

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1904.

Number 326.

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.

"Scum of the earth"! There is none—except what rises to the top.

The character of ex-President Cleveland's article in McClure's Magazine for July, and the great importance of its subject—the part taken by the Cleveland administration in suppressing the Chicago railway strike of 1894—seem to us amply to justify the space we devote this week to reviewing it.

A solution of the labor problem has been discovered by the head of the Methodist church in Canada—the Rev. Albert Carman, D. D.—bless his name. It is simple, too. All great things are simple. The highly perceptive Dr. Carman's solution is that every laboring man learn the Lord's prayer. Good! As far as it goes, excellent! But it is not enough for laboring classes to learn the Lord's prayer. Other classes also should learn it,—not its words, but its penetrating principles; above all, the ministerial class, and most of all, the Rev. Dr. Carman.

If Isaac H. Mayer, the Chicago lawyer, who is at least as "able and prominent" as the attorney for the railroad conspirators whom President Cleveland selected for the government's special counsel in the strike troubles of 1894, which those conspirators were then fomenting—if this Mr. Mayer were entitled to public gratitude for no other reason, he is entitled to it for his exposure

this week in the State courts of Judge Grosscup's proceedings in the Federal courts in connection with the Chicago traction cases (p. 137). It is to be regretted that there was no Isaac H. Mayer, representing property interests, to dissect the conduct of Grosscup and Woods, the Federal judges for Chicago at the time of the railroad strike of 1894.

The Republican national convention was an impressive example of political decay. Its principles were the selfish principles of piracy, phrased in the cant of decadent religions. Its delegates represented corporate instead of public interests. Its idealized dead were not its Lincolns but its Hannas. The vocabulary of its speakers, enriched with such sporty phrases as "stand pat," "four of a kind," a "fifth ace," "a full house," were suggestive more of gambling hells than of serious politics. Yet clergymen are applauding these sporty speakers as noble characters, this convention of corporation tools as a patriotic gathering, its piratical doctrine as moral precepts. Compare all that with the high moral principles and trend and tone of the Republican party when it exalted its Lincolns and denounced its Camerons, and say what it spells if not political decay.

If most lawyers were as sensitive to professional obligations in these times that "try men's souls" more literally than did the days of Valley Forge, there would be better reason for confidence in the triumph of law and order. Few though they may be, however, there are some such lawyers. One of them is John Brooks Leavitt, of New York, whose address to the graduating class of the law school of the Maryland University at Baltimore rings true to the best

professional traditions and measures up to a high standard of professional ethics. In utilizing the Colorado revolution to illustrate the general principles he had discussed, Mr. Leavitt said:

My remarks should not end without reference to the anarchy which has been reigning for long in one of our States. I have left it to the last, because I wished to deal mainly with causes rather than symptoms. Mention of Colorado is pertinent to enforce the position that we should revise our code of ethics and take active measures to see that our profession obeys the laws of the State in spirit and in truth. In that great commonwealth, a veritable El Dorado for beauty of nature and prosperity of man, unchecked lawlessness by corporations and labor unions, advancing from bribery through riot to murder, has spread to all classes in the community. Respect for law has disappeared. The judiciary has been treated with contumely by the executive. The writ of habeas corpus has been suspended, not by act of legislature, but by fiat of the militia. Colorado is an anarchistic State. She is a terrible example of what her sister States will become, unless the tide of lawlessness is stayed. It is the solemn duty, the sworn duty, of lawyers to stand for the supremacy of the law. It is useless for us to do so with our tongues, unless we stop sowing with our hands the seeds of lawlessness. This we have been doing for a generation under the enticements of the contingent fee and the corporational fee. If in hot indignation at corporations for bribery, or labor unions for murder, we demand to know who is the guilty cause, then let every conventionally respectable lawyer, who has accepted an unclean corporational fee, or manufactured an unholy contingent fee, say to himself: Thou art the man!

It is a pleasure to name Mr. Root, late secretary of war, as possibly having returned to those professional standards. He appears at any rate, in his Yale address, to have stood for the supremacy of the law with his tongue. Whether he will now stop sowing with his hands the seeds of lawlessness, remains to be seen. The part of Mr. Root's address which we reproduce with more than ordinary satisfac-

tion comes over the wires as follows:

The cry of "emperor," "czar," and "man-on-horseback" are but extravagant appeals to an instinct which ought to exist and happily does exist among us against submission to unlawful authority, however trifling may be its exercise and however beneficent its despotism. There is a constant tendency to ignore such limitations and condone the transgression of them by public officers, provided the thing done is done with good motives, from a desire to serve the public. Such a process, if general, is most injurious. If continued long enough, it results in an attitude of personal superiority on the part of great officers which is inconsistent with our institutions, a destruction of responsibility and independent judgment on the part of lower officers, and a neglect of the habit of asserting legal rights on the part of the people. The more frequently men who hold great power in office are permitted to overreach the limitations imposed by law upon their powers, the more difficult it becomes to question anything they do, and the people, each one weak in himself and unable to cope with powerful officers, who regard any questioning of their acts as an affront, gradually lose the habit of holding such officers accountable, and ultimately practically surrender the right to hold them accountable. Constant accountability of public officers for strict observance of the limits imposed by law and customary and undoubted assertion of the private right of the citizen to have no power exercised over him except in strict accordance with the letter and the spirit of the law—these are the essential conditions of free government and personal independence.

Had these eminently sound doctrines been observed when the Philippine temptation came we should have a grander history and a higher future; had they been observed in the Chicago strike of 1894, the Colorado usurpation might not threaten republican institutions now.

Before Dr. Gunsaulus made himself guilty of the unpatriotic act of denouncing the fundamental statement of the American Declaration of Independence, to the graduating class of the Armour Institute at Chicago this year, he should have made himself familiar with its doctrine. It is not good form for distinguished educators to trifle with the unripened minds of their students. And Dr.

Gunsaulus ought to learn that it is trifling to assume that the Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal" in every possible sense in which the term "equality" can be used. What that document does assert is, that in justice "all men are created equal" in their rights under just human laws. Lincoln interpreted this great Fourth of July document truly when he said:

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men, but they did not mean to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say that all men were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what they did consider all men created equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This they said and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society which should be familiar to all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors, everywhere. . . . The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be—as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to those who in after times might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants; and they meant, when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, that they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

All this is obvious upon any common sense reading of the American Declaration, and it is demonstrated by its context. Do the Gunsauluses deny the truth of its assertion as to equality in that meaning? If they do, why not deny it candidly? If they do not deny it, then why do they pettifog? For it is pettifogging to argue that because men are not created

"equal" as to height and might, or mental and moral temperament, they are therefore not created "equal" as to legal rights, and that the great Declaration of human liberty is as to this, its basic clause, "a glittering generality" or "an interesting falsehood."

In his baccalaureate address President Hadley, of Yale, traced "almost every evil—political, social, or commercial—which constitutes a serious menace to the permanent prosperity of our country, to our tolerant acceptance of selfishness." It is an encouraging sign of the times that a man occupying President Hadley's position recognizes definitely that conditions are "menacing." If it were possible for him, with his wide influence, to denounce the means whereby selfishness becomes a social menace, some of the evil manifestations of selfishness as a social factor would speedily disappear. That the menacing conditions to which President Hadley points are logical and necessary consequences of adequate causes, will not be denied by anyone who believes that this is a universe of law; and no one will find it easy to account for them adequately upon any other theory than that they are the pains of social disease caused by legal privilege. There is consequently but one cure for them, and that is the destruction of legal privilege. Most of the manifestations of selfishness to which President Hadley alludes spring from a sense of that utter helplessness of the individual in the face of narrowing opportunities, from a realization that life is a struggle against overwhelming odds, from a consciousness of complete absence of equality of legal right and opportunity as a heritage of all. They are merely self-defense reduced to its lowest terms. If President Hadley, resisting every impulse of his mind to perpetuate institutions as they are, with all their defects and perversions and oppressive possibilities, and inspired solely by a motive to translate moral truth into terms of economic and