks which Populist papers are making upon Bryan's good sense and good faith.

It is this kind of irresponsible

run-a-muck leadership, to which the Populist party is sadly subject, that discourages fundamental democrats, disgusted with the plutocracy of their own parties, from trusting the Populist party as an affirmative political force. Governed too much by the sympathetic nerve system and too little by the cerebro-spinal, it has yet to learn that political leadership demands horse sense and patience as well as sincerity and energy. As a negative force in this campaign, this party has unquestionably been welcomed by many Bryanites; but they would be approximately angelic if they did not "cool off" under insinuations against the sincerity of a leader whom they trust, and sneers at a course which he adopts with their approval.

That Bryan is supporting Parker in all good faith, no one who knows the simple straightforwardness of the man can doubt. That he is doing it without enthusiasm is natural. Even the strongest supporters of Judge Parker are without enthusiasm. There is nothing to be enthusiastic about. That Bryan does not deviate from the straight path by supporting Parker is evident. Fidelity to a cause does not always call for a "bolt" when one's party organization falters or its candidate is doubtful. Until a leader's cause within his own party is finally lost, he is under no call to get out of it. Quite the contrary. His followers are free to support him by supporting his party, or to support him by disciplining his party at the polls. They may go out and come back at will. But a leader's place is within his party until he concludes that its regeneration is impossible. Bryan has so construed his obligations of leadership, and Jeffersonian democrats who trust him are not likely to stamp with their approval any

wanton assaults upon his good judgment in so deciding or his good faith in so acting. If Bryan Democrats who wish to discipline their party recoil from voting the Populist ticket, it will be in no small measure because they resent these attacks upon the man whom they regard as preeminently the national leader of Jeffersonian democracy.

With many Bryan Democrats, however, there is a feeling which even the foolishness of Populist papers cannot allay. Though they succeed in turning them away from Watson, it will take more than that to turn those voters toward Judge Parker. They feel that if Parker were to receive a large vote it would be equivalent to a final surrender of the Democratic party to its plutocratic element. And the feeling is well warranted. To quote a humorous paper in support of this assertion may seem incongruous, but Life, while delightfully humorous in method, is really so very serious in purpose that there is no inappropriateness in quoting it on such a point. An ardent supporter of Parker, Life sympathetically explains the motives of a certain class of Democrats in voting against Roosevelt, by saying that their—

foremost interest is not his defeat, but the medication of their own party. They want to see the conservative element in their party confirmed in such a share of control, that when the Democrats win—as they will presently—the party may be fit to administer the government.

The meaning of that is very clear, despite its euphemistic shadings. "Conservative," in the connection in which Life uses it, is Waldorf-Astoria for plutocratic; while the reference to "fitness to administer the government" is, under the circumstances of recent Democratic history and Life's attitude toward it, a very plain intimation that yokels like Bryan are quite unfit for any such patrician service. No more terse and accurate description of the Democratic situation than this by Life is possible; and the fact is realized by others than Life and its "conserva-

tive" Democrats "fit to administer the government." It is realized by many a loyal friend of Mr. Bryan. While these voters approve of Bryan's regularity as a responsible leader in the organization of his party, they look forward without much sorrow to that party's overwhelming defeat at this election as its best "medication." Here is their problem, precisely the one that Life states: Shall the plutocratic element in the Democratic party be confirmed in control of the party, as Life desires; or shall that control be discredited? Parker's election would confirm it, but with some compensations in the way of improved administration. It would be confirmed also by his defeat by only a narrow margin, and in that case without any compensations. But Parker's emphatic defeat would put an end to the control by the plutocratic ring that captured the party at St. Louis. So far as we have been able to discover the sentiments of radical Democrats over the country, they are, with but few exceptions, in entire agreement with Life, as to the significance of a vote for Judge Parker; but unlike Life, these Democrats are inclined to "medicate" their party by casting their votes against "the conservative element" which seeks to control it. They are somewhat confirmed in this inclination, moreover, by recollections of the "medication" to which Life's "conservative" element of the party subjected it in 1896 and 1900.

Walter Wellman has added nothing to a comparatively good reputation as a journalist, by his report on the Colorado situation. He offered in his report to convict the labor leaders of Colorado of moral responsibility for the deplorable conditions there, "before a jury composed of the decent, honorable labor organizations of the country." To this challenge the Chicago Federation of Labor responded with an invitation to Mr. Wellman and his employers "to select a party of 12 prominent men from the labor organizations of the country," and prove Mr.

Wellman's charges before that tribunal. The response fully met the challenge. But Mr. Wellman backed out (p. 355). Because he regarded the response as offensive in some of its language he declined to "take up the Colorado question under the auspices" of the Chicago federation. They had not proposed that he should take it up under their auspices. The auspices under which they had proposed that he take it up, were those of a jury of 12 prominent men from the labor organizations of the country, to be selected by himself. If he made his challenge in good faith, he cannot evade it by complaining of the tone of the response, nor yet by saying, as he does, that his charges have been proved "to the satisfaction of nine-tenths of the people and the press." Mr. Wellman's inference as to what nine-tenths of the people and the press may think, is not equivalent to the verdict of "a jury composed of the leaders of the decent, honorable labor organizations of the country." That was the tribunal to which he appealed; and it was the jury which the Chicago Federation offered him, he himself to select its members.

The Federation's reply to Mr. Wellman's "back out" is worth his consideration whether its rudeness disturbs him or not. In part it reads:

What right have you to assume that "nine-tenths of the people" believed, or have any confidence, in your unproved charges? What right have you to assume that the wealth producers of this nation have sufficient confidence in the public press to accept as true what appears over the signature of a correspondent, when almost every intelligent man knows that this same public press is the purchased oracle of legal brigands, and the secret enemy of American labor, American manhood and American progress? Is it manly to fall back on offended dignity when a question is raised against your integrity by honest men and women who are accustomed to call a spade, a spade? We have not been schooled in refined perfidy nor tutored to hide honest thought behind a mass of dishonest verbiage. We felt that your charges were baseless and made at a time for purposes best known to yourself, and with that thought uppermost in our minds we accepted your challenge.